

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

Thursday, May 8, 1969

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Warner Howard of Coopers Mills.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate
Conference Committee Report**

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Providing for Full-Time District Attorneys" (S. P. 384) (L. D. 1291) reporting that the Senate recede from its former action whereby it referred the Bill to the Committee on Judiciary; that the Senate refer the Bill jointly to the Joint Standing Committees on Judiciary and State Government; that the House recede and concur with the Senate.

(Signed)

VIOLETTE of Aroostook

MILLS of Franklin

QUINN of Penobscot

—Committee on part of Senate.

JALBERT of Lewiston

DENNETT of Kittery

RIDEOUT of Manchester

—Committee on part of House.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill referred to the Committees on Judiciary and State Government jointly.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence. The House voted to recede and concur.

**Reports of Committees
Ought to Pass with
Committee Amendment**

Report of the Committee on Health and Institutional Services on Bill "An Act to Provide for the Registration of Professional Social Workers" (S. P. 346) (L. D. 1212) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-118) submitted therewith.

Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Use of Cable Traps to Trap Bears" (S. P. 165)

(L. D. 537) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-120) 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.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Death Benefits before Retirement under State Retirement System (S. P. 175) (L. D. 576) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 23 and passed to be engrossed on April 18.

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

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Give the Attorney General Authority to Require Certain Telephone Records" (H. P. 386) (L. D. 496) on which the House accepted the "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee on Judiciary and passed the Bill to be engrossed on May 6.

Came from the Senate with the Report and Bill recommitted to the Committee on Judiciary in non-concurrence.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Concerning the Liquor Laws" (H. P. 702) (L. D. 902) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on March 28.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Hichens of Elliot, the House voted to adhere.

(Later Reconsidered)

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Retirement of Chief Liquor Inspector" (H. P. 943) (L. D. 1204) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 29.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, moves that the House insist on its former action. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Whereupon, Mr. Temple of Portland moved that the House recede and concur.

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

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I regret this morning that it becomes necessary to debate this bill again. I really feel that it is an imposition upon the patience of this House to constantly be debating this measure. I will endeavor to be very brief. I feel that behind this bill is far more than reaches the eye and I believe the members of this House are very very much aware of this proposition, and I certainly hope that you will not vote to recede and concur with the Senate.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett has indicated this morning there are far more reaching implications in this document this morning than meets the eye or even meets the sound of the ears, and for that reason I certainly hope for that and many other reasons I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr.

Temple this morning will be successful so that we won't have to go back to these very serious implications, not only for the Chief Inspector but also for all the other worthy employees of the State of Maine that might want to retire at the age of seventy.

Thereupon, Mr. Dennett of Kittery requested the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, moves that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays. For the Chair to order a roll call vote it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

More than one fifth having expressed the desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Temple, that the House recede and concur. All in favor of receding and concurring will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Barnes, Bedard, Bernier, Binnette, Bourgoin, Brown, Bunker, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Coffey, Cox, Crommett, Croteau, Cummings, Dam, Drigotas, Emery, Eustis, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fraser, Gauthier, Gilbert, Giroux, Haskell, Hichens, Hunter, Jameson, Jutras, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Laberge, Lawry, Lebel, LePage, Levesque, MacPhail, Marquis, Martin, McKinnon, Mills, Mitchell, Moreshead, Nadeau, Norris, Ouellette, Payson, Pratt, Ricker, Rocheleau, Santoro, Tanguay, Temple, Watson, Waxman, Williams, Wood.

NAY — Allen, Baker, Benson, Berman, Boudreau, Bragdon, Brennan, Buckley, Chandler, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Clark, H. G.; Corson, Cote, Cottrell, Crosby, Curran, Curtis, Cushing, Dennett, Donaghy, Dudley, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Farnham, Finemore, Good, Hall, Hardy, Harriman, Hawkens, Henley, Heselton, Huber, Immonen, Jalbert, Johnston, Kelleher, Kilroy, Lee, Leibowitz, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Lund, Marstaller, McNally,

Meisner, Millett, Morgan, Mosher, Noyes, Page, Porter, Quimby, Rand, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Sahagian, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Soulas, Starbird, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Tyndale, Vincent, Wheeler, White.

ABSENT — Birt, Couture, D'Alfonso, Danton, Evans, Faucher, Fortier, M.; Foster, Hamison, Hewes, Kelley, K. F.; McTeague, Sheltra, Stillings, Wight.

Yes, 60; No, 75; Absent, 15.

The SPEAKER: Sixty having voted in the affirmative and seventy-five in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to insist.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Chiropractic Services for Injured Employee under Workmen's Compensation Law" (H. P. 95) (L. D. 104) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1115) (L. D. 1434) under same title and that it "Ought to pass" which Report was accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on April 18.

Came from the Senate with the Report and Bill indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. JAMESON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Jameson moves that the House insist.

Whereupon, Mr. Huber of Rockland moved that the House recede and concur.

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

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

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Speaker, I request that item eight be tabled until Tuesday next.

Whereupon, Mr. Richardson of Cumberland asked for a vote on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Jutras, moves that this matter be tabled until Tuesday, May 13, pending the motion of Mr. Huber of Rockland to recede and concur. A vote has been requested. All in favor of tabling this matter will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

46 having voted in the affirmative and 87 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Huber, that the House recede from its former action and concur with the Senate. Is the House ready for the question? All in favor will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 60 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Messages and Documents

The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
AUGUSTA

May 7, 1969

Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 104th Legislature

I have given careful consideration to House Paper 408, Legislative Document 519, "An Act Repealing Provision for Student Tuition in Coordination of Public Higher Education," and regret that I must return it to the Legislature.

L. D. 519, must, I believe, be read in the context both of the recent history of our higher education legislation, and of our hopes for the future college and university education of our children.

The debates in the 103rd Legislature on the bills for the establishment of a higher education coordinating system recognized the need for compromise among differing approaches to higher education. One of the reasons for the intensity of the debate and for the delay in working out an acceptable arrangement for the

governing of our higher education facilities in Maine was the fear on the part of many that the position of the state colleges — Gorham, Farmington, Aroostook, Fort Kent, and Washington would be compromised by their being thrown in with the larger and generally more fully developed old University of Maine.

The final legislative product of the special session of the 103rd Legislature in January of 1968 was admitted by all to be a compromise. Very carefully and skillfully worked out by the cooperative action of dedicated legislators, private citizens, and University and College leaders, it sought to create a viable management for a part of the higher education system while respecting the integrity of the autonomous units of that system. The debate during that special session makes clear that the maintenance of a temporary, special proportionate relationship in the tuition of the old University of Maine on the one hand and of the state colleges on the other hand was a matter of special concern to many who agreed to the compromise.

I believe it is too early for us to reconsider an important element of the understanding arrived at in the 103rd Legislature. The relative position of the state colleges has not changed since then. Several of these state colleges still do not meet accreditation by Regional and National standards. In part, the provision of the enabling act was designed to protect the weaker units of the new system. In the absence of an explicit control incorporated in the Legislation over the University of Maine's Board of Trustees so as to retain the proportional differentiation in tuition between the two main components of our higher education system, I would think first, that the University's trustees would be quite within their rights in construing the Legislature's action in L. D. 519 as constituting an abrogation of the principle of maintaining the tuition differential, and, second, that the 104th Legislature would have modified, without warrant, a definite understand-

ing sanctioned by the 103rd Legislature.

