

# 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

*Ninety-Fourth Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1949

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Wednesday, May 4, 1949

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

Prayer by the Rev. Elliott Varney of Manchester.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

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

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Board and Care of Neglected Children" (S. P. 31) (L. D. 6)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Build Armory in Lewiston (S. P. 563) (L. D. 1228)

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting same on Bill "An Act to Create the Phippsburg School District" (S. P. 310) (L. D. 503) which was recommitted.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

**Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Report of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Resolve to Repeal Clam Cleansing Research (S. P. 237) (L. D. 351) which was recommitted reporting a new draft (S. P. 689) (L. D. 1593) under title of Resolve Providing for a Continuous Survey of Closed Clam Areas and Mussel Control Program and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of same Committee on Resolve Directing Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries to Make Study of Herring and Means of Avoiding Their Depletion (S. P. 366) (L. D. 583) which was recommitted reporting a new draft (S. P. 687) (L. D. 1592) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Resolves passed to be engrossed.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence and the Resolves read once and assigned for second reading at 2 o'clock this afternoon, Eastern Standard Time.

**Senate Divided Reports**

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1950, and June 30, 1951 (S. P. 97) (L. D. 103) and new draft of same (S. P. 624) (L. D. 1360) under same title, which were recommitted, reporting a second new draft (S. P. 678) (L. D. 1557) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BOWKER of Cumberland  
SAVAGE of Somerset  
— of the Senate  
BIRD of Rockland  
DENNETT of Kittery  
JALBERT of Lewiston  
JACOBS of Auburn  
—of the House

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill and new draft reporting that the second new draft (S. P. 678) (L. D. 1557) "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WILLIAMS of Penobscot  
—of the Senate  
BROWN of Unity  
JOHNSTON of Jefferson  
WEBBER of Bangor  
—of the House

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the second new draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

On motion by Mr. Brown of Unity, the House voted to accept the Majority Report in concurrence, and the Bill had its two several readings and was assigned for third reading this afternoon.

**Senate Divided Reports**

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve for School Construction Assistance (S. P. 605) (L. D. 1296)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BOWKER of Cumberland  
SAVAGE of Somerset  
—of the Senate  
BROWN of Unity  
DENNETT of Kittery  
JACOBS of Auburn  
BIRD of Rockland  
JALBERT of Lewiston  
WEBBER of Bangor  
JOHNSTON of Jefferson  
—of the House

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot  
—of the Senate

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: The House voted to accept the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" in concurrence with the Senate.

**Senate Divided Reports**

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing for a Classroom and Library Building at Farmington State Teachers' College (S. P. 603) (L. D. 1294)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BOWKER of Cumberland  
SAVAGE of Somerset  
—of the Senate  
BROWN of Unity  
DENNETT of Kittery  
JACOBS of Auburn  
BIRD of Rockland  
JALBERT of Lewiston  
WEBBER of Bangor  
JOHNSTON of Jefferson  
of the House

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot  
of the Senate

Came from the Senate with the Minority Report accepted and the Resolve passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that the House accept the minority report of the committee, in concurrence with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, moves that the House accept the minority report.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This resolve, Resolve Providing for a Classroom and Library Building at Farmington State Teachers' College was passed out of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on a divided report, with a substantial majority of the committee reporting "Ought not to pass." This resolve provides for raising the sum of \$470,000 out of the unappropriated surplus.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this unappropriated surplus is not an inexhaustible fund; there is only so much there. This sum of money, approaching nearly a half million dollars, will make quite a dent in this fund. This library, while it may possibly be needed at Farmington State Teachers' College, is certainly not a basic need. There are other things that we need in the State that will benefit a far greater number of people than this. I therefore suggest that the motion by the gentleman from Strong (Mr. Jennings) does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr.

Jennings, that the House do accept the minority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Tyler.

Mr. TYLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The basic reasons underlying the request, as embodied in L. D. 1294, for the allocation of \$470,000 for the construction of a library-classroom building at the Farmington State Teachers' College are as follows:

1. The need for additional instructional space,
2. The necessity for providing additional library storage and study space, and
3. The need for additional specialized instructional space for the department of Home Economics.

Farmington's general enrollments are mounting. Since 1944-45 the student registrations have increased over thirty percent, with additional numbers immediately in sight. The present situation is one which, with the present limitations of classroom space, makes adequate scheduling very difficult. The proposed building would provide at least four modern college classrooms to relieve this current pressure. In addition, the present space allocated for library storage and reading-room purposes would then become converted to general and specialized classroom use which would, in combination, extend significantly the present facilities.

In 1945, the college received a bequest of \$50,000. The income from this amount was specifically designated to be used for the purchase of additional library accessions. The opportunity, provided by such a bequest, is an unusual one for a State Teachers' College. At present, the library accessions approximate 12,000 volumes. When it is realized that the national accrediting agencies expect not less than 20,000 to be available for the use of students in such a professional college, it is easy to understand why the Maine teachers' colleges and normal schools have thus far been unable to achieve standard recog-

nition by regional and national accrediting agencies.

Regular purchases have been made under the provisions of this bequest. However, the available storage space for accessions is now practically exhausted. Further, practical purchasing will have to be allowed so additional space can be created to make such materials available for student use. This building, which has been proposed, will provide adequately for a long-term program of building toward a definite library collection which will be matched by the best in similar institutions in this part of the country.

Furthermore, it has long been obvious that the smaller and rural schools within a fifty-mile radius of the college could profit immensely from the creation of a depository, located at the college, for the purpose of circulating supplementary library, instructional, and portable equipment materials. The creation of such a facility would provide the necessary storage and work spaces to implement this badly needed service to surrounding public schools.

The Farmington State Teachers' College has developed one of the outstanding programs for the training of Home Economics Teachers in the east. Some time ago the enrollment needed to supply the annual vacancies within the State outran the capacity of the plant. Due to factors of loss by fire and increased enrollments, this program is being severely hampered in its development because of the lack of adequate physical facilities. While the additional space provided by this building would not solve entirely the basic college problem, it would include specialized space for specific purposes which would make a significant addition at this time.

With the exception of the Alumni Gymnasium, which was constructed about 1932, through the combined effort of the college alumni and the State Legislature, no capital expenditure has been allocated to this college for functional space for a long time. As a matter of

fact, the institutional facilities remain about as they were in capacity at the time of the original construction of the plant. It is to be noted that this is one of five institutions created by the State to provide low-cost collegiate professional teacher-training to Maine students. The college has no additional revenues which could be, from year to year, accumulated in significant amounts to provide a sinking fund for capital expenditures. In fact, since the years of the economic depression, even basic maintenance has been at a very low level because of the presence of a minimum budgetary program.

This is a request which has been carefully analyzed. The amount of \$470,000 represents the lowest figure which can be defended in terms of permanent construction with the elimination of all but the essentials that must accompany such defensible construction. The need which such a facility would help to meet has been developing over a long period of time and represents a reasonable request in terms of a State's responsibility to one of its collegiate institutions responsible for providing trained personnel for service in a critical state educational area.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is an inopportune time to present a bill of this magnitude, before a House that is so economically inclined, but I move that the bill be passed and the fund taken from the surplus which I understand we have.

---

The SPEAKER: The Chair, at this time, notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of the Eighth Grade of the Norway Junior High School. The adult leaders in charge of the group are Mrs. Greenlaw, Mr. Chapman and Mrs. Palmer. On behalf of the House, we bid you welcome. (Applause)

---

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept

the minority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stratton, Mr. Carville.

MR. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I shall not take up any more of your time, but I do feel that if there are to be any additional funds for the educational program, this one is justified. There is a shortage of Home Economics Teachers. They are very crowded there, and I believe that this was one of the few bills that the Appropriations Committee gave very careful consideration. I believe it is a necessity if we are to take care of our teacher shortage problem.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the minority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Palmyra, Mr. Millett.

MR. MILLETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Strong (Mr. Jennings) because I feel that a teacher in our schools is the starting point of our educational system, and we realize, the most of us, that there is a shortage of teachers, and I believe that education is one of the most fundamental issues in our State.

As far as accepting this minority report is concerned, I would like to remind the members of the fact that we have already approved minority reports here for other things to come out of the unappropriated surplus, and I would like to ask the members which they consider the most necessary, improvement of our educational facilities for teachers or a building down here at Kittery to advertise our products. I maintain that if we put up a good product and put it on the market, and have good regulations in regard to the packing of these products, and make as good a product as any other state, we won't have too much trouble in competing with the rest.

But we do need education. I am a man without too much education, but I am ready and willing to sacrifice that any child that will go to school shall have the best facilities to acquire a good education, and I also realize that the need is growing more urgent as time goes on, and I believe this is an issue that is well worth the sacrifice that we may have to make along other lines to improve our teacher's colleges.

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

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill has been pretty well covered, but I do want to remind you once again, as has the last speaker, that after all, yesterday, we carefully listened to the Majority Floor Leader give us a little pep talk in regard to the Information Center.

Now I do not believe there is any question, when it comes to a matter of need, what we need the most, whether it is a school or an information center. Every report we have had in the past year or two years has shown that there definitely are not enough teachers. Not only that, but there is not enough space to teach the number of teachers that we need. In fact, Farmington Teachers' College expects to double their enrollment of Home Economics Teachers by 1951, and this will be completely impossible if they cannot have the funds to expand their school.

The gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Tyler, has covered, I believe, a majority of the subjects in regard to what the bill will do, I believe, a majority of the subjects in regard to what the bill will do, enlarging the classrooms and what-not. I simply want to point out again to you that time and time again in this House I have heard of the crying need of education. Well if that is so, then let us build a school for these teachers so we can have a sufficient number of teachers to supply our elementary schools and our high schools with highly trained personnel.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the minority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, requests that when the vote is taken, it be by division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, may not prevail. I have no doubt that this bill has merit, but we have had a lot of meritorious bills here before us and we have rejected many of them for lack of funds. This is certainly not the most meritorious bill that has been introduced in the cause of education. We have already rejected many bills that have a great deal more merit and a great deal more usefulness in the field of education than the bill now under consideration.

I can understand why every member of the Franklin County Delegation should request it; perhaps if it were Somerset County, I should do the same myself; but I think we should bear in mind that all of the members of the Appropriations Committee except one have reported "Ought not to pass" on this bill, that it is so framed that we will spend at least \$470,000, and the chances are that it may cost much more. I hope that the motion may be defeated, in line with what, I hope, is the established policy to live within our means and preserve a margin of financial safety.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the minority "Ought to pass" report of the committee. The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, re-

quests that when the vote is taken, it be by a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the minority "Ought to pass" report of the committee will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-four having voted in the affirmative and sixty-two having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the majority report "Ought not to pass" was accepted in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

#### Ought to Pass in New Draft

##### Amended by Senate Amendment "A"

Report of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act to Clarify and Simplify the Sea and Shore Fisheries Law (S. P. 122) (L. D. 143) reporting a new draft (S. P. 638) (L. D. 1594) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

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

Senate Amendment "A" read by the Clerk as follows:

**SENATE AMENDMENT "A"** to S. P. 688, L. D. 1594, Bill "An Act to Clarify and Simplify the Sea and Shore Fisheries Law."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the last line of section 9 the underlined figure "\$5" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "\$3"

Thereupon, Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence, and the Bill was assigned for third reading this afternoon.

Report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Bill "An Act Relating to Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District" (S. P. 392) (L. D. 709) reporting a new draft (S. P.

671) (L. D. 1523) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

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

Senate Amendment "A" was then read by the Clerk as follows:

**SENATE AMENDMENT "A"** to S. P. 671, L. D. 1523, Bill "An Act Relating to Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District."

Amend said Bill by inserting before the headnote thereof the following: 'Sec. 1.'

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. P. & S. L., 1935, c. 88 § 9-A, additional. Chapter 88 of the private and special laws of 1935 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section, to be numbered 9-A, to read as follows:

'Sec. 9-A. Maintenance. The moneys necessary for the upkeep, maintenance and repair of the bridge shall be expended from the general highway fund.'

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill was assigned for third reading this afternoon.

Report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Resolve in Favor of a Bridge Across the St. John River in Allagash Plantation (S. P. 394) (L. D. 707) reporting a new draft (S. P. 685) (L. D. 1588) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

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

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

**SENATE AMENDMENT "A"** to S. P. 685, L. D. 1588, Resolve in Favor of a Bridge Across the St. John River in Allagash Plantation.



Amend said Resolve by striking out all of the 1st paragraph thereof after the headnote and inserting in place thereof the following paragraph:

"That there be, and hereby is, appropriated from the general highway fund the sum of \$100,000 to aid in building a bridge across the St. John River in Allagash plantation, at or near the "present ferry site", this bridge to be built under the bridge act, so called; and be it further"

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence, and the Resolve was assigned for second reading this afternoon.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Relating to an Institutional Farm Supervisor" (S. P. 219) (L. D. 339) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 19th, and passed to be engrossed on April 12th.

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

In the House: The House voted to reconsider its action of April 19th whereby the Bill was passed to be enacted.

The House further voted to reconsider action taken on April 12th whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

Senate Amendment "A" was then read by the Clerk as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 219, L. D. 339, Bill "An Act Relating to an Institutional Farm Supervisor."

