

# 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 Fourth  
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1969

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Wednesday, March 19, 1969

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Robert Merrill of Gardiner.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

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

Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve to Open Millinocket Lake, Piscataquis County, to Ice Fishing (S. P. 101) (L. D. 311)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

**Ought to Pass**

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Revising Criminal Failure to Support Minor Children" (S. P. 102) (L. D. 316)

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

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

**Ought to Pass with  
Committee Amendment**

Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act relating to Transfer of Funds from Maine Sardine Council to Department of Agriculture for Sardine Inspection Activities" (S. P. 199) (L. D. 608) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-36) submitted therewith.

Report of the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act relating to Weight Tolerance on Building or Construction Materials" (S. P. 78) (L. D. 240) which was recommended, reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-35) submitted therewith.

Report of same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Distribution of Axle Loads on Commercial

Vehicles" (S. P. 84) (L. D. 531) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-34) submitted therewith.

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

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence and the Bills read twice. Committee Amendment "A" to each was read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bills.

**Petitions, Bills and Resolves  
Requiring Reference**

The following Bill was received and, upon recommendation of the Committee on Reference of Bills, was referred to the following Committee:

**Business Legislation**

Bill "An Act to Permit Savings Banks to Engage in Debtor Counseling Services" (H. P. 1076) (Presented by Mr. Clark of Jefferson)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

The following Bill and Resolves, approved by a majority of the Committee on Reference of Bills for appearance on House Calendar, were received and referred to the following Committees:

**Appropriations and Financial  
Affairs**

Resolve Providing for Purchase of Copies of History of Auburn (H. P. 1077) (Presented by Mr. Drigotas of Auburn)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

**Claims**

Resolve to Reimburse Julia Junkins of South Portland for Damage to Property (H. P. 1078) (Presented by Mrs. Morgan of South Portland)

(Ordered Printed)

Sent up for concurrence.

**Legal Affairs**

Bill "An Act Establishing the Boundary Line between the City of Bath and the Town of Woolwich"

(H. P. 1079) (Presented by Mr. Lund of Augusta)  
(Ordered Printed)  
Sent up for concurrence.

#### Orders

On motion of Mr. Starbird of Kingman Township, it was ORDERED, that Rev. Perley Kelley of Lincoln be invited to officiate as Chaplain of the House on Tuesday, March 25, 1969.

#### House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Hichens from the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Minors on Liquor Licensed Premises after 8 P.M. (H. P. 776) (L. D. 1009) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Covered by Other Legislation

Mr. Crommett from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act to Increase Salary of County Treasurer of Penobscot County" (H. P. 651) (L. D. 839) reported Leave to Withdraw, as covered by other legislation.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Ought Not to Pass Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Chick from the Committee on Education reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Create a School Administrative District in the Town of Jay" (H. P. 428) (L. D. 552) which was recommitted.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Dyar of Strong, tabled pending acceptance of the Report and specially assigned for Friday, March 21.)

Mr. Noyes from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Health Warnings on Labels on Liquor Bottles" (H. P. 807) (L. D. 1046)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Rand from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act Adding Airport Facilities to the Revenue Producing Municipal

Facilities Act" (H. P. 740) (L. D. 958) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1080) (L. D. 1313) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

#### Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Binnette from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Blood or Tissue Transfer Services" (H. P. 927) (L. D. 1188)

Mrs. White from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Clarify the Barber Laws and Raise Certain Fees" (H. P. 464) (L. D. 601)

Mrs. Lincoln from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Credit for Military Service under State Retirement Law" (H. P. 576) (L. D. 762)

Mr. Meisner from same Committee reported same on Resolve Making a Retroactive Adjustment in the Retirement Pension of Charles Hulbert (H. P. 781) (L. D. 1014)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice, the Resolve read once, and tomorrow assigned.

#### Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Scott of Wilton from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to Report of Insurance Companies of Fire Loss Adjustments to Insurance Commissioner" (H. P. 315) (L. D. 402) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-103) submitted therewith.

Mr. Noyes from the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act Increasing Compensation of Members of Board of Hairdressers" (H. P. 227) (L. D. 283) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-104) submitted therewith.

Mrs. Baker from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to the City Charter of the City of Caribou, Authority of the

City Council and Time of Elections in the City of Caribou" (H. P. 568) (L. D. 749) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-105) submitted therewith.

Same member from same Committee on Bill "An Act to Grant a Charter to the Town of Pittsfield" (H. P. 609) (L. D. 797) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-106) submitted therewith.

Mr. Cote from same Committee on Bill "An Act Extending Time for Relocating of Maine Central Railroad Tracks in Livermore Falls" (H. P. 668) (L. D. 855) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-107) submitted therewith.

Mr. Shaw from same Committee on Bill "An Act Providing for a Council-Manager Charter for the Town of Vassalboro" (H. P. 638) (L. D. 826) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-108) submitted therewith.