I believe that we are approaching a time of critical decision in our whole approach as a state to the relationship of our program of higher education to our young people. We have just begun to move toward making higher education something relevant and attractive and real for all our young people. We still have a long way to go before we convert our university and college system into something that is not remote, not foreign, not alien to many of these young people. We still have not begun to change attitudes of some parents or counsellors who too often discourage our young people from thinking of going on to college. In fact, the Trustees and the Legislature may well desire to adopt a policy that reduces student costs—rather than balance the University budget by increased fees.

Under our present system the state colleges still afford an opportunity for a college education at a cost that is within the reach of many of our families who would not be able to afford the cost of the old University of Maine. This economic factor was one of the strengths of the State College system.

I think it proper for the Legislature to retain the present proportionate difference through the academic year 1971-1972 as now required by law, not only in the spirit of the original legislation, but in order to give all of us an opportunity to think through the question of how we are going to make a higher education financially feasible for all our young people with the talent and the motivation needed to benefit from it. I therefore believe that I must return L. D. 519 to you without my signature, feeling that a respect for both the past understanding and future program possibilities requires that I do so.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) KENNETH M. CURTIS
Governor

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is, shall this Bill become

law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am going to speak to you this morning not only as members of this House, but as parents, grandparents, uncles and aunts. I am sure if you think in reference to these relatives and children that you will find that quite a few of them have been turned down for admission to our various state colleges, including the University of Maine itself.

Now I would first remind you that this bill did not specify any particular amount of tuition. It simply untied, unshackled the hands of the trustees so that if they wanted to, in their good judgment, change the tuition schedules at the universities — through the super university, the tuition in these schools they could do so for 1972. At the present time in our teachers colleges so-called, our former teachers colleges, the tuition is only \$200 a year for out-of-state students. It is costing you and I as taxpayers over \$2,000 for each one of these students. I would also add that at the University of Maine there is a great difference in the tuition charged for resident and non-resident students, and these non-resident students occupying places and dormitories in the halls of learning that could well be taken up by our own children.

For instance, our neighboring State of New Hampshire charges \$1575 per year for the tuition for non-resident students; and so I differ with the Governor on this especially. I know that we must progress in education. I know that we must have schools, and good schools, but I don't think that we should be furnishing them at the great expense that we are—not only in dollars but in expense to our own children, and I would ask that you would sustain our vote of the other day, when it was 88 to 33 I believe. Thank you.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to

support Mr. Donaghy. I think we have a strange situation here. At the hearing on this particular bill the trustees of the University supported this piece of legislation and asked that it be removed from the books, as it very properly should be. I think that the action of the House in passing this legislation was based on a sound decision. As was pointed out at the time of the original debate here, there is a million and a half dollars in excess of national average of a four-year college of over subsidy involved.

I think this is very clearly an area in which the Legislature can take the initiative, can point out to the trustees that they are aware of this over subsidy, and in the last analysis the decision on tuition rates is clearly up to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees at the University supported this piece of legislation. This Legislature in its wisdom very properly passed it and I feel that we should sustain it against the veto.

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think it is important to remember, for those of us who were members of this Legislature two years ago, of the legislation which put together the new University of Maine. One of the items that was finally agreed to, as a compromise by both the University of Maine and the teachers colleges, was that the tuition differential between the two institutions would remain the same until 1971 and 1972.

The very next Legislature, the 104th, we who are now sitting, have taken up a bill which would remove that differential. If this is not a violation of the original intent of the compromise that was made less than a little more than a year ago, I don't know what is. And personally as a member of the 103rd, who is active in the greater development of the broader University of Maine, I would certainly hope that we would sustain the Governor's veto and keep the position of the Legislature at least partially consistent.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I very much sympathize with the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy this morning and also the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell. Although these are new members of this session of the Legislature, they probably understand by now sometimes what must be done and what has to be done in order to arrive at a goal, and that is the word that we hear constantly — compromise.

This was one of the areas that we had to compromise two years ago in order to arrive at what we thought was going to be satisfactory administration of the entire system of the University of Maine; and at that time the members, that were here in the House or in the Legislature two years ago, strongly recommended that the percentages of tuition between the University of Maine as it was and the five state colleges would remain on a percentage level that they were two years ago. In other words, this was telling the students of our state colleges that the percentages would remain the same between the state colleges and the University at Orono.

Now it would seem to me that this probably poses a difficulty that if the tuition is raised, and there is nothing to indicate that the University or the state colleges cannot raise their tuition, the only thing that this implies and is also directed, that the University if it raises its tuition the state university system — and that comprises of the state colleges, can also raise their tuition, but they must raise it on a percentage basis, and I think that probably this legislation was adopted to carry through until 1972.

I think that we must recognize that we have made a bargain with the students at the state colleges and at the University, and I think it is much too early to start breaking this bargain two years after the university system has been established. Fully recognizing the fact that we are pumping an awful lot of money into our state colleges and University, we must also

recognize that other states that some of our students in Maine are attending they are also pumping in an awful lot of money into their system which is helping our State of Maine students in other states.

So this is primarily the reasons why the Governor feels and I feel that we should not change the percentages that have been established when the University of Maine system was established.

So therefore I hope this morning that the House will see fit to retain what we presently have and sustain the Governor's veto.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I find myself in a very unusual position. For two days running I am going to support the Governor's veto, and I am very glad that I have so many friends on each side of the aisle.

I would like to point out to you that the trustees of the University of Maine did not support this by a vote of the trustees. One of the trustees, Mr. Haskell, came before the Committee and said that he was unaware that the bill was even being presented, but that in view of the fact that it was presented that he would support it. The Chancellor did not support this bill because the Chancellor said that if there was any possibility that there was a feeling among legislators that a commitment had been made, that that commitment should be kept. So I hope that you will support the Governor's veto.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will be very brief. I am sure that one of the trustees who was down here and testified on this — I don't know where my good friend Mr. Richardson got his information, but I had two letters prior to Mr. Haskell's arrival that he was coming. Also the Assistant Chancellor — I don't know where we got off base on that other than perhaps at a press conference, but in addition to these two people the schools

most involved here are the former teachers colleges, and we have somehow neglected to mention that the chairman of this group, the president of Gorham State Teachers College, was down here and testified for this bill, as was one of the legislators that probably worked the hardest to keep this so-called ratio in force for his home town college of Farmington, and that same gentleman came down and testified that he released any thought of not being able to change this tuition, especially in relation to non-resident students.

Now it would seem to be a simple matter to make this change, but because of the difference in the tuition at these colleges it is practically a mathematical impossibility to change without changing the ratio, because we have \$200 for non-residents in the teachers colleges and \$1,000 for non-residents at the University of Maine; while at our teachers colleges the tuition is \$100 for our resident students while at the University of Maine it is \$400. Now it is pretty hard to keep this ratio if you just want to change your non-resident figures. And this simply would give the chance for the trustees to change this in whatever manner they deemed best. It doesn't tell them to; it is simply permissive, that they may change it in any relation that they want to.