Amend said Bill by adding at the end of the 2nd underlined paragraph thereof the following underlined sentence:

**'The salary and the expenses incurred by the farm supervisor shall be prorated among the accounts set up for the several institutional farms.'**

Further amend said Bill by striking out the abbreviation and figure "Sec. 1." at the beginning of the 1st paragraph thereof, and

by striking out all of Section 2 thereof.

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

#### Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Authorize the Issuing of Bonds to be Used for the Purpose of Building Highway or Combination Bridges Authorized by the Legislature (S. P. 670) (L. D. 1522) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 3rd as amended by House Amendment "A".

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

In the House:

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

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of information, may I inquire if House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed in the Senate?

The SPEAKER: In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Spear, House Amendment "A" was not indefinitely postponed in the Senate. It was adopted in the Senate.

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House concur with the action of the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to recede and concur in the passage of the Bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A"?

The motion prevailed.

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the Resolve as amended be passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: In order that there may be no misunderstanding, the Chair will state that the motion to recede and concur in the passage of the Bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" accom-

plished that purpose, upon acceptance of the motion by the House. The Bill has been passed to be engrossed.

#### **Resolve Substituted for Report in Senate**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing for a Men's Dormitory at Gorham State Teachers' College (S. P. 602) (L. D. 1293)

Came from the Senate with the Resolve substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Dennett of Kittery, the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted in non-concurrence and was sent up for concurrence.

#### **Bill Substituted for Report in Senate**

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Authorizing the City of Presque Isle to Provide for the Collection and Disposal of Garbage, Refuse and Rubbish and to Assess a Charge Therefor" (S. P. 461) (L. D. 913) as it is covered by other Legislation.

Came from the Senate with the Bill substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed.

In the House: The "Ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted in non-concurrence and was sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Miss Longstaff of Crystal, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session, in order to permit smoking.

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

Report of the Committee on Claims reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in Favor of General Ice Cream Corporation of Rockland (H. P. 898) which was accepted in the House on April 26th.

Came from the Senate recommended to the Committee on Claims in non-concurrence.

#### **In the House:**

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. DeSanctis.

Mr. DeSANCTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move to recede and concur with the Senate on this matter and have the resolve recommitted. Since the committee's action on the resolve we have received the necessary information that we needed in order for the bill to be acted on properly, so I move that the resolve be re-committed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madison, Mr. DeSanctis, moves that the House do recede and concur in the recommitment of the Resolve to the Committee on Claims. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the Resolve was recommitted to the Committee on Claims in concurrence.

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

Resolve Providing for Purchase and Installation of Heating Equipment at the State School for Boys (S. P. 419) (L. D. 776) which was finally passed in the House on March 17th and passed to be engrossed on March 10th.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the Resolve.

#### **Indefinitely Postponed in Senate**

Report of the Committee on Maine Publicity reporting "Ought to pass" on Resolve in Favor of State of Maine Building at Eastern States Agricultural and Industrial Exposition (S. P. 212) (L. D. 274)

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed.

In the House, on motion by the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, the House voted to concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the Report and Resolve.

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

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Commissioner of Labor

and Industry" (H. P. 600) (L. D. 183) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 2nd.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed and asking for a Committee of Conference.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist and that a Committee of Conference be appointed on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess, moves that the House do insist and join in a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Calls of "No."

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess, that the House do insist on its former action whereby the Bill was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 2nd and join in a Conference Committee. As many as are in favor of the motion that the House do insist and join in the Conference Committee will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Forty-two having voted in the affirmative and twenty-nine having voted in the negative, the motion to insist and join in the Committee of Conference prevailed.

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

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to consider a bill which we acted upon this morning.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Spear, moves that the House do reconsider on a certain matter?

Mr. SPEAR: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman care to state in his motion what matter is referred to?

Mr. SPEAR: It is a non-concurrent matter, Item 13 on page 3 of today's calendar, Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Authorize the Issuing of Bonds to be Used for the Purpose of Building Highway or Combination Bridges Authorized by the Legislature (S. P. 670) (L. D. 1522)

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Spear, moves that the House do now reconsider its action with regard to Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Authorize the Issuing of Bonds to be Used for the Purpose of Building Highway or Combination Bridges Authorized by the Legislature (S. P. 670) (L. D. 1522) whereby, earlier in today's session, the House passed the Bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and by Senate Amendment "A". Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider its action whereby it passed the Bill to be engrossed as amended?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, this is mainly a matter of clarification, it not being quite clear to me on the calendar. Inasmuch as Senate Amendment "A" completely absorbs House Amendment "A" and makes the correction necessary, I would now move the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider its action whereby it adopted House Amendment "A", under suspension of the rules?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Spear, now moves that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: Senate Amendment "A" has already been adopted by the House.

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure of the parliamentary procedure but I will now move that the Resolve, as amended by Senate Amendment "A", now pass to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Spear, moves that the Resolve as amended by Senate Amendment "A" be passed to be engrossed. Is it the pleasure of the House that the Resolve as amended by Senate Amendment "A" again pass to be engrossed in non-concurrence?

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

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the resolve, as amended, with accompanying papers, be sent to the Senate for their consideration at their session this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Spear, now moves that the Resolve and accompanying papers be sent forthwith to the Senate. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The House may be at ease for a few minutes.

#### House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, out of order, I would like to move that we reconsider our action on Item 15, Bill "An Act Authorizing the City of Presque Isle to Provide for the Collection of Garbage, Refuse and Rubbish and to Assess a Charge Therefor (S. P. 461) (L. D. 913). This is the bill which the citizens of the city of Presque Isle want. If we vote to reconsider, I would like to move that we substitute the bill for the report. I understand there is another bill before a Committee of Conference, and if it should pass, I will then move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Jamieson,

moves that the House do reconsider its action taken earlier in the day's session whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Authorizing the City of Presque Isle to Provide for the Collection and Disposal of Garbage, Refuse and Rubbish and to Assess a Charge Therefor (S. P. 461) (L. D. 913). Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider its action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now understands that the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Jamieson, moves to substitute the Bill for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. As many as are in favor of the substitution of the Bill for the report of the committee will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed, and the Bill was substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its two several readings and was assigned for third reading this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now directs the attention of the members to the fact that there was a printer's error in the House Advance Journal and Calendar this morning, in that the next item of business is "Orders", and anyone reading the Calendar would be led to believe that the next item would be "Bills in the Third Reading." The correct order of business will be, "Orders", "Reports of Committees" and "Bills in the Third Reading."

#### Orders

Mr. Brown of Baileyville, presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be instructed to study the need for minimum wage legislation; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of their study to the 95th Legislature. (H. P. 2117)

The order received a passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Brown of Wayne, presented the following order and moved its passage:

**ORDERED**, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, directed to study the utilization of wood waste and the development of new products therefrom; and be it further

**ORDERED**, that the results of such study shall be reported to the 95th Legislature. (H. P. 2118)

The order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

#### **House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass**

Mr. Hall from the Committee on Claims reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in Favor of the City of Biddeford (H. P. 1445)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Sanford for Fire Equipment Used During the Emergency Fires of 1947 (H. P. 895) (L. D. 366)

Mr. Knapp from same Committee reported same on Resolve in Favor of the Town of Machias (H. P. 896) (L. D. 367)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Strong (H. P. 122)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in Favor of the Town of Acton (H. P. 897) (L. D. 368)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Bridgewater (H. P. 1115)

Mr. Carter from the Committee on Taxation reported same on Bill "An Act to Create the Maine Highway District and Maine School District" (H. P. 1917) (L. D. 1279)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### **Tabled and Assigned**

Mr. Dow from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to

pass" on Bill "An Act Relating to Taxation of Boats" (H. P. 1743) (L. D. 1096)

(On motion by Mr. Jewett of Manchester, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for this afternoon)

Mr. Atherton from the Committee on Temperance reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Relating to Appeal from Decisions of the State Liquor Commission" (H. P. 1856) (L. D. 1193) as it is covered by other Legislation.

Mr. Bird from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquor to Minors" (H. P. 1751) (L. D. 1043)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### **Consolidated Resolves**

Mr. DeSanctis from the Committee on Claims on the following Resolves:

S. P. 33. Resolve in Favor of Arlo M. Adams, of Gardiner.

S. P. 41. Resolve in Favor of Earl Swett, of Brewer.

S. P. 43. Resolve in Favor of Dr. Walter G. Dixon, of Norway.

S. P. 44. Resolve in Favor of Alfred G. Snow, of Norway.

S. P. 32. Resolve in Favor of Dr. Harold Libby, of Gardiner.

S. P. 42. Resolve in Favor of Francis Millet, of Norway.

S. P. 53. Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Susan S. Wood, of Gouldsboro.

S. P. 55. Resolve in Favor of Richard Wing, of North Anson.

S. P. 67. Resolve in Favor of Clarence Earl Osgood, of Fryeburg.

S. P. 68. Resolve in Favor of Alfred Whitehouse, of Hollis Center.

S. P. 81. Resolve in Favor of C. E. Fogg, of Yarmouth.

S. P. 99. Resolve in Favor of Dana M. Bragdon, of Franklin.

S. P. 113. Resolve in Favor of Ernest Brown, of Bath.

S. P. 128. Resolve in Favor of Ernest Libby, of Portland.

S. P. 129. Resolve in Favor of Rosaire Cliche, of Lewiston.

- S. P. 161. Resolve in Favor of Arnold L. Foster, of Machias.
- S. P. 162. Resolve in Favor of David Grant, of Addison.
- S. P. 164. Resolve in Favor of New England Metal Culvert Company, of Portland.
- S. P. 165. Resolve in Favor of Hugh C. Leighton, of Blue Hill.
- S. P. 166. Resolve in Favor of Alanson B. Thomas, of Surry.
- S. P. 167. Resolve in Favor of E. Robert Jordan, of Ellsworth.
- S. P. 168. Resolve in Favor of Donald McCrum, of Presque Isle.
- S. P. 185. Resolve in Favor of Gilbert S. Floyd, of Columbia Falls.
- S. P. 186. Resolve in Favor of Everett L. Seavey, of Steuben.
- S. P. 188. Resolve in Favor of Forrest A. Dow, of Ellsworth.
- S. P. 197. Resolve in Favor of Carroll B. Johnson, of Brewer.
- S. P. 198. Resolve in Favor of Roy Wright, of East Holden.
- S. P. 199. Resolve in Favor of Herbert D. Page, of Portland.
- S. P. 245. Resolve in Favor of William F. Rokes, of Belfast.
- S. P. 246. Resolve in Favor of Domenic Cuccinello, of Rockland.
- S. P. 256. Resolve in Favor of Carlton Rollins, of Sanford.
- S. P. 257. Resolve in Favor of Donat J. Fortin, of Lewiston.
- S. P. 288. Resolve in Favor of Delmar C. Ellingwood, of North Windham.
- S. P. 292. Resolve in Favor of Merlin Hammond, of Houlton.
- S. P. 293. Resolve in Favor of Robert E. Cleaves, of Portland.
- S. P. 338. Resolve in Favor of Eva Eaton, of North Ellsworth.
- S. P. 340. Resolve in Favor of Morton Whitcomb, of Ellsworth.
- S. P. 341. Resolve in Favor of J. Philip Jacobs, of Caribou.
- S. P. 343. Resolve in Favor of James F. Cox, of Caribou.
- S. P. 390. Resolve in Favor of Samuel Dorrence of Augusta.
- S. P. 420. Resolve in Favor of Nolan C. Gibbs, of Monroe.
- S. P. 593. Resolve in Favor of Wallace McQuarrie, of Millinocket.
- H. P. 1. Resolve in Favor of Tingley's Bakery, of Houlton.
- H. P. 2. Resolve in Favor of Alfred Adler, of Houlton.
- H. P. 8. Resolve in Favor of Sumner O. Berry, of Bath.
- H. P. 9. Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Melvin D. Whittam, of Bath.
- H. P. 10. Resolve in Favor of Marcia M. Stinson, of Woolwich.
- H. P. 19. Resolve in Favor of Donald Grant, of Bangor.
- H. P. 20. Resolve in Favor of George B. Luce, of Gray.
- H. P. 21. Resolve in Favor of Ralph E. Draper, of New Gloucester.
- H. P. 23. Resolve in Favor of Earle W. Vickery, of Greenville Junction.
- H. P. 24. Resolve in Favor of Vera G. Sawyer, of Greenville.
- H. P. 26. Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Tomye C. Davine, of Sargentville.
- H. P. 27. Resolve in Favor of Philip I. Bartlett, of No. Brooklin.
- H. P. 28. Resolve in Favor of George L. Bent, of Brooklin.
- H. P. 29. Resolve in Favor of Harold J. Stinson, of Stonington.
- H. P. 30. Resolve in Favor of Thelma Grindle of Blue Hill.
- H. P. 31. Resolve in Favor of Thomas Johnston of Ellsworth.
- H. P. 32. Resolve in Favor of Colie Jordan of Ellsworth.
- H. P. 33. Resolve in Favor of Norman W. MacDonald, of Presque Isle.
- H. P. 34. Resolve in Favor of Howard W. Loring, of Avon.
- H. P. 35. Resolve in Favor of Raymond Joy, of Addison.
- H. P. 36. Resolve in Favor of Maynard Grant, of Columbia Falls.
- H. P. 37. Resolve in Favor of Warren L. Corliss, of Cherryfield.
- H. P. 38. Resolve in Favor of A. J. Perrault, of Skowhegan.
- H. P. 39. Resolve in Favor of Clifton Bean, of Skowhegan.
- H. P. 40. Resolve in Favor of Leslie Washburn, of Skowhegan.
- H. P. 41. Resolve in Favor of Emile J. Thibault, of Skowhegan.
- H. P. 42. Resolve in Favor of Norman Pratt, of Kennebunkport.
- H. P. 43. Resolve in Favor of Mary E. Turner, of Mapleton.