Reports were read and accepted and the Bills read twice. Committee Amendment "A" to each was read by the Clerk and adopted, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bills.

Mr. Lebel from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Clarify Certain Motor Vehicle Laws" (H. P. 246) (L. D. 301) which was recommitted, reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice. Committee Amendment "A" already having been adopted, the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Revising the State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation Law" (H. P. 437) (L. D. 561)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot  
PEABODY of Aroostook  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. HASKELL of Houlton  
HUBER of Rockland  
DURGIN of Raymond  
GOOD of Westfield  
BEDARD of Saco  
CASEY of Baileyville  
McTEAGUE of Brunswick  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. BELIVEAU of Oxford  
— of the Senate.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Huber of Rockland, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Compensation of the Panel of Mediators" (H. P. 691) (L. D. 891)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TANOUS of Penobscot  
PEABODY of Aroostook  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. HUBER of Rockland  
DURGIN of Raymond  
GOOD of Westfield  
CASEY of Baileyville  
McTEAGUE of Brunswick  
BEDARD of Saco  
HASKELL of Houlton  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. BELIVEAU of Oxford  
— of the Senate.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Huber of Rockland, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting

“Ought to pass” on Bill “An Act relating to Sunday Sale of Liquor” (H. P. 289) (L. D. 365)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BERRY of Cumberland  
CONLEY of Cumberland  
BOISVERT  
— of Androscoggin  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. CHANDLER of Orono  
COUTURE of Lewiston  
FAUCHER of Solon  
TANGUAY of Lewiston  
LEIBOWITZ of Portland

— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HICHENS of Eliot  
STILLINGS of Berwick  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens.

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Three weeks ago tomorrow I caused a slight stir when I stated to a group of 150 citizens present at the Liquor Control Committee hearing on the Sunday liquor bill that I felt that their presence was a waste of time and a loss of pay because the arguments presented would have little or no effect on 8 of the 10 members of that Committee, they having made up their minds as to their vote before they entered the hearing room. I stated that regardless of statements made, that the best that could be expected was a 7-3 vote in favor of the Sunday liquor bill. I was over-optimistic as you can see.

I based my statement on the fact that two freshman legislators claimed that they were open-minded and would listen to arguments before making a decision. Naturally, I hoped that the 100 opponents of this bill, along with their arguments, against the 50 proponents, with their arguments, would convince these two committee members. As you can see by the report, one voted in favor of the bill, the other against.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman of the House, I ask you to disregard the vote of the tendentious members of the Committee and consider the report as divided equally for and against.

On that basis I ask that you support the “Ought not to pass” Report and kill this bill herewith.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Meisner.

Mr. MEISNER: I move that this bill be tabled until Wednesday, March the 26th.

Mr. DENNETT of Kittery: Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A tabling motion is pending, the motion of the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, is that the House accept the “Ought not to pass” Report.

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

Mr. DENNETT: I ask for a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the motion to table, and the pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, that the House accept the Minority “Ought not to pass” Report. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Wednesday, March 26, will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, that the House accept the Minority “Ought not to pass” Report.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to the motion made by the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens. I well realize that human emotions run high on a bill such as this. But I think that the hour has come when Maine should again consider itself a member of the world community. I don't think that we can hold to these archaic rules and regulations in face of

the progress of the modern world. Now, the State of Maine does not presently permit the sale on Sunday of intoxicating beverages; yet every state and province that surrounds it does.

Now this bill, just what does this bill cover? Actually, it is not a wide-open bill to any extent. It would permit on the first day of the week the sale of alcoholic beverages in class A restaurants, in private clubs and in duly licensed hotels. It differs from a bill that was previously presented to this Legislature because that bill permitted the take-out sale of beer on that day. There seemed to be some opposition to that proposition.

However, and particularly during the summer season, thousands and thousands of tourists come into the State of Maine. They expect to be served meals; they expect hotel accommodations in those places that are established for that purpose within the State. They also expect that before they have their dinner they might buy a cocktail. They, in many instances, are astonished when told that they cannot purchase the same in the State of Maine as it is contrary to the law.

Now I think all of you who have any experience in travelling, and you don't necessarily have to have experience in drinking, know that people who go into a class A restaurant, a first class dining room, a hotel dining room, on a Sunday and wish to buy a cocktail, don't do it for the purpose of getting intoxicated. Generally speaking those who plan on getting intoxicated, or should I use a crude and vulgar word which is called stoned, they usually get their supply in well in advance. They have no desire to go out and purchase a single drink.

Now again, you will be told no doubt that Sunday is a day when people shouldn't drink. I would remind you that the Christian religion has never placed any interdict on alcohol. Neither has that of Judaism. The only religion that places an interdict and forbids the use of alcohol is that of Islam. The Moslems, if you were a good Moslem, you don't take alcohol but

you can still buy it in those countries.