Now I personally would be one of the last to want to see the teachers colleges so-called come off on the short end of the stick, because I am very proud that I am a graduate and friend of Washington State Normal School, which is now called Washington College. I certainly wouldn't want to do anything that would hurt this school. I wouldn't want to do anything that would hurt the purpose of our former teachers colleges, and that was to give local people a chance to stay there in their territory and teach the children of that territory. Because it is difficult to get people from outside to come in and teach in some of our rural areas, and this was the basic reason that these teachers colleges were set up where they were set up and the

reason the tuition is so low is to attract these people.

But we are not talking here about local people; we're talking about non-residents that can come in here to get a bachelor's degree for a total tuition of \$800 and then go back to their own states and up the pay that we have to pay here in the State of Maine because, as you well know, that our teachers look at the pay paid in Connecticut and say, "well, we have to have as much"; and perhaps they deserve as much, but Maine is not Connecticut. I don't have to tell you this, so I hope you will vote with me today.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question before the House is shall this Bill become law notwithstanding the Governor's objections? Pursuant to Article IV, Section 2 of the Constitution the yeas and nays are ordered. All those in favor of this Bill becoming law notwithstanding the Governor's veto will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Baker, Barnes, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buckley, Chandler, Clark, C. H.; Coffey, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, Cushing, Dennett, Donaghy, Durgin, Dyar, Erickson, Evans, Farnham, Finemore, Foster, Good, Hall, Hansson, Hardy, Harriman, Haskell, Hawkens, Henley, Heselton, Hichens, Huber, Kelley, K. F.; Lewin, Lincoln, Lund, MacPhail, Marstaller, McNally, Meisner, Millett, Moreshead, Mosher, Norris, Noyes, Page, Pratt, Quimby, Rand, Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snow, Soulas, Stillings, Susi, Thompson, Tyndale, White, Wood.

NAY — Allen, Bedard, Benson, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Bunker, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Casey, Chick, Clark, H. G.; Corson, Cote, Cottrell, Cox, Crommett, Croteau, Curran, Dam, Drigotas, Dudley, Emery, Eustis, Faucher, Fecteau, Fortier, A. J.; Fortier, M.; Fraser, Gauthier, Gilbert, Giroux, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Jameson, John-

ston, Jutras, Kelleher, Kelley, R. P.; Keyte, Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Lewis, Marquis, Martin, McKinnon, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Nadeau, Ouellette, Payson, Porter, Richardson, G. A.; Ricker, Rochelneau, Sahagian, Santoro, Scott, C. F.; Sheltra, Starbird, Tanguay, Temple, Vincent, Watson, Waxman, Wheeler, Williams.

ABSENT — Couture, D'Alfonso, Danton, Hewes, Laberge, Lee, McTeague, Trask, Wight.

Yes, 64; No, 77; Absent, 9.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-four having voted in the affirmative and seventy-seven in the negative, sixty-four not being two thirds the Governor's veto is sustained.

Orders

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston presented the following Joint Resolution and moved its adoption:

WHEREAS, Harry S. Truman, the 33rd President of the United States, continues to steer the firm course of a good and faithful servant to his Lord and his people; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of the State of Maine have forever enshrined in their hearts and minds the true dimension of greatness which he has rightly earned; and

WHEREAS, Thursday, the eighth day of May 1969, marks the eighty-fifth anniversary of our former chief executive's birth; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, the Members of the 104th Legislature of the State of Maine, now assembled, do extend to Harry S. Truman our warmest congratulations on this his 85th birthday and offer our best wishes for the future; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this Resolution be immediately transmitted to President Truman in honor of the occasion. (H. P. 1179)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is with a deep sense of personal pride and privilege that I introduce this Resolution. As one of the two living presidents of the United States, in my category he is now and will go down in history as one of the

great Americans of our times. It is my distinct pleasure and honor to know this gentleman over the many many years, and there is one thing in the bookful that I could relate wherein it concerns this fine gentleman.

He is the epitome of loyalty. This man who rose really from the real ranks in my opinion over the many years displayed unbound courage. I believe due to his efforts, in his single-handed original fight on NATO and the Marshall Plan, certainly was a great contribution that is now going down in history and will go in deeper as time progresses. The gentleman also possesses a tremendous sense of humor. I can recall very distinctly on one occasion asking him why he attended the funeral of a certain gentleman that was heralded far and wide, not necessarily a summa cum laude nor a member of the Church. His very quick answer to me was, "He was my friend."

I can also remember back a few years ago it was my distinct pleasure to go with him on one of his famous breakfast walks. He had asked me the previous day if there was anything he could do for me and very humbly and meekly I stated that there was nothing I would like any better than to go on one of his famous breakfast walks with him. He told me to be outside of his hotel at six o'clock that next morning and I could accompany him. I was there at four-thirty so that I wouldn't be late. The Press followed him, and incidentally, the Press in that there was oftentimes areas of disagreement, loved him; and I can distinctly remember asking him among several questions as you would know, believe it or not, you knowing that I am rather a talkative gentleman, I allowed him to do a great deal of the talking in answer to my questions. And I said to him, I said, "How are you doing with Drew Pearson?" I said, "Do you think there are those who figure that you are right and there might be those who mildly figure that you are wrong?" Well he says, "Young fellow, let me tell you something right now. I tossed a few adjectives at that certain

gentleman and I wonder what anybody else would say if they would pick up the paper and read that their daughter couldn't sing. I just thought my daughter was the best singer in the whole world and anybody that doesn't think so is this, that and the other." And I loved him for it.

It is with distinct pride and personal privilege that I move the adoption of this Resolution.

The Joint Resolution was adopted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Kelley.

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In reference to item 6, page two, L. D. 902, whereby we voted to adhere, I move for reconsideration of our action and would ask to speak briefly on my motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman is referring to a Non-Concurrent matter, item 6, Bill "An Act Concerning the Liquor Laws" House Paper, 702, L. D. 902.

The gentleman from Southport, Mr. Kelley moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it adhered to its former action. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This Senate amendment makes this whole bill worthwhile and without the Senate amendment it would be very impractical to try to license any boat for liquor, the problem being that people coming down on Sundays would not be able to take their beer with them when they went out fishing and all this sort of thing, if the boat were licensed without this amendment so that they could get it on board. I hope that you will reconsider.

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

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I humbly request that you vote against this reconsideration. A few weeks ago in my remarks against Sunday sales of liquor, I mentioned the fact that in another session we would be asked to

further advance these sales throughout the state. Apparently we aren't waiting for another session, it is already coming into our presence right now; and this will only be the first of many moves to have Sunday liquor widespread throughout the state and even now to the boats. So I humbly request that you vote against this, and I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Kelley, that the House reconsider whereby it adhered to its former motion on L. D. 902. All in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

79 having voted in the affirmative and 52 having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is shall the House adhere.

Whereupon, on motion of Mr. MacPhail of Owls Head, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mrs. Brown from the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act Establishing the Environmental Advisory Commission" (H. P. 1043) (L. D. 1366) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Covered By Other Legislation

Mr. Rideout from the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to the Division of the State into Regions for the Purpose of Regional Development" (H. P. 829) (L. D. 1068) reported Leave to Withdraw, as covered by other legislation.

The Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Martin from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial

Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing a Bond Issue in the Amount of Six Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for a Vocational Institute in Knox County" (H. P. 976) (L. D. 1260)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. MacPhail of Owls Head, tabled pending acceptance of the Report and specially assigned for Monday, May 12.)