H. P. 44. Resolve in Favor of Harvey Thomas, of Mapleton.

H. P. 45. Resolve in Favor of Soly Caruso, of Southwest Harbor.

H. P. 46. Resolve in Favor of Arthur Pickard, of Gardiner.

H. P. 110. Resolve in Favor of Nelson Sennett, of Pembroke.

H. P. 111. Resolve in Favor of Louis Gardner, of Dennysville.

H. P. 112. Resolve in Favor of Philip King, of Stratton.

H. P. 113. Resolve in Favor of Adam D. Ustic, of South Windham.

H. P. 114. Resolve in Favor of C. Arthur McDonald, of South Windham.

H. P. 115. Resolve in Favor of Lester H. Penley, of So. Paris.

H. P. 116. Resolve in Favor of Ray A. Douglas, of So. Paris.

H. P. 117. Resolve in Favor of Alton Ames, of So. Paris.

H. P. 118. Resolve in Favor of Edna S. Fitch, of East Sebago.

H. P. 119. Resolve in Favor of Merritt D. Furman, of Steep Falls.

H. P. 120. Resolve in Favor of Ada McKenney, of North Baldwin.

H. P. 121. Resolve in Favor of Lucien R. Chamberlain, of Hartford.

H. P. 124. Resolve in Favor of Gordon E. Kimball, of Togus.

H. P. 125. Resolve in Favor of Bruce S. Billings, of Milo.

H. P. 126. Resolve in Favor of Kenneth C. Phoda, of Milo.

H. P. 127. Resolve in Favor of Philip G. Hines, of Milo.

H. P. 129. Resolve in Favor of Edwin O. Sturtevant, of Milo.

H. P. 130. Resolve in Favor of Doris P. Sang, of Ellsworth.

H. P. 131. Resolve in Favor of Frank V. Wright, Jr., of Topsham.

H. P. 166. Resolve in Favor of Maurice Parlin, of Coopers Mills.

H. P. 167. Resolve in Favor of Austin D. Winchenbaugh, of Waldoboro.

H. P. 168. Resolve in Favor of Robert L. Madden, of North Whitefield.

H. P. 169. Resolve in Favor of Harold C. Ralph, of Waldoboro.

H. P. 170. Resolve in Favor of Joseph LeClair, of Westbrook.

H. P. 172. Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Eugenia Robbins, of Westbrook.

H. P. 174. Resolve in Favor of Stuart M. Woodard, of Hampden.

H. P. 175. Resolve in Favor of Harold Martin, of Hampden Highlands.

H. P. 252. Resolve in Favor of Luther Snell, of Hammond Plantation.

H. P. 253. Resolve in Favor of Keith L. Grass, of Oxbow.

H. P. 254. Resolve in Favor of Harold Lane, of Sherman Mills.

H. P. 255. Resolve in Favor of Holbert Noyes, of Patten.

H. P. 256. Resolve in Favor of Patrick Landry, of Millinocket.

H. P. 257. Resolve in Favor of Floyd Pratt, of Troy.

H. P. 258. Resolve in Favor of Lemuel Morrell, of Limestone.

H. P. 259. Resolve in Favor of Bangor Hydro-Electric Company, Bar Harbor.

H. P. 260. Resolve in Favor of Howe C. Smith, of Salisbury Cove.

H. P. 261. Resolve in Favor of Basil Clements, of Winterport.

H. P. 264. Resolve in Favor of Henery Cormier, of Lewiston.

H. P. 265. Resolve in Favor of Edward Faulkner, of Lincoln.

H. P. 266. Resolve in Favor of Leo Tinkham of Passadumkeag.

H. P. 267. Resolve in Favor of Thomas Musher, of Lincoln.

H. P. 268. Resolve in Favor of Dr. G. M. Dorman, of Lincoln.

H. P. 269. Resolve in Favor of Roscoe Moore, of Saponac.

H. P. 270. Resolve in Favor of William C. Brehaut, of Lincoln Center.

H. P. 271. Resolve in Favor of Herbert Lyons, of Burlington.

H. P. 272. Resolve in Favor of Jane M. and Cora B. Little, of Richmond.

H. P. 274. Resolve in Favor of Joseph F. Morin, of Augusta.

H. P. 275. Resolve in Favor of C. B. Mitchell, of Wilton.

H. P. 276. Resolve in Favor of Walter Miele, of North Edgecomb.

H. P. 277. Resolve in Favor of Harriet Dennison, of Freeport.

H. P. 278. Resolve in Favor of Sherman Simmons, of Warren.

- H. P. 279. Resolve in Favor of Ernest C. Ober, of Northeast Harbor.
- H. P. 280. Resolve in Favor of Ernest C. Ober, of Northeast Harbor.
- H. P. 281. Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Frank Pierce, of Portland.
- H. P. 282. Resolve in Favor of Gordon Winslow, of Southport.
- H. P. 283. Resolve in Favor of Clinton L. Brackett, of Boothbay Harbor.
- H. P. 325. Resolve in Favor of George Witham, of Old Town.
- H. P. 326. Resolve in Favor of Clinton S. Stewart, of Windham.
- H. P. 328. Resolve in Favor of Walter L. Heald, of Livermore Falls.
- H. P. 329. Resolve in Favor of Dwight W. Lamb, of Livermore Falls.
- H. P. 330. Resolve in Favor of Robert McNally, of Patten.
- H. P. 331. Resolve in Favor of Robert V. Blaney, of Woodland.
- H. P. 333. Resolve in Favor of Clyde T. Hall, of Mt. Vernon.
- H. P. 335. Resolve in Favor of Florin Spaulding, of Lee.
- H. P. 336. Resolve in Favor of Alton Coffin, of Lee.
- H. P. 337. Resolve in Favor of Maude R. Boyington, of Prentiss.
- H. P. 338. Resolve in Favor of Laura Wooster, of Blue Hill.
- H. P. 339. Resolve in Favor of Elias Gagnon, of Millinocket.
- H. P. 340. Resolve in Favor of Dalton Lund, of East Machias.
- H. P. 341. Resolve in Favor of Garnett M. Bubar, of Harmony.
- H. P. 343. Resolve in Favor of Harold Ryder, of Pownal.
- H. P. 344. Resolve in Favor of Floyd Clements, of Farmington Falls.
- H. P. 345. Resolve in Favor of Nathan P. Lord, of Bangor.
- H. P. 346. Resolve in Favor of Manley Bemis, of Bangor.
- H. P. 347. Resolve in Favor of Perley Brooks, of Bangor.
- H. P. 348. Resolve in Favor of H. E. Peabody, of Bangor.
- H. P. 349. Resolve in Favor of Stanley A. Miller of Thomaston.
- H. P. 419. Resolve in Favor of Stanley Paul, of Brooks.
- H. P. 420. Resolve in Favor of Donald A. Pooler, of Augusta.
- H. P. 422. Resolve in Favor of William L. Graves, of Brownville Junction.
- H. P. 423. Resolve in Favor of Philip H. Cummings, of Lockes Mills.
- H. P. 424. Resolve in Favor of Richard S. Waldron of Bethel.
- H. P. 425. Resolve in Favor of Henry Hastings, of Bethel.
- H. P. 426. Resolve in Favor of Clayton Sweat, of Bethel.
- H. P. 427. Resolve in Favor of Rodney Eames, of Bethel.
- H. P. 428. Resolve in Favor of Samuel T. Smith, of North Newry.
- H. P. 429. Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Bertha Holman, of Kingfield.
- H. P. 430. Resolve in Favor of Milford Goodwin, of Hudson.
- H. P. 431. Resolve in Favor of William A. Swett, Jr., of Howland.
- H. P. 432. Resolve in Favor of Spencer M. Benner, of Bethel.
- H. P. 433. Resolve in Favor of Charles M. Clements, of Belfast.
- H. P. 434. Resolve in Favor of Edward H. Beale, of Belfast.
- H. P. 435. Resolve in Favor of Raymond Ryan, Jr., of Belfast.
- H. P. 436. Resolve in Favor of Francois D. Roy, of Belfast.
- H. P. 437. Resolve in Favor of Maurice E. Gray, of Belfast.
- H. P. 438. Resolve in Favor of Stephany Hughes, of Rumford.
- H. P. 439. Resolve in Favor of Thomas Kelly, of Rumford.
- H. P. 440. Resolve in Favor of Leon E. Wilbur, of Rumford.
- H. P. 441. Resolve in Favor of Norman A. Young, of Rumford.
- H. P. 442. Resolve in Favor of Nellie R. Gibbons, of Dover-Foxcroft.
- H. P. 443. Resolve in Favor of Cecil P. Chase, of Dover-Foxcroft.
- H. P. 446. Resolve in Favor of Richard Radcliffe, of Manchester.
- H. P. 447. Resolve in Favor of Harlow E. Powers, of St. Albans.
- H. P. 448. Resolve in Favor of Roy W. Giebersen, of Hartland.
- H. P. 449. Resolve in Favor of Rex St. Ledger, of Winthrop.
- H. P. 450. Resolve in Favor of Leonard Ford, of Winthrop.