I wish you would consider and consider well the proposition that we find ourselves up against this morning. It is to permit this to be sold on Sunday, freely, with the rest of our neighboring states, with our neighboring provinces. We don't ask for the unusual, we don't ask for the impossible. This in turn would mean more revenue for the State of Maine at a time that we need it. It would encourage the summer business to a greater extent. You no doubt will be told that many people come into the State of Maine because they can't buy it, and I would present to you that I don't know of a person who ever went anywhere for a negative purpose. I certainly don't go into any state, I don't visit any town, because I don't want to do something; I do it because I want to.

I sincerely hope that when the vote is taken you will vote against the motion made by the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, and when the vote is taken I would ask for a division.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Eustis.

**MR. EUSTIS:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I ride no white horse, I wear no suit of armor, and I wave no plumed helmet. I say this to dispel any ideas you might have that I am trying to be a crusader. This is not so. I do, however, have a deep and abiding affection for the State of Maine, and what this bill asks the State of Maine to do — not you or I as individuals or this group as a group, is to put the seal of Good Housekeeping on the sale of Sunday liquor.

Let us examine this bill a bit, and the claims made for it and how far they will stand up. In the first place there is no denying that legislation. Second, the idea that it is discriminatory legislation. Second, the idea that we have to imitate other states I think is wrong. As to bootlegging, which will undoubtedly come into it, anybody who personally or through friends or through groups knows

the specie, knows full well that this will in no way cut down the amount of bootlegging. The people who want liquor on Sundays they want it Sunday morning, they are not going to sit in a rocking chair in their best clothes and wait until noon to go and buy a drink, which wouldn't be enough anyhow.

To me, imitation of our neighbors is no proof of virtue. I perforce go back to the turn of the century, a little bit before that. I am a son of Maine and even at that early age she projected to me an image which I think should remain unsullied, and I believe firmly that if we tag this Good Housekeeping approval seal on the State of Maine we will be clouding and distorting the real virtue that belongs to our State. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Chandler.

Mr. CHANDLER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. CHANDLER: A discussion for just a moment of the membership of the Committee and the voting record of the Committee, my own particular vote involved.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's point is well taken, and I would advise and warn the House that when you are addressing the House and debating bills you will not be allowed to inject personalities into your debate.

Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, that the House accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Sunday Sale of Liquor," House Paper 289, L. D. 365. All those in favor of accepting the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

52 having voted in the affirmative and 81 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read twice, and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

### Orders Out of Order

Mrs. Wheeler of Portland presented the following Joint Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the League of Women Voters of Maine is commencing its fiftieth year of service to the voters of this State; and,

WHEREAS, the League has worked tirelessly and fearlessly for good government and legislation to improve the American way of life; and,

WHEREAS, its members have continued the tradition of concern for citizenship education established by those who, fifty years ago, gained for women the right to vote; now, therefore, be it

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the 104th Legislature extend to the League of Women Voters of Maine congratulations and best wishes for its future endeavors. (H. P. 1081)

The Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

On request of the same gentleman, ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

On motion of Mr. Bedard of Saco, it was

ORDERED, that Deborah Bedard and Margie Lafond of Thornton Academy be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Retirements and Pensions reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Permit Two Retired Persons on Board of Trustees of Maine State Retirement System" (H. P. 349) (L. D. 456)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HANSON of Kennebec  
CIANCHETTE of Somerset  
DUQUETTE of York  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. SHELTRA of Biddeford  
BARNES of Alton  
PRATT of Parsonsfield  
MARQUIS of Lewiston  
MEISNER

of Dover-Foxcroft  
— of the House.

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



Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. TEMPLE of Portland

Mrs. LINCOLN of Bethel  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The Majority "Ought not to pass" was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Divided Report

##### Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Create the Department of Banking and Insurance" (H. P. 783) (L. D. 1016)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington

LETOURNEAU of York

BELIVEAU of Oxford

— of the Senate.

Messrs. MARSTALLER

of Freeport

DONAGHY of Lubec

D'ALFONSO of Portland

RIDEOUT of Manchester

— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. DENNETT of Kittery

Miss WATSON of Bath

Mr. STARBIRD

of Kingman Township

— of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Rideout of Manchester, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, March 26.)

#### Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditure of State Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969" (S. P. 219) (L. D. 660)

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1970 and June 30, 1971" (S. P. 372) (L. D. 1232)

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

#### Third Reader

##### Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Permitting Employment of State Prison and Reformatory Inmates on County and Municipal Public Works Projects" (H. P. 497) (L. D. 651)

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

(On motion of Mr. Vincent of Portland, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Friday, March 21.)

#### Third Reader

##### Indefinitely Postponed

Bill "An Act relating to Penalty for Illegal Sale of Liquor" (H. P. 738) (L. D. 956)

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

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

Mr. BIRT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Yesterday when this motion was made to substitute the bill for the report I think the action was moving a little bit faster than some of us were able to comprehend. Back in 1851 I think, initially the State of Maine passed a bill of this type and I would hope that we are not heading in that direction, and I don't think that this was the intent.