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Breman from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Increasing Fines in the Superior Court" (H. P. 520) (L. D. 691)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Brennan of Portland, tabled pending acceptance of the Report and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Mr. Foster from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Suspension of Operator's Motor Vehicle License when Person is Convicted of Larceny or Breaking and Entering" (H. P. 953) (L. D. 1234)

Mr. Moreshead from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Persons Found Intoxicated in Liquor Licensed Premises" (H. P. 1003) (L. D. 1305)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Referred to 105th Legislature

Mr. Mitchell from the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Dogs from Kennels and Pet Shops" (H. P. 794) (L. D. 1035) reported that it be referred to the 105th Legislature.

Report was read and accepted, the Bill referred to the 105th Legislature, and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Draft Printed

Mr. Chandler from the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Fee for Certificate of Approval to Sell Malt Liquor"

(H. P. 701) (L. D. 901) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1178) (L. D. 1499) under title of "An Act relating to Fee for Breweries and Wholesale Outlets to Sell Malt Liquor" and that it "Ought to pass"

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

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mrs. Brown from the Committee on Natural Resources reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Creating the Oil and Gas Conservation and Development Control Act" (H. P. 836) (L. D. 1074)

Mr. Eustis from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Revising the Maine Mining Law" (H. P. 339) (L. D. 448)

Mr. Snow from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Classifying Marsh Stream, Waldo County" (H. P. 1044) (L. D. 1367)

Mr. D'Alfonso from the Committee on State Government reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Expenditures from Aeronautical Fund" (H. P. 72) (L. D. 72) which was recommitted

Mr. Crommett from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Appointment of Town Clerk of Jay" (H. P. 363) (L. D. 471)

Mr. Dyar from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Vacating of Street Locations on Plans" (H. P. 495) (L. D. 649)

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

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Berman from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Broadening the Scope of the Uniform Arbitration Act" (H. P. 937) (L. D. 1198) 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" (H-289) was read by the Clerk and adopted, and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

**Divided Report
Tabled and Assigned**

Majority Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Tandem Trailers" (H. P. 400) (L. D. 510)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GREELEY of Waldo
PEABODY of Aroostook
— of the Senate.

Messrs. McNALLY of Ellsworth
LEE of Albion
HALL of Windham
NADEAU of Biddeford
DUDLEY of Enfield
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. CIANCHETTE
— of Somerset
— of the Senate.

Messrs. BURNHAM of Naples
WOOD of Brooks
— of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Wood of Brooks, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Monday, May 12.)

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Defenses of Family Relationships in Civil Actions" (H. P. 168) (L. D. 207)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MILLS of Franklin
VIOLETTE of Aroostook
QUINN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Messrs. FOSTER
— of Mechanic Falls
DANTON
— of Old Orchard Beach
HESELTON of Gardiner
BERMAN of Houlton
BRENNAN of Portland
MORESHEAD of Augusta
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. HEWES of Cape Elizabeth
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. BERMAN: I move that the House accept the 9 to 1 Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is, in my opinion, a very important bill. It would change the law that has been in force in Maine ever since Maine became a state in 1820. Although it is a short bill, at the present time the only reason that a spouse may sue a spouse is for divorce — for no other reason.

This bill, if passed, would permit suits among spouses irrespective of whether they are married or not. All of you married people know that we have enough troubles now without permitting legal suits one against the other.

In my experience as a lawyer I've come across some divorce matters, sometimes most unfortunate, and sometimes the separation is ignited by some minor, relatively trivial matter. It seems to me that this bill might be another blow toward breaking up the sanctity of the home. Now it permits suits by spouses—between spouses; it also would permit suits by minor children against their parents, which at the present time is prohibited. I feel that this is a bad bill and I respectfully request that you vote against the motion to accept the Majority Report.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope that you will vote with the 9 to 1 Majority "Ought to pass" Report, and very briefly I would like to give you my reasons.

First off may I say that the other nine members of the Judiciary Committee have the highest regard and highest respect for our colleague from Cape Elizabeth, Mr.

Hewes. On this particular measure though we feel that he may be missing the point. We are living in 1969 and not 1820. The bite of the bill basically comes down to this—it involves in most instances the unfortunate automobile accident case. Now those of you who are married and have children and are driving with them and happen to be involved in an automobile accident, your coverage in the State of Maine protects everyone except your own wife or husband and your own children.

Now in this day and age we think that it is wrong. In other jurisdictions which had this anachronistic law, which unfortunately still clutters our law books, the courts have had the courage, the foresight the candidness to change the law. Now in Maine because in recent years, if my understanding is correct, no case has reached our highest court on this particular matter. The law still stands as it would stand, as Mr. Hewes pointed out, in 1820. Now again I would say we're not in 1820, and it seems to me very unfair that a married person driving along the highways of this state in an automobile with his spouse and family, would have his insurance protect everyone except those who are nearest and dearest to him. So I hope that you will go along with this 9 to 1 Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. MORESHEAD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I urge that the House this morning go along with the Majority Report of the Committee. This is definitely a bill which is not drawn up or entered into the docket for the purpose of allowing spouses to sue each other without just cause. What this bill is aimed at is when there is insurance in an automobile accident case, under present law if your wife or children were injured due to your negligence they would not be able to recover under your insurance policy. And I question, why do we buy insurance? And I think the answer is, we buy insurance so that if someone's injured because of our negligence, they can recover for their damages. And

just because the person who is injured is your wife or your minor children, why should they not also be able to recover on your insurance policy?

So this is all this bill is primarily designed to do. It's not designed to allow at will wives to sue husbands and children to sue husbands. It's right at this issue of insurance. It's at the issue that now if someone comes into a lawyer's office and they say, "I was injured in an accident and my wife was driving the car," we have to say, "Sorry, you can't get a nickel. You're out, you pay your own bill." Why do they have insurance? People buy insurance so that when a situation arises where there is damages, the damages are taken care of when there's legitimate damages and legitimate liability.

So I say that this bill does away with this right not to sue, the husband sue wife or wife sue husband, but does away with this fiction and allows just claims to be paid and people who are injured to be compensated. So I urge that you go along with the Majority Report this morning.

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

Mr. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As an insurance man I feel that it is my responsibility to give you my views on this matter. If you think your insurance premiums are high now and you pass this measure, there's no telling what the premiums will be. They certainly will increase greatly. And I would also want to remind the members of the House that under your present policy you can protect yourself now under medical reimbursements. So this isn't necessary.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At the time this bill was heard before our committee, there were some insurance lawyers there, and I don't think that any one of them thought it would make one particle difference in a change of premium. In fact — I forget which one it was that stated that he doubted it would

make any difference and our insurance people would encourage it. They think it's an unfair situation and it isn't going to change the situation any. Why couldn't a man protect his family? Why would it have to be somebody other than his own family he provides protection for?