H. P. 451. Resolve in Favor of Bradford F. Rand, of Portland.

H. P. 452. Resolve in Favor of Frank E. Little, of Waterville.

H. P. 455. Resolve in Favor of Merle Bowden, of Orland.

H. P. 456. Resolve in Favor of Howard G. Treadwell, of Bucksport.

H. P. 457. Resolve in Favor of Aaron La Bree, of Bucksport.

H. P. 458. Resolve in Favor of Arthur Tempesta, of Norridgewock.

H. P. 459. Resolve in Favor of Walter J. Hayes, of Augusta.

H. P. 460. Resolve in Favor of Kenneth H. Bunker, of Norridgewock.

H. P. 461. Resolve in Favor of Winfred A. Kelley, of Fairfield.

H. P. 462. Resolve in Favor of Theresa Arnold, of Fairfield.

H. P. 475. Resolve in Favor of William B. Forsyth, of Ellsworth.

H. P. 543. Resolve in Favor of Andrew Champeon, of Dexter.

H. P. 545. Resolve in Favor of Asa Ogden, of Kingman.

H. P. 546. Resolve in Favor of Brooks Terry, of Dover-Foxcroft.

H. P. 547. Resolve in Favor of Evan Leavitt, of Flagstaff.

H. P. 548. Resolve in Favor of Harold Young, of Manchester.

H. P. 549. Resolve in Favor of Clifton E. Taylor, of Brunswick.

H. P. 551. Resolve in Favor of Winfield Jordan, of Old Town.

H. P. 552. Resolve in Favor of Donald Beane, of Skowhegan.

H. P. 553. Resolve in Favor of Laura Doyle, of Winthrop.

H. P. 554. Resolve in Favor of Michael Markowski, of Winthrop.

H. P. 555. Resolve in Favor of Joseph E. Keith, of Winthrop.

H. P. 556. Resolve in Favor of Philip Warren, of Kenduskeag.

H. P. 557. Resolve in Favor of Doria T. Nadeau, of Biddeford.

H. P. 558. Resolve in Favor of Donald E. Robbins, of Cedar Grove.

H. P. 559. Resolve in Favor of Irene Hemond, of Mechanic Falls.

H. P. 560. Resolve in Favor of Robert J. Fisher, of Turner.

H. P. 561. Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Olive Gradford, of Turner.

H. P. 563. Resolve in Favor of Maynard F. Marsh, of Westbrook.

H. P. 565. Resolve in Favor of George N. Sferes, of South Windham.

H. P. 567. Resolve in Favor of Paul E. Fortin, of Lewiston.

H. P. 568. Resolve in Favor of Wilfred Racicot, of North Berwick.

H. P. 634. Resolve in Favor of Oscar L. Wyman, of Orono.

H. P. 635. Resolve in Favor of Paul F. Goodchild, of Madison.

H. P. 638. Resolve in Favor of Earl Ettinger, of Sebago Lake.

H. P. 639. Resolve in Favor of Vernard I. Pierce, of Bingham.

H. P. 640. Resolve in Favor of Doris L. Young, of Palermo.

H. P. 641. Resolve in Favor of Henry Beaudoin, of Limerick.

H. P. 642. Resolve in Favor of Daniel B. Lord, of Kezar Falls.

H. P. 643. Resolve in Favor of Mrs. William Kirk, of Eagle Lake.

H. P. 644. Resolve in Favor of Paul Wadsworth, of Hiram.

H. P. 645. Resolve in Favor of Harry J. Welch, of Gorham.

H. P. 646. Resolve in Favor of Kenneth E. Stoddard, of Boothbay.

H. P. 647. Resolve in Favor of Philip N. Whittaker, of Bangor.

H. P. 700. Resolve in Favor of George Stairs, of Searsport.

H. P. 701. Resolve in Favor of Theron McBrierty, of Allagash.

H. P. 702. Resolve in Favor of A. V. Higgins of Mt. Desert.

H. P. 730. Resolve in Favor of Oscar Walker, of Bangor.

H. P. 731. Resolve in Favor of Benjamin H. Jones, of Woodland.

H. P. 734. Resolve in Favor of Stanley Crawford, of Albion.

H. P. 735. Resolve in Favor of Leslie W. Wildes, of North Kennebunkport.

H. P. 736. Resolve in Favor of Katherine E. Marshall, of York Village.

H. P. 740. Resolve in Favor of Lawrence L. Felt, of Whitefield.

H. P. 742. Resolve in Favor of Ralph A. Gallagher, of Damariscotta.

H. P. 814. Resolve in Favor of Arthur L. Hitchcock, jr., of Rangeley.

- H. P. 818. Resolve in Favor of Keene Morrison of Wilton.
- H. P. 819. Resolve in Favor of Darrell F. Ireland, of Pittsfield.
- H. P. 820. Resolve in Favor of Grevis F. Payson, of Union.
- H. P. 821. Resolve in Favor of Donald Grinnell, of Washington.
- H. P. 823. Resolve in Favor of Albert D. Bartlett, of Bucksport.
- H. P. 900. Resolve in Favor of Alice P. Gillespie, of Meddybemps.
- H. P. 901. Resolve in Favor of Daniel W. Munroe, of Waterville.
- H. P. 902. Resolve in Favor of Webber's Dairy, Inc., of Waterville.
- H. P. 905. Resolve in Favor of American Oil Company, of Portland.
- H. P. 906. Resolve in Favor of Donald D. Grant, of Sanford.
- H. P. 907. Resolve in Favor of Dr. Melvin Bacon, of Sanford.
- H. P. 908. Resolve in Favor of Aloyse Zbink, of Monmouth.
- H. P. 909. Resolve in Favor of John M. Schwerin, of Portland.
- H. P. 910. Resolve in Favor of Harold M. Weed, of Portland.
- H. P. 913. Resolve in Favor of P. E. Severance of Hampden Highlands.
- H. P. 973. Resolve in Favor of Paul Erickson, of Monson.
- H. P. 975. Resolve in Favor of Clyde French, of Lincoln.
- H. P. 976. Resolve in Favor of Horace Newcombe, of Addison.
- H. P. 977. Resolve in Favor of Alcide M. Pelletier, Jr., of Addison.
- H. P. 978. Resolve in Favor of Ernest Theis, of Westbrook.
- H. P. 980. Resolve in Favor of Charles R. Ginn, of Brewer.
- H. P. 981. Resolve in Favor of Arnold E. Adams, of Brewer.
- H. P. 982. Resolve in Favor of Lester Stubbs, of Hampden Highlands.
- H. P. 983. Resolve in Favor of Polly F. Peirce Leavitt, of Bangor.
- H. P. 1030. Resolve in Favor of Clarence R. Eaton, of Bath.
- H. P. 1031. Resolve in Favor of Maxime Dionne, of Stockholm.
- H. P. 1032. Resolve in Favor of Walter Bliss Cronkite, of Newport.
- H. P. 1033. Resolve in Favor of Ralph E. Bowdoin, of Milo.
- H. P. 1113. Resolve in Favor of Cecil C. Woodard of Bangor.
- H. P. 1114. Resolve in Favor of Ralph G. Plaisted, of Livermore Falls.
- H. P. 1116. Resolve in Favor of Mary Williams of Charleston.
- H. P. 1120. Resolve in Favor of Dolard Foster, of Bingham.
- H. P. 1123. Resolve in Favor of Carl Houston Dow, of Brunswick.
- H. P. 1124. Resolve in Favor of Wallace Cook, Jr., of Winthrop.
- H. P. 1127. Resolve in Favor of Frank L. Coffin, of Harpswell.
- H. P. 1128. Resolve in Favor of Marguerite W. Goodall of Mechanic Falls.
- H. P. 1130. Resolve in Favor of Stanley Robash, of Farmington.
- H. P. 1274. Resolve in Favor of Chester Roberts, of Augusta.
- H. P. 1278. Resolve in Favor of Carl T. Moran, of Winterport.
- H. P. 1279. Resolve in Favor of Myrtle A. Hammond, of Limerick.
- H. P. 1280. Resolve in Favor of B. E. Blanchard, of East Corinth.
- H. P. 1283. Resolve in Favor of Luther Snell, of Houlton.
- H. P. 1340. Resolve in Favor of John Manchester, of Northeast Harbor.
- H. P. 1368. Resolve in Favor of Gene P. Woodworth, of Houlton.
- H. P. 1372. Resolve in Favor of Howard E. Fuller, of Rangeley.
- H. P. 1373. Resolve in Favor of Donald Veilleux, of Waterville.
- H. P. 1374. Resolve in Favor of Ralph B. Gilliam, of Bar Harbor.
- H. P. 1378. Resolve in Favor of Donald E. C. McKay, of Waterville.
- H. P. 1379. Resolve in Favor of Clinton A. Clauson, of Waterville.
- H. P. 1380. Resolve in Favor of Maurice Davis, of Warren.
- H. P. 1383. Resolve in Favor of Raymond F. Tassinari, of Auburn.
- H. P. 1384. Resolve in Favor of John D. Clifford, Jr., of Lewiston.
- H. P. 1385. Resolve in Favor of Royal Amusement Company, of Auburn.
- H. P. 1447. Resolve in Favor of Wilfred Simoneau, of Livermore Falls.

H. P. 1448. Resolve in Favor of Clyde W. Lingley, of Dennysville.

H. P. 1450. Resolve in Favor of John C. Libby, of Chester.

H. P. 1451. Resolve in Favor of Lawrence H. Osgood, of Kingman.

H. P. 1452. Resolve in Favor of John Richards, of Rumford.

H. P. 1456. Resolve in Favor of Ernest J. Bryant, of Dover-Foxcroft.

H. P. 1457. Resolve in Favor of Emery McIntyre, of Bingham.

H. P. 1459. Resolve in Favor of Knowlton Stuart, of Coopers Mills.

H. P. 1461. Resolve in Favor of Richard Black, of East Limington.

H. P. 1462. Resolve in Favor of Albert F. Lessard, of Springvale.

H. P. 1468. Resolve in Favor of Eric A. Ohlson, of New Sharon.

H. P. 1593. Resolve in Favor of Truman Sleeper, of Sherman Mills.

H. P. 1595. Resolve in Favor of Pearl Heath, of Sherman Mills.

H. P. 1680. Resolve in Favor of Corporal Elmer S. Pelletier, of Dow Field, Bangor.

H. P. 1682. Resolve in Favor of Harold L. Gammon, of East Sumner.

H. P. 1684. Resolve in Favor of Margaret Belleau, of Sanford.

H. P. 1686. Resolve in Favor of Peter Christensen, of Calais.

H. P. 1687. Resolve in Favor of Fred McKay, of Calais.

H. P. 1688. Resolve in Favor of Balfour Glidden, of Red Beach.

H. P. 1767. Resolve in Favor of Curtis H. Patterson, of Bangor.

H. P. 1769. Resolve in Favor of William J. Bowes, of Waterville.

H. P. 1822. Resolve in Favor of Herbert Vaillancourt, of Van Buren.

H. P. 1866. Resolve in Favor of Wilfred Moors, of Bradley.

H. P. 1867. Resolve in Favor of Kenneth Laughlin, of East Eddington.

H. P. 1868. Resolve in Favor of John Stults, of Lewiston.

H. P. 1869. Resolve in Favor of Vaughn Walker, of Island Falls.

H. P. 1906. Resolve in Favor of Violet Dysart, of Augusta.

H. P. 1907. Resolve in Favor of John Graves, of Etna.

H. P. 1932. Resolve in Favor of Kenneth H. Adams, of Yarmouth.

H. P. 2003. Resolve in Favor of Laurence Jenkins, of Topsfield.

Reported a Consolidated Resolve under title of Resolve Providing for the Payment of Certain Damages Caused by Protected Wild Animals (H. P. 2115) (L. D. 1610) and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve, having already been printed, was read once under suspension of the rules, and assigned for second reading this afternoon.

#### Consolidated Resolve

Mr. DeSanctis from the Committee on Claims on the following Resolves:

S. P. 400. Resolve in Favor of the Town of Parkman.

H. P. 273. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Bowdoinham for Supplies Furnished to George Lambers.

H. P. 418. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Fairfield for Support of Charles J. Richards.

H. P. 544. Resolve in Favor of Charles A. Dean Memorial Hospital, of Greenville Junction.

H. P. 699. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Dexter for Support of a Pauper.

H. P. 738. Resolve in Favor of the Town of Phillips.

H. P. 741. Resolve in Favor of the Town of Waterford.

H. P. 816. Resolve to Reimburse the City of Old Town for Hospitalization and Aid Furnished Mrs. Lawrence Gordon.

H. P. 1121. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Berwick.

H. P. 1126. Resolve in Favor of the Town of Chapman.

H. P. 1129. Resolve in Favor of Stanley Bros., of Kezar Falls.

H. P. 1272. Resolve in Favor of the Inhabitants of the Town of Westfield for the Support of John Bennett and Family.

H. P. 1281. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Oakland for Supplies Furnished William Stevens.

H. P. 1339. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Stetson for Certain Pauper Expenses.

H. P. 1369. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Pembroke for Support and Medical Aid for Mrs. Kenneth Gove.

H. P. 1589. Resolve in Favor of the Town of Garland.

H. P. 1596. Resolve to Reimburse Town of Crystal.

H. P. 1594. Resolve in Favor of Milliken Memorial Hospital of Island Falls.

H. P. 1685. Resolve in Favor of Calais Hospital.

H. P. 1690. Resolve to Reimburse the Clyde Smith Memorial Hospital for Hospitalization and Medical Aid for Carroll Hapgood.

H. P. 1692. Resolve in Favor of Dr. J. C. Bourque of St. Leonard, N. B.

H. P. 2104, L. D. 1595. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Whiting for Transportation of State Children. Reported a Consolidated Resolve under title of Resolve Providing for the Payment of Certain Pauper Claims (H. P. 2116) (L. D. 1611) and that it "Ought to pass".

Report was read and accepted and printed, was read once under suspense the Resolve, having already been pension of the rules.

Mr. DeSanctis then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

**HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 2116, L. D. 1611, Resolve Providing for the Payment of Certain Pauper Claims.**

Amend said Resolve by adding at the end thereof the following:  
'; and be it further

**Resolved:** That the moneys appropriated under the provisions of this resolve shall be appropriated from the unappropriated surplus of the general fund.'

On motion by Mr. Brown of Unity, House Amendment "A", with accompanying papers, was tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session.

The **SPEAKER:** In order that there may be no misunderstanding about the matter, the Chair calls the attention of the members to the fact that in the list of the printed Resolves, being Legislative Document 1611, the last item thereon, "Town of Whiting for Transportation of State Children, \$200" is a printer's error to this extent: That it should read: "Town of Whiting for Transportation of State Children, \$220.

#### **House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Mr. Ames from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act Regulating and Defining Fish Weirs" (H. P. 1737) (L. D. 1091) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 2114) (L. D. 1604) under title of "An Act Creating a Board of Arbitration for Weir Fishing" and that it "Ought to pass"

The **SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird.

Mr. **BIRD:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The original bill was designed to get at one party who was breaking the present statutes under the Sea and Shore Fisheries laws. A large group of weir fishermen attended the hearing and opposed the passage of this bill. These men represented weir fishermen from Knox, Hancock and Waldo Counties, where the greatest part of the weir fishing is done in the State of Maine.

The new draft of this bill proposes to set up a Committee on Arbitration. This committee can prove very costly to function and undoubtedly they will be ineffective in trying to solve the problems that will be presented to them.

For the information of the members of the House who are not too familiar with the type of fishermen, a weir fishermen is confined to one spot on the coast, and under the present statutes a seiner who seines from a boat cannot come within two thousand yards of that weir. At the present time the seiners supply about ninety percent of the fish received by the sardine

factories and other canning factories. That leaves ten percent which are caught by the weir fishermen. As I see it, this bill proposes to drive a wedge into the ten percent that is left to the weir fishermen at the present time, therefore, I move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, moves that Bill "An Act Creating a Board of Arbitration for Weir Fishing" be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird that the report, together with the Bill, be indefinitely postponed will say aye —

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince.

Mr. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hesitate to rise and take issue with my good friend, the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird.

To begin with, it is not two thousand yards; it is two thousand feet that the twine fishermen have to keep away from the traps. We weighed the evidence that came to our hearing that day, and we found that the twine fishermen did not catch ninety per cent of the fish. In 1947, the difference in poundage between the trap fishermen and the weir fishermen and the twine fishermen was around 5,000,000, showing that it is not a ninety per cent proposition.