But this bill, if probably the most of you have taken a look at it since, would forbid the sale of any liquor in the State of Maine. It would remove about six or seven words but in effect would eliminate all sale of liquor in the state, and I am certainly sure that we don't want to go in that direction. I would therefore move the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Chandler.

Mr. CHANDLER: Mr. Speaker, if I might take just a moment to speak on this measure.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CHANDLER: A good friend of mine who is a pathologist in Orono tells the following story to be absolutely true. He claims that one morning last summer he went

to the Penobscot Valley Country Club, when the early morning mists were still lying upon the heather and so on, and there appeared before him on the deserted course two angels. The first angel stepped up to the tee, hit the ball, and it lobbed a little way down the tee. A ground hog stepped out of a hole, caught the ball in his mouth and started to run with it. An eagle swooped down out of the sky, took the ground hog, and climbed up into the air. And then a lightning bolt struck the eagle, who dropped the ground hog, who dropped the ball, for a hole in one. The second angel looked at the first and said, "Marvin, are you going to play golf or are we going to fool around?" (laughter)

My constituents last night asked me the same thing, "Are you going to pass legislation, or are you going to fool around?"

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from East Millinocket, Mr. Birt, that Bill "An Act relating to Penalty for Illegal Sale of Liquor," House Paper 738, L. D. 956, be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor will say aye; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

### Third Reader Indefinitely Postponed

Bill "An Act Concerning the Riding of Bicycles" (H. P. 789) (L. D. 1022)

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

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Last night, and it was probably by a twist of fate, my car stalled at the exit on Route 95, at the Waterville open road exit, there is a slight incline there but I was luckily going towards the down hill direction. I was able to get out and start pushing my car to get into a gas station. After the debate here yesterday the first thought that came to my mind, as soon as I stepped out of my automobile and started pushing I should be on the

left hand side of the road. Like the bike rider I was now a pedestrian. (laughter)

Now the National Safety Council has bike riders on the right hand side of the road. This is probably why there are no other states that have them on the left. For this reason I would move indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mrs. Payson.

Mrs. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My worthy colleague, the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey, has brought out a splendid point. He feels that if anyone gets out on the road that they should always be on the left hand side because they are probably pedestrians, which is probably true. Once in a while it is important that we take into consideration the realities of the situation; and that is what I am asking you to do today, in respect to the bill requiring bicycles to travel on the left hand side of the road.

I think that this bill should be considered on its merits and its merits alone. No other state in the entire United States has passed such a law. It would indeed be unfortunate if no state could do anything innovative unless another state had already done it. Mr. Asa Richardson, chief counsel for the Maine State Highway Commission, has given us his opinion that we are free to make our own choice on this bicycle bill as far as federal regulations and federal funds are concerned. Therefore, I hope that you will look at this from a purely realistic point of view, that each bicyclist should be in a position to watch the cars bearing down on him, rather than being in a position where he must turn his back to the oncoming cars and pray that no one will mow him down.

Let us be realists. I hope that you will vote against the motion for indefinite postponement. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey, that Bill "An Act Concerning the Riding of Bicycles," House

Paper 789, L. D. 1022, he indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of this motion will vote yes

— Mr. Carey of Waterville then asked for a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken, 83 having voted in the affirmative and 44 having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Sent up for concurrence.

#### Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Driver's License Reexamination" (S. P. 232) (L. D. 672)

Bill "An Act relating to the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act" (S. P. 267) (L. D. 905)

Were 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.

#### Orders of the Day

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

tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE REPORT — Ought not to pass — Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act Creating a Second Assistant County Attorney for the County of York" (H. P. 302) (L. D. 378)

Tabled—March 12, by Mr. Dennett of Kittery.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Danton of Old Orchard Beach to Reconsider Acceptance.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Dennett of Kittery, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Danton of Old Orchard Beach to r e c o n s i d e r acceptance and specially assigned for Wednesday, March 26.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (6) — Ought not to pass — Committee on Election Laws on Bill "An Act Repealing Certain Procedure for Registration of Voters"

(H. P. 628) (L. D. 816) — Minority Report (4) — Ought to pass.

Tabled — March 12, by Mr. Henley of Norway.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

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

Mr. CARTER: I move we accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. ROSS: In opposition to that motion, I would like to comment on this bill. This is a bill which would prohibit notaries and justices from registering and enrolling voters.

In the late 1950's the Legislature realized that the election laws in our state needed revision. In 1961, after a four-year study and an expenditure of \$10,000, the Legislature enacted an Omnibus Bill completely revising our election laws and making the changes deemed necessary to bring them up to date.