Now this idea of getting medical protection, that doesn't do a child much good if he is crippled for life or doesn't do a wife much good if she's crippled for life and bedridden or in a wheel chair, that medical aid. So I think that it's probably the most enlightened bill that we have had here. I had in my own little office within the past year a situation where a man and wife were riding on a woods road. The husband gets out to move a small tree that had fallen across the road and as he was removing the tree the car started to move, the wife made a lunge with her foot to stop it, she hit the accelerator, ran over him, pinned him under the car, he died in a matter of a few minutes, she ran for a mile and a half — and he was a breadwinner. He was winning the bread for her three or four children, and they were heavily insured and had been paying premiums for years and never had any occasion to call on it. But as far as those children getting any benefit for the loss of or the death of their father, they were barred. And it can be and is oftentimes a very serious situation, and I don't think insurance companies have too much to worry about their premiums; they have a way of getting their premiums. There has been investigation going on or has been going on in the past, federal investigation, about these premiums, where are they all going to. I think most of us who buy insurance would like to know ourselves exactly where they are all going to.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In regard to the possible effect of this legislation on insurance premiums, I think it's fair to say that it would have some effect because some accidents do occur, as Mr.

Foster has described, between husband and wife and within a family, but one thing that was stressed at the hearing by a representative of the insurance industry was this: if this law were passed, you could buy a policy that had coverage for members of your family which would cost slightly more, but you wouldn't be required to.

The gentleman from the insurance industry pointed out that probably, if the law were passed, some policies would provide for this protection and others would not. You could choose if you wanted to pay a little extra to get the protection or if you didn't want it you could save a few dollars, but perhaps you might be sorry later on.

As the law stands now, you have no opportunity to buy this protection. You can buy medical payments coverage, and I believe the typical maximum there is about \$5,000. Most common probably is \$500 or a \$1,000. But when you are dealing with the replacement of a man's income for life, if he is killed through the negligence of another member of his family, like the case that Mr. Foster pointed out, \$500 or even \$5,000 is very inadequate.

So this is really in a sense permissive legislation, which I think would result in allowing those people who want to be prudent and protect themselves to do so. Thank you.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to concur with the gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Scott. I too am in the insurance business, and I think in rising this morning there is certainly no conflict of interest on my part. If you pass this bill you are going to put some money in my pocket. You are not going to take it away. As the premiums rise, I, like all in the insurance business, work on a percentage basis; I am going to get a percentage of this. So actually what I am doing this morning is talking against putting money in my own pocket.

The gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Foster, said that the

insurance companies have a way of getting these premiums, and no one was ever more right. They have got a way; and it's from you that they are going to get the money! So many people have a great idea that these insurance companies, these more or less nebulous great corporations, pull money out of thin air, they can pay the bills. Of course they pay the bills; they have got to pay the bills. But they have got to collect the premiums, and the premiums come out of the public in general.

Mr. Scott is very very right when he tells you that a thing like this will result in a great advance in premium costs. It will come out of the general public. He is also very correct when he says the insuring public have ample manner in which to protect themselves without matters such as this going to law.

I sincerely hope that you vote against the motion to accept the majority report.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It isn't often that I differ on an important measure with my very close friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, but I do this morning. And I am very willing to put money in the pocket of Mr. Dennett because Mr. Dennett is a very honest man. And the public will be protected if you accept the Majority, "Ought to pass" Report.

Now, frankly, some years ago when other bills of a similar nature came before this legislature, the hue and cry from well-meaning and well-intentioned people in the insurance business was that if you take off the limit on pecuniary loss for death of a father, a husband, the insurance rates are going to go sky high.

If I recall at that time some years ago when that argument was raised, I, in collaboration with my very good friend, the gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Scott, who is in the insurance business and at that time was also opposed to what I considered protecting the public better than it is protected

now, in collaboration with Mr. Scott we went over to see the Insurance Commissioner, and I think at that time we spoke to both the Insurance Commissioner and the Deputy Insurance Commissioner, and this wasn't on just one occasion. If I recall correctly, and my memory may err because this was some years ago, we went over the matter in depth on more than one occasion, and it was the considered opinion of the Insurance Commissioner, as I recall, and the Deputy Insurance Commissioner, who is an authority on rate changing, that at that time removing the death limit for the pecuniary loss of a father, a husband, would not appreciable affect the insurance rates.

Now I say to you in all fairness and in all sincerity that this is one of the very few instances that I think that my friend, the gentleman from Kittery, is wrong, on this having an appreciable effect on insurance rates. Certainly all reasonable people can see that if protection is broadened to cover your wife, your children, your grandchildren, when you may have, unfortunately, been negligent, the cost will rise somewhat. But I say that this is a very fair cost, this is one of the fairest things that this Legislature can do, and I hope that you will go along and accept the 9 to 1 Majority "Ought to pass" Report and when the vote is taken, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I too am an insurance man. The industry has used me very well. I do make a good living and have made a good living, but it is not only the insurance industry that makes a living out of law suits in cases before the court.

We have been told that they are being investigated. They don't have to investigate very far, but on many of these suits, without negotiation, the fee is roughly one third of the award.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not in the insurance business and certainly not an attorney. For this reason I would like to ask a question of some member of this committee. I have met, in my lifetime, some very unruly female characters, and I was wondering if in a case my wife was to cause me bodily injury by virtue of striking me with some instrument or something, if I could sue her under this bill.

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

Mr. HEWES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the gentleman from Enfield's question, under the present law if you were hit by a rolling pin by your wife you may not sue her for bodily harm, only for divorce, if that is one of the grounds towards your divorce. However, under this bill, yes, you could sue her for the bodily harm she inflicted upon you.

Mr. Berman of Houlton was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. BERMAN: Thank you. I would further answer the question posed by my seatmate and neighbor of many years, the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley. Frankly, if such a situation that he spoke of arose, I would say that possibly he would be very ill advised to sue his wife because his wife would have a legitimate reason for doing what she did. (laughter)

And while I am on my feet I would like to say something about the remarks made by my friend of this session, the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, with regard to other costs it could possibly involve — not in insurance premiums, but in the overall picture. I have long thought that in this jurisdiction, in this State of Maine, to discourage litigation, that the party who prevailed in litigation should have its charges borne by the person who lost the suit. This has not been the case. It would be practically impossible to get something like that on the books at the present time because I think that if a person is injured

through the fault of another they should come out of it whole, their costs should be borne by the person who is responsible.

Now people who are injured in this state today sometimes take the position, or more often than not take the position, that they will seek help in obtaining redress of the wrong. If they seek help in retaining redress of the wrong they put the proposition quite frankly, "If you get something for me I am certainly willing to pay you, but if you don't get anything for me I don't want to pay you anything."

Now this is what causes the situation that Mr. Donaghy has mentioned. It's no fault of legal counsel, it's no fault of the insurance agency. I say very frankly it is because the public feels that unless they recover something, then they shouldn't have to pay.

Now this raises the cost of preparing these cases for the people who are injured and frankly it would have nothing whatsoever to do on insurance rates. Thank you.

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

Mr. MARSTALLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to ask a question to any member of the committee who wishes to answer. How many states have a similar law to this?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Marstaller, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the Judiciary Committee who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very sorry, Mr. Marstaller, that I didn't realize that this bill was going to run into the flak that it has this morning and I do not have the exact number of states that have this type of law on the books. I will say this though: that particularly in the last decade when the general public is waking up to just what's going on in the insurance industry, that not all agents are as honest and as well-intentioned as the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy, the gentleman from Wil-

ton, Mr. Scott, and the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that there are problems in the insurance industry. Other states, the enlightened states, have taken the matter under consideration. Some—I can't give you the exact number, may have done this by legislation such as we are attempting to do here today. Others, where the courts are very courageous—and I make no reference that our courts are not, but I do know that, I believe it's in the neighboring State of New Hampshire, for some years their very courageous court has taken the position—"Look, we are living in the modern age, we are dealing with insurance, we are dealing with the realities of life; we are not dealing in theory, we are not dealing—with all due respect to my friend from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, with superficial situations, but we are dealing with plain, hard facts." And the court in New Hampshire—

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that his answer is rather lengthy.