Another thing that we had to contend with was that the trap fishermen, or the weir fishermen, could get a permit, drive down a few stakes, put any piece of twine that he wanted to on these stakes, and call it a weir. Any twine fisherman coming into that cove, might not realize that that was a trap. However, if he set his twine and caught seven or eight thousand bushels of fish, the fellow who had that weir privilege could come out and make a demand for a certain percentage of the catch. That, of course, is illegal and very discriminatory.

Now the committee spent many hours working out a proposition

that would protect the trap fisherman and the seiner. The seiner will stay two thousand feet from the trap and allow the trap fisherman to fish legally. I therefore hope that the motion of the gentleman from Rockland (Mr. Bird) does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, that the report of the committee be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, that the report "Ought to pass in New Draft" of the committee be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-four having voted in the affirmative and forty-four having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass in New Draft" report was accepted, and the new draft, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules and assigned for third reading this afternoon.

#### Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Laughton from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in Favor of Joseph M. Martin, of Van Buren (H. P. 732) (L. D. 1607) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve, having already been printed, was read once under suspension of the rules.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"

to H. P. 732, L. D. 1607, Resolve in Favor of Joseph M. Martin, of Van Buren.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the figures in the second line thereof, "\$500" and inserting the figures therein '\$250'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve was as-

signed for second reading this afternoon.

Mr. Laughton from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in Favor of Hatches, Inc., of Belgrade (H. P. 822) (L. D. 1608) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted, and the Resolve, having already been printed, was read once under suspension of the rules.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 822, L. D. 1608, Resolve in Favor of Hatches, Inc., of Belgrade.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the figures in the second line thereof, "\$326" and inserting the figures therein, '\$163'.

Committee Amendment "A" was then adopted, and the Resolve was assigned for second reading this afternoon.

Mr. Laughton from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in Favor of O. E. Weymouth, of Lincoln (H. P. 445) (L. D. 1606) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve, having already been printed, was read once under suspension of the rules.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 445, L. D. 1606, Resolve in Favor of O. E. Weymouth, of Lincoln.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the figures in the second line thereof, "\$357" and inserting the figures therein, '\$175'.

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted, and the Resolve was assigned for second reading this afternoon.

Mr. Laughton from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in Favor of George V. Jordan, of North Waldoboro (H. P. 1029) (L. D. 1609) reported "Ought to pass" as amended

by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted, and the Resolve, having already been printed, was read once under suspension of the rules.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1029, L. D. 1609, Resolve in Favor of George V. Jordan, of North Waldoboro.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the figures in the second line thereof "\$377.98" and inserting the figures therein '\$344.53'.

Thereupon, Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve was assigned for second reading this afternoon.

Mr. Chapman from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Saco" (H. P. 1988) (L. D. 1373) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted, and the Bill, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1988, L. D. 1373, Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Saco."

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

**Sec. 6. Referendum; effective date.** This act shall take effect 90 days after the adjournment of the legislature only for the purpose of permitting its acceptance or rejection by the legal voters of the city of Saco at the next general election to be held on the 1st Monday in March as prescribed in the preceding section. The question relating to the amending of the said charter of the city of Saco by this act shall be placed upon the ballot in substantially the following form:

"Shall an act passed by the legislature in the year 1949, entitled, 'An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Saco,' be accepted?"

If a majority of the qualified voters of the city, present and voting, vote in favor of the acceptance of this act, it shall become operative. The city clerk shall forthwith file with the secretary of state a certificate of the action of the voters thereon, and the mayor shall forthwith make proclamation of the fact.

It is further provided, however, that this act shall be null and void and of no effect whatsoever, and no referendum shall be held under this act, if the voters of the city of Saco accept the council-manager form of government as set forth in an act entitled, "An Act to Grant a Council-Manager Form of Government to the City of Saco," to be voted upon by referendum at an election to be held on the 1st Monday in October, 1949.'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. McENERY.

Mr. McENERY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move for indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A" and substitute the bill for the report, Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that I have another bill coming up later on today for the City Manager Form of government for the City of Saco. This bill originally called for a referendum date for the people of the City of Saco to vote upon this question, along with a City Manager form of government. This bill calls for an increase for the Mayor in his salary, for the City of Saco. At the present time he is getting only six hundred dollars; this calls for an increase up to two thousand, to be voted upon in October. The amendment changes the date of election at the general election next March.

It is the wish of the Chairman of the Republican City Committee in Saco and the present Mayor and city government that this bill come up at the same time to be voted upon in October, therefore I move for indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A".

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the gentleman from Saco, Mr. McENERY, and his motion to indefinitely postpone this amendment. These two bills that are before the Legislature at this present time are closely related, and this one, this morning, on which the amendment was just offered, and the one on which the gentleman from Saco, Mr. McENERY, has offered the motion to indefinitely postpone would set a date for the election which would conflict with the previous one. In other words, they would have two elections on closely related matters. It is apparently in the interests of the people of Saco that this referendum or these referendums be voted upon at one and the same time.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Saco, Mr. McENERY, that Committee Amendment "A" to H. P. 1988, L. D. 1373, Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Saco", be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. FARLEY.

Mr. FARLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is not very often that I rise in support of the City of Saco, but fortunately this time I am a member of the minority party. A great many of the majority party in the City of Saco who think as much of the Grand Old Party as I do of my own Grand Old Party know that there is a left wing, if you understand that political term, behind this city charter. Their main purpose is to defeat a bill that will raise the salary of the Mayor, and to do that in the city election, not wanting to take their chances in the October referendum on the City Manager. In other words, they want two stabs in somebody's back, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Saco (Mr. McENERY) prevails, and I ask for a division.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Saco, Mr. McEneary, that Committee Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Farley, has requested a division. As many as are in favor of the gentleman from Saco, Mr. McEneary, that Committee Amendment "A" to House Paper 1988, Legislative Document 1373, Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Saco" be indefinitely postponed will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Eighty-three having voted in the affirmative and one in the negative, the motion prevailed, and Committee Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, the Bill was assigned for third reading this afternoon.

Mr. Atherton from the Committee on Temperance on Bill "An Act Relating to licenses for Consumption Sale of Liquor and Appeals" (H. P. 1810) (L. D. 1134) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules.

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

**COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"**  
to H. P. 1810, L. D. 1134, Bill "An Act Relating to Licenses for Consumption Sale of Liquor and Appeals.

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the last sentence of the first paragraph of that section designated Sec. 60-A.

Thereupon, Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was assigned for third reading this afternoon.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to

pass" on Bill "An Act for the Assessment of a State Tax for the Year 1949 and for the Year 1950" (H. P. 250) (L. D. 79)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. **NOYES** of Hancock  
          **ALLEN** of Cumberland  
                                    —of the Senate  
**CARTER** of Bethel  
Miss **LONGSTAFF** of Crystal  
Messrs. **DOW** of Falmouth  
**CHASE** of Cape Elizabeth  
**DUQUETTE** of Biddeford  
**WIGHT** of Bangor  
**DORSEY** of Fort Fairfield  
                                    —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 member:

Mr. **HASKELL** of Penobscot  
                                    —of the Senate

On motion by Mr. Dow of Falmouth, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, and the Bill, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules and assigned for third reading this afternoon.

#### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Military Affairs reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Relating to Maine Soldiers and Sailors in the War with Spain" (H. P. 1655) (L. D. 963)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. **SLOCUM** of Cumberland  
                                    —of the Senate  
**EASTMAN** of Paris  
**JENNINGS** of Strong  
**PAINE** of Portland  
**DUFRESNE** of Bar Harbor  
**HAYES** of Dover - Foxcroft  
                                    —of the House

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



Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. **BATCHELDER** of York  
**SAVAGE** of Somerset  
 —of the Senate  
**FARLEY** of Biddeford  
**PAYSON** of Union  
 —of the House

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings.

Mr. **JENNINGS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move to accept the majority report of the committee, and I might give you my reasons, or the reasons of the majority of this committee.

This, it seemed to us, to be something that was long overdue. After the close of the war that these soldiers and sailors took part in, it was understood, through ways that I cannot explain, that they would receive \$100. They did receive \$22. of this \$100, therefore those that are living are asking for \$78. As I understand it, even though we do not have money earmarked for a lot of items, this one has been gone over to the extent that, with the understanding of the committee, there will be money from the General Fund to accomplish this purpose. I therefore move to accept the majority report of the committee.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Union, Mr. Payson.

Mr. **PAYSON**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to briefly give my reasons for signing the minority report on this bill.

Originally this bill came in as a companion measure to another bill which taxed amusement devices with which to pay this bonus, but yesterday the House killed the bill to tax amusement devices, and today we have before us simply a bill providing for the payment of a bonus. The cost is estimated at

\$40,000, which would come out of the General Fund.

Now I have not anything against the veterans of the Spanish American War, but it seems to me, in view of what has happened in the House this winter, our fight for new money and to keep alive certain measures that are deserving of the attention of the House, that after fifty odd years that this is one thing that perhaps the people of Maine could get along without. Individually, it only means \$78 to each veteran, but collectively it means \$40,000 to the State of Maine. That is why I am opposed to the bill.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

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

Mr. **BERRY**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As the sponsor of that bill, I feel that I should set before this body just what that bill means, and in order to do that—it won't take me a great while—but in order to do that I want to say this: There are very few in this House that can remember back fifty-one years ago. Fifty-one years ago the 25th day of this last April the United States declared war on the Kingdom of Spain, which brought about this bonus bill that I put in. Governor Powers, at that time mustered into the Federal Service—and I want you all to understand—some people do not understand—about the Spanish American War veterans. Our President at that time, William McKinley, called for 458,000 men. He got over 500,000 and they were all volunteers. Maine's quota at that time, was something like 3,500, 1st Maine Infantry, 2nd Maine Heavy Artillery and the Navy Forces.

We did not go into that war for the purpose of a bonus; that was the least that we thought of. We went to free an oppressed people, and some of those men, in 1898,

served in the Philippines, and the Boxer Insurrection in China.

To get back to this bonus, Governor Powers stated that he believed that we should receive the same as those boys of the Civil War, and he had taken it up with the State Legislature, and stated that the State did not have the money. Governor Powers put at the disposal of the State—I don't know the exact figures, but somewhere around \$46,000, which gave us a bonus of \$22, and informed us that when we got back the balance of \$78 would be forthcoming.

The veterans signed a pay check, and you can find it at the Adjutant General's Office, on the 18th day of May, in 1898.

That bill has been brought up in the House several times, and it is the same old song: They did not have the money. I took the matter up with the Governor and the Adjutant General, when I came here to this Legislature this winter. I got the go-ahead sign. I put in a bill for \$40,000. At that time, June 12th last, we had 505 Spanish War veterans, according to the Adjutant General of the Department of Maine.

Since that time it was dropped—I was talking with Department Adjutant last Sunday—and we have 418 members living, that we know of in the State of Maine, that are affiliated with the organization. Out of that number I think we can say there wouldn't be over 300, if this bill were passed, that would be eligible.

Now some of the members here have asked me why I didn't put it in for those deceased. That has been tried over a period of 51 years. All I am asking on this bill is that the State pay what they justly owe these veterans after a period of 51 years. As I say, as near as I can figure, the number would be under 300. I put in for an appropriation of \$40,000, the estimate at that time, but since then some have died, and at the present time I don't believe it would cost the State over \$23,000 or \$24,000.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I walked to the station with these boys 51 years ago, but I didn't go with them. I lost a brother in the Spanish - American War, and my mother received a small pension of \$20 after she was about seventy-five years of age. Now I think these boys who are living, these some 340 odd boys, should receive that \$78, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, prevails. I ask for a division of the House.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee, and the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Thompson, requests that when the vote is taken, it be by a division. Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the majority "Ought to pass" report. However, for the purpose of a clarifying amendment, I would like to table this bill until later in today's session, and have it specially assigned for this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Johnson, moves that Bill "An Act Relating to Maine Soldiers and Sailors in the War with Spain" (H. P. 1655) (L. D. 963) with the accompanying papers, lie upon the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings, that the House do accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee, and that the matter be specially assigned for this afternoon's session. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the Bill was so tabled and so assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we recess until 1:30 Eastern Standard Time.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, moves that the House do now recess until 1:30 Eastern Standard Time this afternoon. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the House so recessed.

#### After Recess—1:30 P.M., E.S.T.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The next item of business is Bills and Resolves reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and on their passage to be engrossed.

#### Passed to be Engrossed

Resolve Providing Pensions for Soldiers and Sailors and Dependents and Other Needy Persons (S. P. 683) (L. D. 1582)

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

Senate Amendment "A" read by the Clerk as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 683, L. D. 1582, Resolve Providing Pensions for Soldiers and Sailors and Dependents and Other Needy Persons.

Amend said Resolve by adding at the end of the 1st paragraph after the Emergency Preamble the following:

"There is hereby appropriated from the general fund of the state to carry out the purposes of this Resolve, the following:

Fiscal year	1948-49	\$ 6,000
Fiscal year	1949-50	35,000
Fiscal year	1950-51	35,000'

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted.

Mr. Patterson of Freeport, offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 683, L. D. 1582, Resolve Providing Pensions for Soldiers and Sailors and Dependents and Other Needy Persons.