In 1962, on behalf of the State of Maine, Mr. Paul MacDonald, then Secretary of State, received an award from the American Heritage Foundation stating that our election laws were one of the outstanding sets in the entire United States. These laws included the stipulation that to register and enroll a person should go before a board of registration or city and town clerks. In 1962, the 102nd Legislature, in a drastic departure from this, enacted a law saying that notaries and justices could register persons at their homes, at their business, on the street, in vans, and so forth. The purpose, as stated at that time, was that this would make it a great deal easier for the voter. I opposed it then, and I certainly oppose it now, because I foresaw the problems which would develop as far as accuracy and control went and it has been proven in my opinion anyhow, that I was correct.

The Secretary of State just this last six months has made a survey of all the boards of registration and the city and town clerks in the state. The Deputy Secretary has on file a very comprehensive

list of correspondence. Nearly all of the persons contacted advised changing back. The comments varied, but they went something like this: that the information they were getting was wrong and it was not complete; that there were a great many errors; that the justices and notaries were not using enough care; that they were not turned in properly; that in some instances they were even turned in to the wrong town.

Now, the overall effect of this is that it has not been a convenience for the voter but often just an annoyance and frustration. In the last election alone a great many people went to the polls believing that they were properly registered only to find out that their names were not on a voting list and they had to be turned away.

In the final analysis, I think that this is very unfair to the voters of our state, and certainly very poor public relations for our entire election laws system, and I hope you vote against the pending motion now, and I request a division.

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

Mrs. BOUDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: After every election when ever a group of people gather, the conversation always ends up, "What a shame we don't have greater voter participation. Are we sincere? Do we really want the citizens to be able to register and vote?" If we passed L. D. 816, the answer must be no.

Under the present law there is equal opportunity for both political parties to increase the voting lists. There have been some abuses I am sure, but there has also been infractions of the motor vehicle laws. Do we abolish all laws, or do we punish the violators? The voter registration laws provide for penalties. Let's do our job. Let's punish the violators, not the innocent citizens. I urge you to vote against the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. MILLS: I rise to support this "Ought not to pass" Report. At the hearing down there on this bill I was the only person there outside of Representative Ross, Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Shute, and Secretary of State, Joe Edgar.

Now, to clarify this situation a little bit better, I am a Justice of the Peace from Washington County. I am also Chairman of the Democrat Registration Committee down there, and in going around to talk to these people who work out of town, we have a good many of them in Washington County who leave their place of abode and travel 60 or 70 miles to get to work. They don't get back until seven or eight o'clock at night. The town rooms and city rooms are closed there on Saturdays when these people would have this opportunity to register to vote. They just can't make it.

Now as far as registering these people to vote, I have registered these people, into both parties, Democrat and Republican, and I think, myself, that this is the only way these people are going to get a chance to vote, and a good many times to get these people to the polls both parties have organized caravans of cars in order to get them there to vote, that haven't registered. A good many times in their elections down there, or anywhere in the state, we have a very small majority of the voters actually voting. This is not good. It does not give us the full feeling of the people that want to vote simply because they can't make it.

I support Mr. Carey in an "ought not to pass."

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

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to comment briefly on this to support my friend, Representative Ross. I am one of the minority signers. I wish that we, as a body, would be as

quick to take a law off our books perhaps as we are to make it.

I am also a notary public. I have registered several voters, and I did so conscientiously to the best of my ability, but it seems to me, from the records, that it was a mistake to open this avenue on registration.

If we need additional registrars, if we need different rules of when the registrars will be available, if we need more public education of the people who will be registering as voters, I feel there should be one of two things: either justices of the peace or notaries should be specially instructed, which apparently they were not in a good many cases, or there should be other arrangements made, because it seems to me, from my reports and from reports of registrars and town clerks, that really in a lot of areas there was a mess made of it this past election, especially with the travelling groups, that in all sincerity, were working they thought for the good of the people. Nevertheless, I think that they considered that volume counted more than quality and in a good many cases they hurried things; and cards were lost, they were turned into the wrong places. In some cases they were not turned in at all.

I know one time I had a lady call me up right after the primaries and it so happened that she was a lady who had been signed over to my party. Something had happened to her card. When she got there to vote they said, "Well, you are not a Republican, you are a Democrat." She insisted that she had signed over, but her card never showed up. I don't know what happened to it. I didn't sign her over, but somebody did. But anyway we nearly lost her completely. She was furious and pounded my ear for twenty minutes or so on it. Those things did occur, and they occurred in many places.

So, I feel that change in the law was an error, and I don't feel that we should take offense. I'm sorry that my friend, Mr. Mills — he appeared before the Committee — and he felt that the change desired was an affront personally. It

certainly was not. I don't feel that originally justices of the peace or notaries public were appointed for that specific reason, and if we want to make registrars out of them, why, I feel, that they should be instructed; but for the time being, it seems to me we should let go of this law; we shouldn't be like sometimes the doting parents, which we read about too often nowadays, that says, "Well, this just couldn't happen, he's my son."