Mr. BERMAN: I'm sorry.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Defenses of Family Relationships in Civil Actions," House Paper 168, L. D. 207. The Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of accepting the Majority "Ought to pass" Report will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

77 having voted in the affirmative and 55 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing Compensation of Members of the Legislature" (H. P. 73) (L. D. 73)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
LETOURNEAU of York
BELIVEAU of Oxford
—of the Senate.

Miss WATSON of Bath

Messrs. MARSTALLER

of Freeport

STARBIRD

of Kingman Township

RIDEOUT of Manchester

D'ALFONSO 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. DENNETT of Kittery

DONAGHY of Lubec

—of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report, and I would speak to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, moves the acceptance of the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I stand before you this morning to make an appeal, not an appeal to your hearts, not an appeal to your heads, but rather an appeal this morning to your conscience. We stand here confronted, which I will readily acknowledge, with a grave situation, and it's relative to an increase in the salaries of the members of this Legislature.

Now not for one moment would I stand here and attempt to insult your intelligence by saying that you are not worth the money. I know that there is not a man or a woman in this body, or the other body, who is not worth far more to the State of Maine than you are being paid. But you are faced this morning with a very difficult decision and so is the State of Maine faced with difficult decisions in the days that lie ahead. Every one of you here is aware that there is not sufficient monies to meet all the demands and all the requests or even the needs that

the State of Maine is presently confronted with.

Not only that, there is a great feeling amongst the taxpayers of not only this state but every state, that they are literally in revolt against the taxation which is being levied upon them. We — and when I say “we”, I speak of most everyone in this House, have done and are doing the very best to attempt to keep cost down.

Now departmental heads, heads and members of various commissions, we have refused them pay raises because we would like as much as possible to hold the line. I would just remind you one moment what is your image going to be with the general public, that once having refused raises to these people who are as deserving as we, that we are going to turn around and increase our own salaries?

I think the moment has come not to seek remuneration from the State of Maine for our services but to rather think in a different vein, which I know many of you already do, and that is “not what the State of Maine can do for you, but what can you do for the State of Maine,” and each and everyone is rendering a service by sitting here; I’m aware of it. There isn’t any argument that you can present how badly you’re paid, how it costs you money to come down here, and everything in the book; I will agree. I know it and you know it, but I do ask you to think of your image with the people of the State of Maine, how the Press would treat this, that you, the members of the Legislature, after denying raises to others, vote a raise for yourself. I would like you to stop and reflect upon it and search your conscience, and when you vote I certainly ask you to support the Minority “Ought not to pass” Report of the Committee. When the vote is taken, I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Here

I go again; I’m going to walk right into the propeller.

The 103rd Legislature ordered the Research Committee to study the matter of legislative compensation, which we did, and I had the honor of holding the Chair on this. We made a study, and you will find that the various legislatures around the country range from a high of some \$26,000 to a low of \$200.

Now I heartily concur with Mr. Dennett that perhaps it is not judicious to at this time consider a pay raise because of our image. But on the other hand I don’t think Congress had too much trouble to pass their raise from \$30,000, if you will, to some \$42,500. I don’t think their image is any better or any worse than it was. I also don’t know of a department head that makes \$2,000 a year.

I think that we should consider this; that yes, we are dedicated and devoted. As a matter of fact I am in the fortunate position of living within commuting distance and it doesn’t cost me much of anything to serve here. I do feel badly for some of the people that have to come down here and dip into their savings and really make a sacrifice financially to serve here.

I wish I had it within my persuasion to convince you that a \$500 increase is not that startling insofar as the people of Maine are concerned. And I think it would help perhaps, as we considered on the committee, to encourage people to participate in their government. I don’t think it’s reasonable to ask them to make a financial sacrifice.

So without getting any more bloodied on this, I would ask you to deny the gentleman’s motion and go along with the majority of the committee.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This last session, the 103rd, and in this session, I think that the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett and I have cooperated in many

ways in the areas of salaries for state employees, for state department heads, and so forth. Sometimes we have come to an agreement on raises, and I think most of the time we have agreed. Many times we have agreed to hold the line. I don't think our thinking is too far off even now.

However, I would like to point out that over the last ten years or so I believe the salary of the members of the Legislature has gone from somewhere around \$1200 per session to the present \$2000. In the same period of time many department heads have doubled their salaries. Some who were getting 10 or \$11,000 ten years ago are now getting double that amount.

Now I will agree that in probably most, if not all of these cases, the increase perhaps was justified. Every session that I have been here, department heads have received some increase, sometimes substantial increases, and I am sure that the members who have been here in sessions prior to my first one can remember other instances, that in practically every session there have been increases. The record shows this.

However, we have kept our own salaries low, I think unusually low. I think we have been remiss in our duty to ourselves and to the state because we have provided ourselves with inadequate resources, we have provided ourselves with far less pay for the time that most of us put in; and I think that some few months ago this was brought out far better than I can explain by the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, in an article in the Maine Sunday Telegram. He brought out this factor. He also brought out, I believe, if my memory serves me correct, that we should decrease the size of the Legislature. I was for that too, but unhappily it failed. But I do believe that this is one instance where we here now can give ourselves a modest increase. It still does not bring us up to where we should be, but it is a modest increase to help us along to at least partly compensate us for the time we do

put in, and I urge you to vote against the motion by the gentleman from Kittery.

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

Mr. HICHENS: This morning I rise in support of the motion by the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett. It sort of hurts me to have to do this, not because of personal reasons against the gentleman or for the gentleman, but because it hurts my pocketbook. I, along with a very few members of the House, am dependent upon my salary here as a Representative for 90% of my income during the session. But when I go back home and tell the teachers, when I come down here and tell the state employees, that I think that we should hold the line as far as pay increases are concerned, then I should turn around and vote for a pay increase for myself, I cannot feel very consistent in doing so.

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

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The present salary scale makes many citizens effectively ineligible to serve in the Legislature because they and their families could not survive financially on the present scale. I firmly believe that the salary should be raised so all citizens would have an equal opportunity to serve in this House. I urge you to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am somewhat perturbed here this morning. In questioning my good friend Mr. Dennett out in the lobby one day, I asked him why he took Fridays off, and he informed me that he was in the insurance business and he had to earn a living. I wonder how he can make this compatible with his speech this morning?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Bourgoin.

Mr. BOURGOIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to remark to this Legislature it is the 104th, and we're not raising the wages for the 104th, it will be for the members who will be elected for the 105th. And every person, taxpayers in my locality, when we discussed the salary of the Legislature, every one of them, one hundred percent, said why don't you raise your salary so that other people can go too?

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Regretfully I rise to answer the question that was put by the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Mills. I am fearful that the days that I have been absent from the Legislature have been due to conditions not involving particularly making a living, but a very difficult situation in which I find myself. Now this gets into entirely personal, because it is a personal question.