Amend said Resolve by striking out therefrom all parenthetical phrases in which appears either the word "conservator" or "guardian".

Further amend said Resolve by inserting the following paragraph before the emergency clause:

'Payment of the pensions herein provided to Lloyd L. Arnold, Thomas Bard, Melvin Steven Belden, Lawrence Bosse, Myrtle Brewer, Charles Ora Butters, Robert Callman, Artell Cookson, John Dean, Delores Demchak, John Ellis, Robert Arlo Fogg, Omer Garneau, Jr., Carlene Hanson, Beulah Louise Ladd, Esther Ann McDonald, Fred Oliver, Hugh O'Riley, Eddie D. Ouellette, Chester Simpson, Charles Smith, Nellie Whitehead, shall be made only after a court of competent jurisdiction has determined under the provisions of law the need for the appointment of a conservator or guardian'

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve was passed to be engrossed and amended in non-concurrence and was sent up for concurrence.

#### Passed to be Engrossed (cont'd)

Bill "An Act Relative to Licensing Dealers in Livestock" (H. P. 2106) (L. D. 1598)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

Mr. Kent of Randolph, offered House Amendment "A".

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 2106, L. D. 1598, Bill "An Act Relative to Licensing Dealers in Livestock."

Amend said Bill by striking out the last sentence of that part designated "Sec. 123-A" thereof.

House Amendment "A" was adopted, and the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Technical Secretary of Sanitary Water Board" (H. P. 2112) (L. D. 1602)

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

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

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for a Bond Issue for the Purpose of Paying for the Issue of Paid-up Life Insurance Policies to Maine Members of the Military and Naval Forces in World War II (H. P. 2109) (L. D. 1599)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

(On motion by Mr. Chapman of Portland, tabled until later in today's session, pending passage to be engrossed.)

#### **Amended Bills**

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Cattle Tested for Bang's Disease" (S. P. 335) (L. D. 566)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, and on motion by Mr. Campbell of Garland, tabled until later in today's session, pending passage to be engrossed.

Bill "An Act to Grant for Council Manager Form of Government to the City of Saco" (H. P. 1648) (L. D. 996)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to the Valuation of the Town of Dedham for the Apportionment of State

School Funds" (H. P. 1131) (L. D. 539)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Compensation for Specified Injuries Under the Workmen's Compensation Law" (S. P. 673) (L. D. 1544)

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

#### **Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys to Continue the Cost of Living Increases of State Employees" (S. P. 674) (L. D. 1546)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of possibly offering an amendment to Item 9, I would move that this item, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys to Continue the Cost of Living Increases of State Employees" (S. P. 674) (L. D. 1546) lie upon the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, moves that Item 9, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys to Continue the Cost of Living Increases of State Employees" (S. P. 674) (L. D. 1546) lie upon the table pending passage to be engrossed and that the matter be specially assigned for Thursday, May 5th. Is this the pleasure of the House.

The motion prevailed, and the Bill was so tabled and so assigned.

Bill "An Act Relating to Accident and Health Insurance" (H. P. 2101) (L. D. 1587)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read

the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" and sent to the Senate.

Bill "An Act Relating to Aid to Dependent Children" (H. P. 1326) (L. D. 691)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Fees of Clerks of Courts" (S. P. 441) (L. D. 829)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Kennebunk, the House voted to reconsider its action taken yesterday where it adopted House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act Relating to Fees of Clerks of Courts" (S. P. 441) (L. D. 829) was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion by the same gentleman, the House voted to reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it adopted House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A".

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A".

House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was then indefinitely postponed.

Senate Amendment "A" was then adopted and the Bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

#### **Passed to be Enacted Emergency Measure**

An Act Relating to Aid to the Blind (H. P. 1550) (L. D. 868)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 125 voted in favor of same and none against,

and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

#### **Finally Passed Emergency Measure**

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Certain Construction, Repairs and Equipment at Certain State Institutions (S. P. 679) (L. D. 1560)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 124 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

#### **Passed to be Enacted**

An Act to Effect Certain Changes in Procedure Under the Unemployment Compensation Law (S. P. 515) (L. D. 1046)

An Act Relating to Katahdin Wild Life Sanctuary (S. P. 621) (L. D. 1337)

An Act Providing for a Standard of Electrical Installations (S. P. 652) (L. D. 1451)

An Act Relating to Elevators (S. P. 664) (L. D. 1495)

An Act to Incorporate the Skowhegan School District (S. P. 672) (L. D. 1533)

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

#### **Tabled Temporarily**

An Act Relating to Amount of Aid to Dependents of Veterans (H. P. 698) (L. D. 223)

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

(On motion by Mr. Brown of Unity, tabled temporarily pending passage to be enacted.)

An Act Freeing the Richmond-Dresden Bridge of Tolls (H. P. 1014) (L. D. 441)

An Act to Incorporate the Town of Dexter School District (H. P. 1052) (L. D. 468)

An Act to Create the Town of South Berwick School District (H. P. 1172) (L. D. 628)

An Act to Control the Payment of Benefits During Vacation Periods Under the Unemployment Compensation Law (H. P. 1575) (L. D. 898)

An Act to Authorize the Construction of a Wharf in Maranacook Lake at Winthrop (H. P. 1629) (L. D. 982)

An Act Creating the South Berwick Sewer District (H. P. 1659) (L. D. 967)

An Act to Incorporate the North Kennebunkport School District (H. P. 1838) (L. D. 1162)

An Act Relating to the Tax on Commercial Fertilizer (H. P. 1903) (L. D. 1268)

An Act to Incorporate the Town of Sebago School District (H. P. 1946) (L. D. 1318)

An Act Relating to Illegal Importation and Transportation of Malt Liquor (H. P. 2015) (L. D. 1397)

An Act Relative to Trapping Season on Fur-Bearing Animals (H. P. 2043) (L. D. 1468)

An Act Relating to Installations in State or State Aid Highways (H. P. 2052) (L. D. 1478)

#### Finally Passed

Resolve Providing for a Fish Screen at Outlet of Donnell's Pond in the Town of Franklin in the County of Hancock (S. P. 677) (L. D. 1551)

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

#### Tabled Temporarily

Resolve in Favor of George L. Varney, of New Gloucester (H. P. 22) (L. D. 10)

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

(On motion by Mr. Brown of Unity, tabled temporarily, pending final passage)

#### Tabled Temporarily

Resolve in Favor of Beatrice Noonan, of Boston, Massachusetts (H. P. 128) (L.D. 1578)

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

(On motion by Mr. Brown of Unity, tabled temporarily pending final passage.)

Resolve Regulating Fishing in Long and Square Lakes in the County of Aroostook (H. P. 571) (L. D. 1401)

Resolve Regulating Fishing in Webb Lake, in the County of Franklin (H. P. 917) (L. D. 369)

Resolve Providing for a Dam and Fish Screen at Chain-of-Ponds, in the County of Franklin (H. P. 2093) (L. D. 1565)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, finally passed, all signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Item 8; the Clerk will read the title.

The CLERK (reading): House Paper 698, Legislative Document 223, An Act Relating to Amount of Aid to Dependents of Veterans.

Mr. BROWN (of Unity): Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would just like to point out once again that the anticipated revenues for the next biennium amount to \$47,687,036. The expenditures under the Appropriations Act which has just had its third reading here amount to \$47,649,705, leaving an unexpended balance of \$37,331.

In as much as this bill calls for appropriation of \$50,000 each year and the action taken by this House, yesterday and last evening, which I think washes up the unexpended balance for the two years, I move the indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, moves in

regard to Item 8, Bill "An Act Relating to Amount of Aid to Dependents of Veterans, H. P. 698, L. D. 223, that the Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. PAINE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, for notifying me this morning he was going to make the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill. He has stated that this bill will call for an appropriation of \$50,000 each year. According to my understanding of this bill, it would not call for an increased appropriation. Yesterday, we passed to be engrossed a bill of a very similar nature, accomplishing the same purposes as this. That was an act providing aid to dependent children. This bill, which I am the sponsor of, relating to aid to dependents of veterans, merely does away with the fixed maximum of \$50 for a mother and one child and \$75 for a mother and two children and changes over those standards to the standards of the Bureau of Health and Welfare, precisely as we did yesterday on the bill for aid to dependent children. In other words, it gives the Department of Veterans Affairs here a chance to administer their funds according to need and not a rigid standard.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the previous speaker has clarified this to some extent. Therefore, I would like to go on record in support of the gentleman from Portland, Representative Paine.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of

the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that Bill "An Act Relating to Amount of Aid to Dependents of Veterans", H. P. 698, L. D. 223, be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the Bill be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Thereupon the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to Item 22, Resolve in Favor of George L. Varney, of New Gloucester. This item is a claim which would cost \$2500. I move indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, moves that Item 22, Resolve in Favor of George L. Varney, of New Gloucester, H. P. 22, L. D. 10, be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. DeSanctis.

Mr. DeSANCTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is another one of those claims that the committee spent considerable time on and it was damage caused by fire that was set by a fourteen year old boy, who escaped from the school there and stayed out overnight. They couldn't find him. Next morning, the inmate was seen running away from the scene of the fire. They overtook him about a mile away from the fire. He admitted setting fire to the set of buildings.

The claim asks for \$5,117. The insurance collected on the property was \$850 and the committee saw fit to allow \$2500 on this claim, figuring the depreciation of the tools and the property. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion

of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that Resolve in Favor of George L. Varney, of New Gloucester be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I put in this claim for Mr. Varney, as Mr. DeSanctis says, for \$5,117, which I felt was probably a fair claim. Mr. Varney served thirty-seven years in the service of the country, thirty-five in the lighthouse service and two years in the army engineers and retired on a small pension on this farm up there in New Gloucester adjoining the Pownal State School. This boy as has been stated was in the custody of the State there and escaped.

If one of my children gets out and damages a neighbor's property, I do not feel that my responsibility for the acts of that child ceases just because I am short of funds. And I don't think the State of Maine has arrived at the point where it cannot pay its just debts to an individual who has been damaged as Mr. Varney has been damaged by this boy burning his farm. I hope the the motion to indefinitely postpone this claim does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that Resolve in Favor of George L. Varney, of New Gloucester be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the Resolve be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take up Item 23, Resolve in Favor of Beatrice Noonan, of Boston, Massachusetts. This is

another claim which costs \$100 and I move its indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, moves with regard to Item 23, Resolve in Favor of Beatrice Noonan, of Boston Massachusetts, H. P. 128, L. D. 1578, that the Resolve be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. DeSanctis.

Mr. DeSANCTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This claim is for \$100 and it is an old World War I veteran's bonus that was never paid and this lady is claiming her husband's \$100. The committee thought she ought to have it. There have been many others that have been presented in past Legislatures and have seen final passage. I hope this motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that Resolve in Favor of Beatrice Noonan, of Boston, Massachusetts be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sebec, Mr. Parker.

Mr. PARKER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think perhaps a little explanation is due the members in regard to this claim.

This veteran enlisted in World War I from my district; therefore, it is my duty to present his claim. It seems, from all the information I can get from the affidavits that were filed by Mrs. Noonan, who now resides in Boston, Mr. Noonan passed away with tuberculosis at about the time the bonus was granted by the Legislature. Therefore, it was some years before Mrs. Noonan knew there was a bonus available in the State of Maine for her husband.

In the last four or five years, Mrs. Noonan has been in financial difficulties and has been trying to obtain this bonus. Just within the last year, she managed to find the correct procedure and last fall wrote me in regard to it. Her claim was just. She had all the supporting affidavits regarding



when her husband was born, when they were married, when he enlisted in the army. She had an affidavit from the Adjutant General's office when he was discharged, honorably.

It amounts to \$100. I wrote Mrs. Noonan several days ago when this claim was first approved by the Claims Committee asking her if there was any of the affidavits she had filed with me which she wished back. In answer to that, I received a letter, yesterday. I would just like to read one or two paragraphs of it. She says: "Dear Mr. Parker: I received your very encouraging letter, yesterday, and I am answering immediately. I have spent a very bad winter as I have been in and out of the hospital having my eye treated and it is not healed yet. I am still under the doctor's care. I am dictating this letter. To add to my troubles, now, I received an eviction notice from my landlord as he wishes this flat for one of his family." That's all I have to say. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the Resolve be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion that the Resolve be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The hour of two o'clock, eastern standard time, having arrived, the House will proceed to take up bills reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and on their passage to be engrossed.

There is a supplemental Advance Journal upon the desks of the members with regard to the items now being taken up.

#### Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Authorizing the City of Presque Isle to Provide for the

Collection and Disposal of Garbage, Refuse and Rubbish and to Assess a Charge Therefor" (S. P. 461) (L. D. 913)

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1950, and June 30, 1951" (S. P. 678) (L. D. 1557)

Bill "An Act for the Assessment of a State Tax for the Year Nineteen Hundred Forty-Nine and for the Year Nineteen Hundred Fifty" (H. P. 250) (L. D. 79)

Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Saco" (H. P. 1988) (L. D. 1373)

Bill "An Act Creating a Board of Arbitration for Weir Fishing" (H. P. 2114) (L. D. 1604)

Resolve Directing Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries to Make Study of Herring and Means of Avoiding Their Depletion (S. P. 687) (L. D. 1592)

Resolve Providing for a Continuous Survey of Closed Clam Areas and Mussel Control Program (S. P. 689) (L. D. 1593)

Resolve Providing for the Payment of Certain Damages Caused

Were reported by the Committee by Protected Wild Animals (H. P. 2115) (L. D. 1610)

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

#### Amended Bills and Resolves

Bill "An Act Relating to Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District" (S. P. 671) (L. D. 1523)

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

#### Passed Over Temporarily

Resolve in Favor of a Bridge Across the St. John River in Allagash Plantation (S. P. 685) (L. D. 1588)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, with regards to Item 10, a bridge over the St. John River, I wish to be heard on a motion for the indefinite postponement at your convenience.

The SPEAKER: Item 10 will be passed over at this time.

Bill "An Act to Clarify and Simplify the Sea and Shore Fisheries Law" (S. P. 688) (L. D. 1594)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair notes, at this time, the presence in the Hall of the House of the distinguished newspaper columnist and radio commentator and a former nationally known all-American football player.

The Chair will request the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms to escort Bill Cunningham to the rostrum.

Thereupon Mr. Cunningham was escorted to the rostrum by the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms and was greeted by the Speaker amid the prolonged applause of the House, the Members rising.

The SPEAKER: Without objection, the Chair invites the gentleman to make such remarks as he would care to make at this time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman: I want first of all to thank you for this unusual and unexpected honor. Secondly, I want to apologize for interrupting what is evidently some very important business. I am only a country boy who came in here to try to pay my respect to the Governor. I evidently made the wrong turn and I was dragged into the Senate Chamber by a couple of distinguished legislators and I never did this before in my life. I thanked them and apologized and sat down and they adjourned about that time and I came out and my guides thought I was going to the

Governor's office and I arrive in here.

It is a great honor, I deeply appreciate it, and I have learned quite a lot about the Legislature in the last five minutes. The biggest thing I have learned is how it is the presiding officers get muscle-bound from banging this thing here. (Laughter)

I have a great many wonderful memories of this particular building and the Governors of the past four or five administrations. Of course, I hope you know how I love Maine, and I want to say I don't think mortal man ever saw a more beautiful day in a more beautiful State and I certainly feel sorry for you poor gentlemen who are going to sit in here instead of being outdoors. Thank you.

Thereupon, Mr. Cunningham retired from the Hall amid the prolonged applause of the Members.

#### Amended Bills and Resolves (cont'd)

Resolve in Favor of O. E. Weymouth, of Lincoln (H. P. 445) (L. D. 1606)

Resolve in Favor of Joseph M. Martin, of Van Buren (H. P. 732) (L. D. 1607)

Resolve in Favor of Hatches, Inc., of Belgrade (H. P. 822) (L. D. 1608)

Resolve in Favor of George V. Jordan, of North Waldoboro (H. P. 1029) (L. D. 1609)

Bill "An Act Relating to Licenses for Consumption Sale of Liquor and Appeals" (H. P. 1810) (L. D. 1134)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I move that Resolve in Favor of a Bridge Across the St. John River in Allagash Plantation be indefinitely postponed.

This bridge would cost \$150,000 which would come out of the gen-

eral highway fund, as I understand it, and it has been a subject for considerable discussion for several years. But, I am informed that, at the present time, the people who live in that immediate locality consider that the construction of the bridge may be deferred for the present in order that the money which it would cost may be used for the improvement of the highways which are said to be in very bad shape.

If this is true, it seems that the passage of this resolve might be deferred for at least two years.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth, moves that Item 10, Resolve in Favor of a Bridge Across the St. John River in Allagash Plantation, S. P. 685, L. L. 1588, be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope that the motion does not prevail. The people of Allagash have been attempting to get a bridge for fifty years and they have even gone so far as to pay \$10,000 a year, or I mean \$5,000 for the next ten years and this bridge comes under the Bridge Act, under the town, the county and the State. It opens up where they have to go over on a ferry. Every two or three years, they build a ferry. It costs them from five to six and as high as eight thousand dollars to build that ferry. This particular bunch of citizens who live over there know there are great lumber operations that bring their lumber down, shoot it down here to the people of Southern Maine to use. Now, the ferry will not stand much more than one year now. It isn't like the old ox cart days; they smash it up in a season. However, it opens up that great northern country where many of our woodland territories have never been mapped, the brooks and the streams are not on it. That's where the lumber lies. It's the largest tract of virgin forest in this United States. There they are, the seven sawmills over beyond

that river and they have to wait their turn, some of them will stand there all day waiting to get across to load the lumber to bring it down here.

Moreover that Allagash Bridge will open up a direct route to all Aroostook and all the main routes through to the Province of Québec. There are only seven miles of road yet to build and the Leclair company have informed me that immediately when this bill is passed, they will build the seven miles connecting and will go all the way through without going around through Canada and leaving our money there. Oh, if there ever was a project that needed to be attended to and a bridge to be built, it is now. Moreover than that, there are, at the present time, at least 1100 Canadians cutting on this American side, hauling it over into Canada, manufacturing it and then shipping it back here as you cannot get it across the St. John River. That will eliminate all that. I have seen as high as 1500 of those men in Canadian camps.

I tell you this is a cruel thing to defeat this bill. Moreover I have seen those citizens there, and there is a time in the spring and a time in the fall when they can't get over at all. I have seen physicians go there from Eagle Lake when someone on the other side of the river was sick. I have seen them go down to the river, when the ice was running and the slush was running, the water was running too high, and say: "I can't go over." They say: "The patient will die." And he says: "Well, maybe I'll die if I go over," and turn away. I have seen all that myself. I nearly lost my life once myself going over to attend a sick baby. I have seen them come down there when the ice and slush were running with their dead and paupers, to get them over the bay and on this side to bury them. They are American citizens and they are white men, why shouldn't they have a chance to live as well as the fellows down here who control the votes, ride

around in their big automobiles while they bust along in old broken-back old bateaux? I say it's a shame and a disgrace. Don't deny this.

I saw the members of the Council up there, and many of the members of the House, three years ago at a celebration. We took them up and we stood there and they even went over on the ferry and they watched the lumber trucks lined up over there waiting their turn to get across. Members, this is preposterous, to deny those men and they are as much citizens as you and I to have this right of crossing the river just simply because the votes are down in this end of the State. Oh, I trust that this motion from this brother does not prevail. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Merritt.

Mr. **MERRITT**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wouldn't know where Mr. Woodworth got his information. I have never known anyone from Aroostook to refuse a bridge or road or whatever they could get. The House adopted this morning an amendment which would cut that from \$150,000 down to \$100,000 and, as I understand it, this is not a determined amount. If this is passed, there will have to be a hearing held on the spot with the State and the county and the town officers and they will determine the location and the cost and if set up on this basis, the county would put up \$45,000 and the town \$5,000. And also in the resolve it reads: "That after the construction of such bridge, Allagash plantation shall pay to the state \$5,000 per year for 10 successive years; such money to be credited to the general highway fund."

It seems to me that the people of Allagash are standing quite a load for that bridge and it is really needed and I think it should pass.

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

Mr. **ROUNDY**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to say a word about this matter. In years past, I have been in the Allagash country a considerable number of times in connection with my work and I do want to say that I do not see how the people there or others who are traveling in that region have been willing to get along for so many years without this bridge. I certainly hope we shall not indefinitely postpone this matter. This is not a day too soon to take action positively in this direction.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Van Buren, Mr. O'Connell.

Mr. **O'CONNELL**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Coming from the St. John River, I think probably I am more familiar with their situation than the gentleman who opposes it. I have sat in this House for the last three months and seen this same gentleman oppose everything for schools, for old age and aid to dependent children. I regret to say that I had to listen to him today oppose a bridge across the St. John River where 600 American citizens, as loyal and true as any in this House. A little community, if my figures are right, who gave 59 boys to go out and fight in the last World War. If this bridge is placed across the St. John River, it will, as the Representative from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, says, open up the virgin territory of lumber; it will shorten the route that way to Quebec. And I have heard and know the Lacroix brothers very well as they maintained the mill in my town for years say that they would build the road. Consequently that would be a seven mile road which they would build to get us into Quebec. If only, Members and Mr. Speaker of this House, on this proposition when we think of those boys and girls who now are coming to the area school in Fort Kent, a distance of thirty-five or forty miles, if we are afraid of spending \$100,000 and so economy-minded that one life will be lost, a boy or

girl attempting to cross there in the spring of the year. I think this gentleman who opposed this has never crossed on one of those ferries when the ice has been running and I have.

If we oppose such a proposition as this, I shall be ashamed, certainly ashamed, to go back home on the St. John Valley and I would never ask to come back to the Legislature again when we can not first of all take care of the old, the children, and at last children who have to travel thirty-five or forty miles to get an education. So, therefore, I hope that Mr. Woodworth's resolution does not prevail.

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

Mr. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mr. O'Connell has said what I intended to say in a way and a lot more and expressed it better. I would like to move at this time that when the vote is taken, it be taken by division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to inform you of this other fact. Five years ago twelve of the young men and women on the other side of that river entered the high school at Fort Kent. How many of them graduated? In the spring of the year there was a season of three or four weeks they could not get over without taking a chance on their lives. And also in the fall of the year. How many of them graduated? They got discouraged; their parents said: "No, you can't go over this morning." They go part way by canoe and over the ice with it, dip it into the turbulent waters and row across to the next open spot, put it on the ice and then go over. They were desperate to get through and graduate, but they couldn't do it.

The gentleman who has spoken would deny the children of the Allagash, a purely Scotch and English settlement, American from

their grandsires to the present time and deny them the privilege of going to high school and having an education. It's preposterous.

I hope and pray that the motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Addison, Mr. Lackee.

Mr. LACKEE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to attempt to describe the conditions in the Allagash because I don't know very much about them, but, at the hearing before the committee, this bill received very great support; there was no opposition, and I would like to call your attention to the fact that it will be built under the Bridge Act. Under that setup it is necessary for three participants to decide upon it, the municipal officers, the county commissioners and the State highway commissioners. Two of those participants must agree. Now, it has been learned since the hearing that the county commissioners are very desirous of this bill being started at this time on the ground of making a survey, of preparing their budget for the money, and so forth, and the committee has unanimously reported it "Ought to pass".

Probably it cannot be started in the very near future, but plans can be made. I would like to call your attention to the fact that that little community up there has agreed to pay back to the State of Maine \$50,000 of this fund.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth, that Resolve in Favor of a Bridge Across the St. John River in Allagash Plantation be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stacyville, Mr. Boulier.

Mr. BOULIER: Mr. Speaker, in the three different sessions that I have been here and worked with the Ways and Bridge Committee, I have heard different applicants for bridges and roads from all over this State, from Kittery to Fort Kent, and the Allagash, and I don't think that there is any place in the State

of Maine where they need a bridge as badly as they do at the Allagash Plantation. Consequently, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Fairfield (Mr. Woodworth) does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Ways and Bridges Committee, who comes from a county where the votes are, I would like to say that I am definitely in favor of this bridge. I listened to the evidence presented at the hearing very closely and to my mind it is a worthy project.

I would also like to call to your attention that that small community up there is willing to tax themselves \$5,000 a year for ten years to help pay for that bridge and I think that any community that is willing to go along to that extent certainly should have some consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Sharpe.

Mr. SHARPE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can't add very much to the arguments against the gentleman's motion to indefinitely postpone this bill. But it happens that I too am quite well acquainted with the St. John River and the people who live on the St. John River, and I am speaking more because I like to talk about the river and like to talk about the people than to have anything to do with this argument. The people living on the St. John River don't ask for much. They are of the old pioneer stock, self-sufficient people, who will make a living for themselves in places where some of us would starve.

I don't know why or how the people in that area have gotten along without this bridge as long as they have without making a concerted effort to get a bridge there. I know of a number of drownings along the St. John River especially up the river above St. Francis simply because of the lack

of adequate and proper facilities for crossing. They have been drowned off ferries and out of canoes and I can't think of anything more worthy than this resolve for this bridge in that area.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lovell, Mr. McKeen.

Mr. McKEEN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do not think that any matter has received more and careful attention than has this bridge across the St. John by the Ways and Bridge Committee. At the hearing we had some thirty-five or more people down before us and some of the hardships that they endured crossing this river are really terrific. I don't think I can add very much to what has been said. Mr. Bubar emphatically told you a long story in regard to this, and I will say the things which he has said are so. I not only consider it is our duty to build this bridge but I really and truly believe that it would be one of the greatest investments that the State of Maine has ever made. The descriptions of that country, covered with virgin forests ready to be taken off, the soil the richest of any in the United States, when this land is cleared, the territory developed up there, it would seem to me that nothing could be more profitable to the State of Maine than to build this bridge and I hope the motion does not prevail.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cyr.