This law was promulgated and enacted in this body, but there are a lot of laws that we find that we have to repeal; and, consequently, I feel that this is one that we should repeal, and I urge you to accept the minority ought to pass and follow Representative Ross' recommendation.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise this morning with the thinking of a little bit of levity more than anything else, not at the expense of the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley, who really is a very good friend of mine, but possibly at the expense of what he commented upon in his remarks when he said that this woman whom he registered, thinking she belonged in the Republican Party and all the time she was registered in the Democratic Party, and she pounded his ear for about twenty minutes. It reminds me of last week when I was in the bank, and this fellow came along and told me a story at the joshing expense of Americans of the French ancestry. So he said, "Let me tell you a story about the three Frenchmen," and so after I listened — it was a pretty good story — and so I got back downtown, and I went to a Hibernian meeting, so I said to the boys, "My friends, let me tell you a story about the three Irishmen." So then last Sunday I went to Pemaquid with my very dear wife, and I turned the story around because I couldn't find any Frenchmen or any Irishmen, so I said let me tell you the story about the three Yankees. So I mean these stories can befit themselves

to the cloth anytime we decide to upraise the pattern.

Wherein it concerns legislation like this, I am not necessarily taking issue one way or another, but for heaven's sake, on all these matters, let's not try to put a party label on the thing, and so far as my own city is concerned, it doesn't necessarily affect the situation at all. Generally, people go down to register to vote, but in any event this is a permissive piece of legislation. It's on the books for people to take advantage of if they want to. If they don't want to, they can go down to the polls and register.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Carter, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on House Paper 628, L. D. 816, Bill "An Act Repealing Certain Procedure for Registration of Voters." All those in favor of accepting the Majority Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

61 having voted in the affirmative and 71 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was read twice and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

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

HOUSE REPORT "Ought not to pass" Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Providing for the Outlawing of Trading Stamp Disbursement by Certain Business Establishments Selling Motor Fuel" (H. P. 506) (L. D. 677)

Tabled — March 14, by Mr. Pratt of Parsonsfield.

Pending — Acceptance.

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

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

HOUSE REPORT "Ought not to pass" Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to State Historian" (H. P. 710) (L. D. 924)

Tabled — March 14, by Mr. Starbird of Kingman Township.

Pending — Acceptance.

On motion of Mr. Starbird of Kingman Township, retabled pending acceptance of Report and specially assigned for Friday, March 21.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (9) — "Ought not to pass" — Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Minimum Speed under the Motor Vehicle Laws" (H. P. 696) (L. D. 896) — MINORITY REPORT (1) — "Ought to pass".

Tabled — March 14, by Mrs. Wheeler of Portland.

Pending — Acceptance of either Report.

On motion of Mr. Carey of Waterville, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Friday, March 21.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Full-time State's Attorneys" (S. P. 243) (L. D. 1294) (In Senate referred to Committee on Judiciary)

Tabled — March 18, by Mr. Rideout of Manchester.

Pending — Reference in concurrence.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that this L. D. be referred to the Committee on State Government in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In the referring of more than 1,500 bills, I submit that the Committee on Reference of Bills is going to make some mistakes. I submit that the reference of this

bill to the State Government Committee is a mistake, that this bill should properly be referred to Judiciary.

There is one lawyer on the State Government Committee, and he agrees that the bill could get a more knowledgeable hearing before Judiciary. Most of the members of Judiciary are, when not in the Legislature, dealing with the problems that this bill proposes to correct.

I have a great deal of respect for the State Government Committee. I think that it may well be the ablest Committee in this Legislature. But when a Committee has special expertise in an area, I think that expertise should be used. I submit that the Judiciary Committee does have special expertise in this area. I urge this House to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, and when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

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

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In opposition to the good gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan, I'd like to refer to both L. D. 1294 and 1291. Our whole legislative committee structure is aimed at the separation of duties and responsibilities of committees by subject matter and function.

The Judiciary Committee should concern itself with changes in the substantive law. The State Government Committee should concern itself insofar as the function and structure of State Government is concerned.

I submit that both these L. D.'s provide for a major change in State Government structure: for instance, providing for a full-time Attorney General, providing for state's attorneys, district attorneys versus county attorneys. I also submit that on March 11 this House voted 109 to 15 to send House Paper 1013, An Act providing for Full-time County Attorneys to State Government. It is reasonable, proper and just that these bills also go to State Government under our system. These are

not lawyers' bills; these are governmental bills.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The elected leadership of the House and Senate, as you know, make up the Reference of Bills Committee. As my friend from Portland points out, we do make mistakes.

Early in the session we reported, or referred a bill having to do with DDT to the Committee on Agriculture. When this mistake was pointed out, we changed the reference. In this instance I suggest to you that the Committee on Reference of Bills did not make a mistake. Lawyers have no corner on the brain market, and I'm sure that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan, did not mean to imply that.