Before I came to this Legislature — I have a business, yes, it's an insurance business, it was operated by two sons. Unfortunately for me my youngest son, who was very capable in the business, was called up in the National Guard Unit and is presently serving in Vietnam. This left us in a very very difficult position in the office that I have, and I have returned not to make money but to help my oldest son who is up against a very terrible situation — due to this youngest boy being in Vietnam. It has nothing to do with money, but I have an older boy there and I just can't kill him with work, and I go there to help him. It's personal; I should not bring it before this Legislature. It really hurts me to have to do so, but a very pointed question was put and I give you a factual answer.

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

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I concur wholeheartedly with the remarks of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brennan. Like many of the members of the House and the

other body, I'm self-employed, and although there are some financial sacrifices involved, they're not huge, they're not overbearing, but like the rest of you I chose voluntarily to come here knowing what the salary was.

I understand that the compensation paid to our very fine Pages and Sergeant-at-Arms, who have responsible functions and execute them well, is in the neighborhood of \$75 per week for the Pages and \$100 per week for the Sergeant-at-Arms. I do not feel that these fine gentlemen are in any way over compensated. However, I feel that if we match the responsibilities that we have as representatives of the people with the administrative responsibilities had by the Pages and the Sergeant-at-Arms, and if you consider, roughly speaking, based on a six-months regular session that our pay is in the neighborhood of perhaps \$75 a week, I ask you to consider this. When you pay a Senator or a member of the House of Representatives the same as you pay a Page, and if you agree that the pay for the Page certainly is not too high, then I think you'll have to agree that the pay for the Representative is too low. For this reason, because I think our responsibilities are greater than those of the Pages, I intend to vote for the increase.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that the House accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report. The yeas and nays have been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All of those desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

More than one fifth having expressed the desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that the House accept the Minority "Ought not to pass" Re-

port on Bill "An Act Increasing Compensation of Members of the Legislature," House Paper 73, L. D. 73. 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.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Allen, Barnes, Berman, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buckley, Bunker, Carrier, Chandler, Chick, Clark, C. H.; Crommett, Crosby, Cummings, Curtis, Cushing, Dam, Dennett, Donaghy, Dudley, Durgin, Dyar, Evans, Fortier, M.; Gilbert, Giroux, Hall, Hanson, Hardy, Hariman, Heselton, Hewes, Hichens, Huber, Immonen, Johnston, Kelleher, Lawry, Lincoln, McNally, Meisner, Moreshed, Mosher, Page, Payson, Porter, Quimby, Richardson, G. A.; Rocheleau, Ross, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Stillings, Temple, Trask, White, Williams.

NAY — Baker, Bedard, Benson, Bernier, Binnette, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Burnham, Carey, Carter, Casey, Clark, H. G.; Coffey, Corson, Cote, Cottrell, Croteau, Curran, Drigotas, Emery, Erickson, Eustis, Farnham, Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Fortier, A. J.; Foster, Fraser, Gauthier, Good, Haskell, Hawkens, Henley, Hunter, Jameson, Jutrass, Kelley, K. F.; Keyte, Kilroy, Laberge, Lebel, Leibowitz, LePage, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Lund, MacPhail, Marquis, Marstaller, Martin, McKinnon, McTeague, Millett, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Norris, Noyes, Ouellette, Pratt, Rand, Richardson, H. L.; Ricker, Rideout, Santoro, Shaw, Sheltra, Snow, Soulas, Starbird, Susi, Tanguay, Thompson, Tyndale, Vincent, Watson, Waxman, Wheeler, Wight, Wood.

ABSENT — Couture, Cox, D'Alfonso, Danton, Jalbert, Kelley, R. P.; Lee, Nadeau, Sahagian.

Yes, 58; No, 83; Absent, 9.

The **SPEAKER**: Fifty-eight having voted in the affirmative and eighty-three in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting

"Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Compensation of State Probation and Parole Board" (H. P. 488) (L. D. 642)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. **WYMAN** of Washington
LETOURNEAU of York
— of the Senate.

Messrs. **DONAGHY** of Lubec
RIDEOUT of Manchester
D'ALFONSO of Portland
DENNETT of Kittery
MARSTALLER
of Freeport
STARBIRD

of Kingman Township
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. **BELIVEAU** of Oxford
— of the Senate.

Miss **WATSON** of Bath
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. **DENNETT**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I appear on this report as a signer of the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. This is a pay raise. In light of what just happened in this House, I cannot in good conscience support my own report. If this House is going to vote pay raises for itself, you certainly should be honest enough to vote pay raises for others. And I will sit and make no motion on the acceptance of this Report.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Rideout of Manchester, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Grant Adult Rights to Persons Twenty Years of Age" (H. P. 1162) (L. D. 1484)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. **LETOURNEAU** of York
BELIVEAU of Oxford
— of the Senate.

Mr. DENNETT of Kittery
 Miss WATSON of Bath
 Messrs. RIDEOUT of Manchester
 STARBIRD
 of Kingman Township
 D'ALFONSO of Portland
 DONAGHY of Lubec

— of the House.
 Minority Report of same Com-
 mittee reporting "Ought not to
 pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the follow-
 ing members:

Mr. WYMAN of Washington
 — of the Senate.

Mr. MARSTALLER
 of Freeport
 — of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Dennett of
 Kittery, the Majority "Ought to
 pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was read twice and as-
 signed for third reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Commit-
 tee on Towns and Counties report-
 ing "Ought to pass" on Bill "An
 Act Creating Aroostook County
 Commissioner Districts" (H. P.
 49) (L. D. 50)

Report was signed by the fol-
 lowing members:

Messrs. MILLS of Aroostook
 PEABODY of Aroostook
 MARTIN of Piscataquis
 — of the Senate.

Messrs. WIGHT of Presque Isle
 DYAR of Strong
 HAWKENS of Farmington
 LABERGE of Auburn
 — of the House.

Minority Report of same Com-
 mittee reporting "Ought not to
 pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the fol-
 lowing members:

Messrs. HANSON of Vassalboro
 CROMMETT
 of Millinocket
 FORTIER of Waterville
 — of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Wight of Pres-
 que Isle, the Majority "Ought to
 pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was read twice and as-
 signed for third reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Commit-
 tee on Towns and Counties report-

ing "Ought to pass" on Bill "An
 Act Creating Waldo County Com-
 missioner Districts" (H. P. 586)
 (L. D. 771)

Report was signed by the follow-
 ing members:

Messrs. MILLS of Franklin
 PEABODY of Aroostook
 MARTIN of Piscataquis
 — of the Senate.

Messrs. WIGHT of Presque Isle
 DYAR of Strong
 HAWKENS of Farmington
 LABERGE of Auburn
 — of the House.

Minority Report of same Com-
 mittee reporting "Ought not to
 pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the follow-
 ing members:

Messrs. HANSON of Vassalboro
 CROMMETT
 of Millinocket
 FORTIER of Waterville
 — of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Wight of Pres-
 que Isle, the Majority "Ought to
 pass" Report was accepted.