We are not talking about a change in the substantive law. We're talking about reworking our entire prosecuting system, and it is for this reason that this bill, and the one which follows, should, in fact, be referred to the Committee on State Government, and I hope that you will support the elected leadership of this House, of both parties, in their reference, who have given this matter very careful consideration, and have heard all the arguments on both sides and still feel that the matter should be referred to the State Government Committee. Thank you.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think probably the Reference of Bills Committee has accepted the errors that they have made in referring some of the documents that came before the House, and the other branch, and we tried to accept this gracefully.

Now, as the discussions have pointed out this morning, no human being is forever perfect. But I think when you find yourself in a position that you basically change

a form of government, most of those documents have been going to the Committee on State Government and I think in this particular instance the Reference to Bills Committee made the right choice of selection of State Government as the Committee to hear this document, and for them to report a bill. I think their qualifications there go beyond our question, and that they will give this bill a good hearing and report out a document which will be suitable to the people of the State.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Frankly, I'm quite surprised that a bill dealing with the administration of justices is sought to be detoured from the Judiciary Committee in non-concurrence.

I recall some years ago when this House was considering a basic change, not only in the procedural aspects in the administration of justice, but in the substance of the changes in the administration of justice; namely, the all encompassing district court bill, there was never any problem. The bill was referred, as it should have been, to the Committee on Judiciary.

Now we are apparently faced with a problem of reference in non-concurrence. It seems to me murky in both logic and precedent, that a bill dealing with basic changes in the administration of justice, is to be detoured from the Judiciary Committee. Now this bill which, as I understand it, is concerned with the system of criminal prosecutions in the State of Maine, should go before the Judiciary Committee, because of all members of the Legislature this Committee is fortunate enough to have a most distinguished gentleman who for ten years was a prosecuting attorney in one of the great counties of this state, Penobscot, and who has also served in a distinguished capacity as a judge in two courts.

Another able gentleman who held the high appointment as Chief Prosecuting Attorney in Maine from President Dwight Eisen-

hower, and served in that capacity for some eight years and who has also served as a judge. A third able gentleman who has served his State very well as a judge under appointment from, I believe that it was Governor Muskie, and six able House members who are trained in the administration of justice: the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Hewes, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan, the gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Foster, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Moreshead, the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Heselton, and the gentleman from Old Orchard, Mr. Danton.

Now, if floor leaders do not wish the Committee on Judiciary, all of whose members have been trained in the administration of justice, to hear the bill, if they wish to detour this matter, unlike the District Court Bill, to the Committee on State Government, then I don't really think that this speaks well of upgrading the legislative process. I remember seeing somewhere during the session a very lengthy statement that the legislative process should be upgraded, and certainly in logic and in precedent a bill of this nature should really go before the Committee on Judiciary. So I hope that in your wisdom that you will not upset precedent, that you will not upset logic, that you will send this bill to the committee where it belongs, and when the vote is taken I would request a division.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The distinguished gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, makes a great deal in his presentation wherein it concerns a district court. I might remind the gentleman that there was a bill concerning an additional justice for the district court that came through this body; it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It called for an additional judge. It naturally is going to cost money but it would be absorbed, as the Chief Justice of the District Court stated it evolved itself around the absorbing of the money through the fees, so



that there would be nothing come out of the General Fund per se. The presentation that was made before the Appropriations Committee was done strictly on the need of an additional judge. This was a District Court Bill. It was referred to the Appropriations Committee by the Reference of Bills Committee. I did not hear any of the distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee say one word about it, so when the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, says let's not break precedent I humbly suggest to you that precedent has already been broken successfully. I am going along with the leadership of both parties. It's very seldom they get along, the two of them together anyway, so this is one time I'm going with them.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I for one am glad that item number 6 and item number 7 are before the Legislature; although taking a somewhat different tack, they both propose much needed reforms in our system for the prosecution of crimes. There are I think, as we're all aware, significant problems and defects with our present part-time attorney system.

In regard to the reference of item 6 to the Committee on State Government, or the Committee on Judiciary, it strikes me, and I am a member of neither of these Committees, that there are basically three types of people who by their everyday working experience have knowledge of the current county attorney system and have knowledge of the prosecution of crimes. We have our police officers, criminal defendants, and the lawyers who represent this State and the defendants in criminal prosecutions.

I am certain that we have no criminal defendants who are members of any legislative committee. To my knowledge we have none, or few, law enforcement officers. We do have, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Houlton, three former prosecutors on the Judiciary Committee, and I

know that the other members in Judiciary have also had experience with the County Attorney system. It would seem, therefore, that in order that the bill would get its most knowledgeable hearing, that it ought to be referred to Judiciary.

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

Mr. MORESHEAD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise not to argue the merits of any of these three bills, two before us this morning, the other being the bill to allow full time county attorneys. I do rise to support Mr. Berman in his argument that these bills should be sent to the Judiciary Committee.