The Bill was read twice and as-
 signed for third reading tomorrow.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Amending Funeral
 Directors' Law" (H. P. 761) (L. D.
 981)

Bill "An Act relating to Bills
 Submitted by Charitable Organiza-
 tions for State Aid" (H. P. 1026)
 (L. D. 1335)

Bill "An Act relating to the
 Treatment of Venereal Disease in
 Minors Without Parental Consent"
 (H. P. 1066) (L. D. 1395)

Bill "An Act to Revise the Phar-
 macy Laws" (H. P. 1175) (L. D.
 1496)

Resolve Authorizing Forest Com-
 missioner to Exchange Land in T2
 R6 (Big Squaw) BKP EKR, Pis-
 cataquis County (H. P. 1163) (L.
 D. 1485)

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

Third Reader Unfinished Business

Bill "An Act Making Supple-
 mental Appropriations for the Ex-
 penditures of State Government

and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1970 and June 30, 1971" (S. P. 449) (L. D. 1483)

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to yield to the House Chairman of the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In attempting to defend the report of this Committee on the Supplemental Budget, I would like to have you go back with me into the atmosphere which prevailed at the beginning of this legislative session.

I am sure that there were feelings on the part of many legislators that over the past few bienniums we have been allowing the expenses involved, in maintaining state functions, to go beyond what might be considered our actual ability state-wide, to provide in a practical way for a tax fund with which to pay for these services.

It is well known among tax experts that it is possible to tax to the point of diminishing returns. I think there was a feeling on the part of many legislators that we were getting dangerously close to this point and possibly in some fields already exceeding it.

It was in this atmosphere that the Appropriations Committee embarked upon a procedure new in the history of Maine legislative annals, namely, taking a careful look at the Part I budget, realizing the possibility that there might be programs in it which could well be eliminated and that there were areas in which cuts could be made without hurting the overall program. Thus going through the Part I budget we eliminated \$4.6 million from Governor Curtis recommendations. I do not consider this an outstanding success; however, I feel we established a precedent which future legislatures

might wisely follow. We have been prone over the years to create programs duplicating in part or on the whole, existing services without eliminating the existing services.

I think that future legislatures might be more successful in such an endeavor than we were in this initial effort.

I would like to have you also go back with me to about the third week of this session when we received the recommendation of Governor Curtis, calling for a budget in the Part I and Part II areas amounting in the overall to \$365.4 million or an increase of \$130 million over the previous session, including with this his proposed tax measure for financing the same which contained the recommendation for a 25% personal income tax as the major tax to be used in financing this. You are as well aware as I am, what sort of a reception this announcement received state-wide. I was asked many times this question, surely we do not have to tax ourselves to provide for such an increase as Governor Curtis now suggests? Especially strong was the objection to his method of financing this budget, namely, the personal income tax.

At that time, I assured those who approached me, that I personally did not believe that the Legislature would go anywhere near to buying his recommendation in total and I for one assured them at this session I could not buy the idea of a personal tax. I expect many of you found yourselves in somewhat the same position.

I understand that Governor Curtis has made it clear that he will not tolerate any increase in the sales tax beyond the 5% level. Thus we find ourselves somewhat hedged in regarding available tax measures.

This was pretty much the atmosphere when the Appropriations Committee started consideration of this Part II budget. It is a well-known fact to many of you that I personally did not wish to see this budget go beyond the \$25 million level. However, as we went through the requests involved, I had to change my thinking. This recommendation is the result of

the combined thinking of the ten members of the Appropriations Committee. I strongly support it and will do everything in my power to help pass tax measures to finance it. There are those on the Committee who felt that this was way too high and we have before us a recommendation of one member of the Committee to cut this budget to \$14 million. At the other extreme, one of the best liked and highly respected members of the Committee, and they are all well liked and highly respected, felt that this budget was too low.

We now hear rumors concerning a Part III budget. This is the democratic way and the prerogative of any member on the Appropriations Committee or any member of the House for that matter; the only problem involved is to find one hundred other people who agree with him not only in the passage of such a Part III budget but also in the matter of financing the same.

In reply to those who are critical of this budget, because of the things it does not provide, I would only ask you to review with me some of the things which it does provide:

In this we relieve the towns of the 18% town share of ADC at a cost of slightly over \$2,000,000. We provide a Drug and Dental Program at a cost of \$698,000. These two programs are both effective for eighteen months of the next year and would cost about \$3.6 million for a full biennium.

In the area of Child Welfare Services we provided \$760,000 to increase board and care payments for foster homes. This increases these rates approximately \$8 per month.

Aid to Aged, Blind or Disabled, we provided \$600,000. We have provided these additional funds to provide for boarding home increase and nursing home increase of about \$25 per month.

In the field of Mental Health and Corrections, we provided \$2,500,000. This takes care of the 40-hour work week and funds for additional operating expenses.

In the field of State employees' salaries, we provided \$4,300,000.

I would assume that this would be distributed to affect the most needy brackets.

Educational Subsidies to cities and towns, we provide \$11,300,000.

To the University of Maine, an increased grant to the University for operations, costing \$6,700,000.

In summary our Part I budget recommendation of approximately \$277 million, our Part II budget of approximately \$34 million and the L. D. for Education subsidies for the first year of approximately \$4.9 million give a total of \$315.9 million or an increase over the previous session of approximately \$80 million. I believe this is as much progress as we can hope to make in one biennium. This is a reduction of about \$50 million from the Governor's recommendations.

I would like to further comment on two areas in which the Committee has been criticized, namely, the University of Maine and the State employees pay raise. With regard to the University of Maine, this budget provides a \$15.6 million increase or 45% over and above the amount provided in the last biennium.

I would now express my personal opinion that I have complete confidence that the Board of Trustees of the University of Maine, made up as they are of competent and knowledgeable Maine citizens, will do what needs to be done to operate our institutions of higher education within the limits of the Part I and Part II appropriations measures.

I sense that there well may be some students and may well be some administrators or faculty members who will not be happy with our solution, but it is my firm conviction that higher education will not unduly suffer from the appropriation we have suggested.

I would suggest to them as well as to state employees who appear dissatisfied with the provisions of this budget, that they recognize that the Committee has made a sincere effort to come up with a program which they believe is fair and just to all citizens of the State. I would also warn that any efforts which might result in materially increasing the size of this budget could very well result in its failure to be financed by this Legislature.

I hope that the members of this House will recognize the serious and sincere efforts of your Committee, and give this budget the necessary 101 votes for passage as well as to make a serious attempt to come up quickly with a tax measure necessary to insure its operation. Thank you.

Third Readers

Unfinished Business

Bill "An Act Increasing Amount of State Grants for Community Mental Health Service" (H. P. 325) (L. D. 412)

Bill "An Act to Reconstitute School Administrative Districts Numbers 31, 32, 40, 41 and 54" (H. P. 513) (L. D. 684)

Bill "An Act to Reconstitute School Administrative Districts Numbers 60, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71 and 72" (H. P. 514) (L. D. 685)

Bill "An Act relating to Welfare Assistance" (H. P. 687) (L. D. 918)

Bill "An Act relating to Harness and Running Horse Races on Sunday" (H. P. 1069) (L. D. 1398)

Bill "An Act to Revise the Laws Relating to Real Estate Brokers and Salesmen" (H. P. 1176) (L. D. 1497)

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State and Providing for the Issuance of Bonds not Exceeding, at Any One Time Issued and Outstanding, Twenty-Five Million Dollars for Loans to Private Colleges for Construction and Expansion of Facilities (S. P. 261) (L. D. 865)

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Affecting the Apportionment of the House of Representatives (H. P. 1015) (L. D. 1323)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bills read the third time and Resolves read the second time.

During the consideration of the foregoing matters,

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.