This matter was thoroughly discussed and argued and debated in the Senate, and the Senate in its judgment —

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that he cannot influence this body by the actions of the upper body.

Mr. MORESHEAD: The lower body or the upper body? I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that if the Reference of Bills Committee did not make a mistake, then I submit to this House that they are inconsistent in their reference of bills during this session and past sessions. I point out, that in this area of prosecution, the Reference of Bills Committee has sent to the Judiciary Committee, a bill which makes the attorney general the chief law enforcement officer in the state. This bill was heard by our Committee and our Committee is holding it realizing that we will have other legislation, or anticipating that we would have had other legislation. We've also received legislation before our Committee concerning the abolishment of the judges of probate and doing away with this office completely and placing it in the hands of the superior court justices.

We have also had before our Committee a hearing on a bill which would take the Clerk of Courts job away from the appointment of the Chief Justice and place it back on the ballot. Now to me there's no difference, there's no concern with these bills in basic

substantive law, and they deal with the administration of law and of the prosecution system, similar to the two bills that we have before us this morning. I also submit that in the last session the Judiciary Committee heard legislation that created the criminal division of the Attorney General's Office, and based on the favorable report of this committee the House and Senate passed it and it was enacted into law. So I would argue this morning that these bills before us today, and the third bill which is currently in the Senate, should go to the Judiciary Committee, and I therefore hope that you vote against the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. Mills of Eastport then moved the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills, moves the previous question. For the Chair to entertain a motion for the previous question it must have the consent of one third of the members present. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This question is debatable for no more than five minutes by any member. As many as are in favor of the main question being put now say aye; those opposed say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, that Bill "An Act relating to Full - time State's Attorneys," Senate Paper 243, L. D. 1294, be referred to the Committee on State Government in non - concurrence. A vote has been requested. All those in favor of this Bill being referred to the Committee on State Government will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

99 having voted in the affirmative and 35 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail and the Bill was referred to the

Committee on State Government in non - concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

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

Bill "An Act Providing for Full - time District Attorneys" (S. P. 384) (L. D. 1291) (In Senate referred to Committee on Judiciary)

Tabled — March 18, by Mr. Rideout of Manchester.

Pending — Reference in concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, referred to the Committee on State Government in non - concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

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

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Repealing the Provisions which Establish the Treasurer of State as a Constitutional Officer (H. P. 14) (L. D. 14)

Tabled — March 18, by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Donaghy of Lubec to Indefinitely postpone.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, retabled pending motion of Mr. Donaghy of Lubec to indefinitely postpone and specially assigned for Friday, March 21.

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

An Act relating to Definition of Agricultural Societies to Qualify for Stipend (H. P. 365) (L. D. 475)

Tabled — March 18, by Mr. Cote of Lewiston.

Pending — Passage to be enacted.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Cox of Bangor, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Friday, March 21.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (6) — "Ought to pass" in New Draft — Committee on Election Laws on Bill "An Act relating to Application for and Marking of Absentee Ballots" (H. P. 224) (L. D. 274) — New Draft under title "An Act relating to Delivery of Absentee Ballots" (H. P. 1064) (L. D. 1233) and MINORITY REPORT (4) reporting "Ought not to pass" Tabled — March 18, by Mr. Ross of Bath.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln to accept Majority Report.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Henley of Norway, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Porter of Lincoln to accept the Majority Report and specially assigned for Friday, March 21.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Taking Smelts for Bait Purposes" (H. P. 235) (L. D. 291)

Tabled — March 18, by Mr. Lewin of Augusta.

Pending — Further consideration.

On motion of Mr. Lewin of Augusta, the House voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the House is in possession of House Paper 189, L. D. 229, An Act relating to Reports of the Managers of the Maine Industrial Building Authority and the Maine Recreation Authority.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will answer the gentleman in the affirmative.

Whereupon, on motion of the same gentleman, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action of March

11 whereby the Bill was passed to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is passage to be enacted.

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker, I now move the indefinite postponement of this legislative document and I will make a brief explanation.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill was the result of a Legislative Research study and that Legislative Research study was prompted by a special order that was directed from the 103rd session of the Legislature, and the intent was to have a better liaison between MIBA and MRA and the Legislature. This bill went merrily on its way through both branches of the Legislature and was placed on the Governor's desk. And the Governor in examining it feels that, number one, it may not be too terribly necessary; and number two, we are establishing a precedent here that may be not in the best interest of state government, that of having monthly reports of our state departments to the Legislature.

I am in agreement with the Governor on this and I feel that the indefinite postponement of this document is definitely in order. The purpose for which the legislative document was originally intended is being carried out, MBA and MRA are now reporting monthly to the Legislature, and this I think establishes the rapport that we originally wanted. Thank you very much.

Thereupon, the Bill was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Crosby of Kennebunk,

Adjourned until tomorrow at nine o'clock in the morning.