Mr. CYR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to arise to substantiate what has been said in favor of that bridge. Knowing the situation, perhaps, much better because it is closer to my district than any of you. I have had several occasions while I was repairman for the telephone company in years back to know the difficulty of crossing the St. John River in the fall and spring of the year, especially when those telephones are out of commission and the people have no way of getting across the river, no connection with the outside world

except through the air and at that time the airplanes were in abeyance. I wish to go on record as supporting the resolve and I would be very much ashamed to go back to my district if I did not rise in favor if after sitting here for the past three months and not knowing what we are going to hatch, either a quahog or a muskrat. (Laughter)

However, I hope before we go home that we will discover what is going to hatch in this House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge to the House that I know nothing about the Allagash and I am sorry that I made the motion and I made the motion at the request of one of our gentleman, who told me he thought he knew the sentiment up there and that he did not like to speak and wanted me to oblige him. I have done so.

I think I have more than fulfilled my obligation since I have heard more about the Allagash in the last few minutes than I ever knew before. I have also received a note: "Can you possibly withdraw your motion?" I am not going to deprive anybody of the pleasure of a vote by division and I shall remain seated. Thank you.

Mr. McKEEN (of Lovell): I have been informed that the money for this was taken from the general fund and in the recent bill the money would come from the highway funds.

The SPEAKER: Is the Chair correct in understanding that the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth, did not withdraw his motion?

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it if that is permitted. I request the privilege of withdrawing my motion. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The Chair now understands that the gentleman's motion has been withdrawn.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I will be more careful in the future. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the passage of the Resolve to be engrossed.

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

Mr. McGLAUF LIN: Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that this is the most commendable thing that has been done this term. (Laughter) Thereupon, the Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

### Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair lays before the House the 1st tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report of the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation on Bill "An Act Relating to Primary Wood - Using Portable Sawmills, Spark Arrestors and Timber Reports" (H. P. 1739) (L. D. 1093), Majority Report "Ought to pass", Minority Report "Ought not to pass" tabled on April 29th by the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Williams, pending his motion to accept the minority report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As I understand it, there is an amendment being prepared at the present time and I wonder if we could consider that a little later in the day?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state for the benefit of the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Williams, as well as the members of the House that if the House will be patient for approximately one minute, the amendment to which he has reference is now being distributed. The House may be at ease for approximately one minute.

### House at Ease

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Williams, that the House do accept

the minority "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Under the circumstances, since this bill has been amended, I will withdraw my motion to accept the minority report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Williams, withdraws his motion that the House do accept the minority "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. Is it now the pleasure of the House to accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee?

Thereupon, the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee was accepted and, under suspension of the rules, the Bill was given its two several readings.

The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1739, L. D. 1093, Bill "An Act Relating to Primary Wood-Using Portable Sawmills, Spark Arrestors and Timber Reports."

Amend said Bill by striking out the 1st underlined sentence after the headnote "Definition" of subsection I of that part designated "Sec. 72" and inserting in place thereof the following underlined sentence: **This section shall apply to primary wood-using portable sawmills or portable plants which use wood products in log or bolt form and saws or processes them.'**

Further amend said Bill by striking out the 1st underlined sentence after the headnote "Hazard clearance" of subsection III of that part designated "Sec. 72" and inserting in place thereof the following underlined sentence:

**The granting and holding of such licenses is conditional on keeping any slash, hereafter caused by wood and timber cutting, removed for a distance of 50 feet in all directions from the mill, sawdust pile and incinerator; live trees need not be removed from the cleared area ex-**

**cept that dead and green branches of conifers or evergreen trees shall be pruned to a height of 10 feet above the ground; dead snags shall also be removed.'**

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of section 72-A thereof.

Further amend said Bill by renumbering section 72-B to be 'Sec. 72-A.' thereof, and by striking out the last paragraph of said section 72-B.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Sharpe.

Mr. SHARPE: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those members who are prepared to go along with me in an attempt to kill this bill, I want to assure you that this amendment has removed my objections to this bill. I move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the dispensing of further reading of House Amendment "A". Is it the pleasure of the House that further reading of House Amendment "A" be dispensed with?

Thereupon, further reading of House Amendment "A" was dispensed with, House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider our action taken earlier in the day whereby we passed to be enacted Senate Paper 515, Legislative Document 1046, Bill "An Act to Effect Certain Changes in Procedure Under the Unemployment Compensation Law."

My reason for doing this is that I have House Amendment "A" of which I move adoption.

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action taken earlier in the day whereby the Bill was passed to be enacted; and further voted to reconsider its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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



HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 515, L. D. 1046, Bill "An Act to Effect Certain Changes in Procedure Under the Unemployment Compensation Law."

Amend said Bill by inserting after the underlined words "**this state**" at the end of the 2nd sentence of that part of section 11 designated "(3)", the following underlined punctuation and words:

**‘; provided, however, that said liens shall be subordinate to any real estate mortgage previously recorded as required by law’**

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the 2nd tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought to pass in New Draft" (H. P. 2088) (L. D. 1559) of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Enable Certain Cities to Impose a General Business and Occupation Tax" (H. P. 1805) (L. D. 1131) tabled on April 29th by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Chapman, pending acceptance of the report.

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

Mr. PAINE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you can guess, this is another tax measure. They say that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. I'm telling you I feel like that right now. However, this is a very important measure for our constituents. I only wish that a more experienced legislator had introduced it for this bill represents the wishes of a large majority of the constituents of the City of Portland.

While I was overseas, Mr. McGlauffin had my power of attorney and handled a little piece of property I had, so he has sort of been a father to me down here and I have been his protege. Before I came down here to the session, he advised me this way: To sit in the session until you came to a very important measure and then

give it all you've got. I recently talked to him and he said that due to the fact that the session is about to close, that I had better be very brief. I understand that he is opposed to this measure. (Laughter) He told me to be very brief and that nobody would listen to me if I had a long debate.

Actually, this is a local question and does not affect the State at large. We had a unanimous "Ought to pass" report of the Committee on Taxation. However, as this is a new type of taxation in the State of Maine, I feel that it is in order for me to explain just a little about the bill.

Before going into the explanation of the bill, I want to point out just how desperately we do need new revenue in the City of Portland and I want to be specific, give specific examples. We have a lot of sewer projects. I was going to read part of this committee report, the Citizens Tax Committee report, but I won't take your time, I will just pick out specific figures.

For instance, here's one, a sewer we need will take \$363,000. Another sewer, costing \$1,475,000, and then to fix up the sewers in the Back Bay section would cost \$2,000,000. And as regards our streets, we have let them run down. If you have been in Monument Square recently, you have noticed that only half of the square is paved and we should remove the car rails there. That project alone would cost about half a million dollars. And we, like the members in rural communities, have our problems with the schools. There are forty schools in Portland, with an average of sixty years. For example, picking out four of them, here are some of the ages: 80 years, 82, 87, 105 and so on. It is not surprising that the school committee's report spoke of a lack of cleanliness and the difficulty of achieving cleanliness in such structures. Now out of these forty schools, only six have hot water; that's in the fair and beautiful City of Portland. The plumbing is generally very poor throughout them. Twenty-

three have obsolete toilets and the lighting is very poor and our playgrounds around the schools are very poor. I hastily skipped over those just to show you that we do need these things. These are not frills and fancies; we just want to fix up these schools and they are really being demanded by our citizens.

You might want to know how the people of Portland feel about this bill. Now, this bill didn't just come out of thin air and just to be introduced at the last minute. It has been worked over and worked on; the matter has been discussed over a period of two years. For example, the Citizens Tax Committee was established; not just a bunch of educators. No, they were the businessmen of the community, the merchants and the industrialists, and they rendered a report after nine months of study, it's long and I'm not going to read it to you. But they really tackled it in a serious manner. They felt briefly that the property tax is becoming too much of a burden on them. They are carrying too much of a load of the cost of municipal government; it is about eighty-two per cent of the cost there.

All these merchants on this committee came out in favor of a tax of this nature. I have a letter here from the Chamber of Commerce, the President of the Chamber of Commerce and he states in it: "The Chamber of Commerce went on record unanimously in favor of this gross receipts bill." There has been, they say, some misconception on the part of the people as to what type of organization the Portland Chamber of Commerce is. To give you a better idea of our viewpoint, I would like at this time to say that the Chamber of Commerce is comprised of 600 business firms representing all types of business in the area, manufacturing, wholesaling, service industries, retailing and hotels. These business firms range from the smallest one-man business to the largest corporation in the city. The board of directors are the duly elected representatives chosen from the

business field. These 600 firms pay approximately 75 per cent of the entire tax burden of the city and they went on record for it unanimously.

Now, I have canvassed the members of the Portland delegation. I wasn't surprised, this being a tax measure, that I found some who were opposed. There were only two out of the entire delegation. I imagine you have already guessed who they are, Mr. McGlaulin and Mr. Albee. Mr. McGlaulin, I believe, was opposed on the ground that this would be double taxation for professional men. They would be taxed on their gross receipts and continue to be taxed on office furniture and fixtures. He also labels it patchwork taxation. But I think that that is just name calling, because the people of Portland are willing to pay these taxes and take care of their local needs at a local level and they will be able to watch over those funds and administer them more effectly. It is not a new idea throughout the nation. This gross receipts tax has been adopted in many cities. I won't bother to list them all, I have figures on those cities.

Mr. Albee's objections are that it exempts salaried men whereas members on commission would pay; also that New Hampshire just recently had rendered a decision calling gross receipts in New Hampshire unconstitutional; and also, generally, that it is bad, bad legislation.

Now, I have here the opinion of the justices of the State of Maine in regard to the constitutionality of this measure. I won't read a lot of this decision but I will read the pertinent paragraphs only. It is in regard to when the State of Maine imposed the gasoline tax.

"In this respect of absence of limitation upon the power of the Legislature to impose excise taxes the Constitution of Maine differs from that of New Hampshire which restricts the Legislature of that State 'to proportional and reasonable assessments, rates and taxes.'"

Skipping along: "In Maine, however, in the absence of any such constitutional restriction we are of the opinion that the Legislature has the power to assess the tax in question as an excise tax upon the selling of gasoline in this State."

And I maintain and it is considered the opinion of many attorneys that that would cover this decision.

Actually, I don't think Mr. McGlaulin and Mr. Albee are too serious in their objections. They just want to continue the precedent of every Portland delegation that has ever come down here of disagreeing. (Laughter) I wish seriously that I was spokesman for the Aroostook delegation because when the Aroostook delegation agrees on anything, they all pull together. But seriously, if they are serious in their objections, I am disappointed in their stand, for here is a bill as far as we can determine at this date the majority of the people of Portland want and, with your permission, the people of Portland will be given the opportunity to vote upon it at the polls. Therefore, I move the acceptance of the unanimous "Ought to pass" report of the Committee on Taxation.

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

Mr. McGLAULIN: Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested in the remarks of the young man who just spoke. When he was in the service—I think he was there for some three years—he did me the honor of representing him at home, and I looked after his affairs for that period and I am much interested in the young man. I was privileged to hear his maiden speech, which I think was a very good one. I agree with him in one respect—that the City of Portland is in desperate need of taxes, but not a tax measure like this one.

I have been trying to think of where the man was trained who ever thought up such an idea. It comes to me that he must have worked at some time or other in the United States Tax Department

but this is certainly one brilliant idea somebody showed you.

Let us look at some of the men that are in favor of this tax. Perhaps I had better tell you first what this tax is. As Mr. Paine starts in, it is taxing me double and all professional men. We pay for the books that we use to get our income and then we pay on our gross income even if we are in the red at the end of the year; that doesn't make any difference; we have got to pay twice. I now come to the men who are primarily interested in getting this tax through. For one, the city manager. He takes in a salary of \$12,000 but he doesn't pay a cent of this tax.

Chester Abbott, the banker, I am informed, takes in a salary of \$10,000 or \$12,000. He is very strong for this bill. He doesn't pay a cent. The corporation counsel has a salary. He is pushing for this bill, I understand. He doesn't pay a cent. His assistant, he gets a salary; he doesn't pay a cent. The city treasurer doesn't pay anything. The city auditor doesn't pay anything. The members of the Council to the extent of their salaries, that is all exempt. The overseers of the poor, the assessors, the building inspectors, the public works department; they pay nothing, they are on salary.

So, when you come to analyze it, not a single public official working for the city of Portland pays a cent of this tax. It says it's a selective tax and believe me it is. No county official will pay it. The county attorney, a good friend of mine, he gets a salary, he doesn't pay any tax. The assistant county attorney, he pays none. None of the people who work for the county or for the State have to pay a cent. None of the judges pay anything; they are all exempt. I am not exempt although I have the title of "Judge" because I don't take in anything from that source now; if I did I would be exempt. None of the policemen pay a cent of this tax; none of the firemen pay a cent; none of the street workers pay anything; none of the bankers or

the banks themselves for that matter; none of the clerks who work in the banks; none of the clerks who work in the stores; none of the street workers; nobody that works on a train, nobody that drives a bus. Who does pay it? Why, a few of us professional men and business men. We are the ones selected for this sacrifice. That isn't all. The banks are exempt. Now, I want you to get this; this is good. I am told by Jake Berman in Portland that the banks of Portland do ten times the probate work that all the lawyers in Portland do put together. By statute, if I handle an estate and I get \$100 for it, and that's what I usually do get, I pay a tax but if any one of the banks handles a large estate they get an income of \$10,000; they don't pay a cent, not one. Now can anybody on God's earth make you think that that is a fair tax bill? We do some funny things up in this Legislature but I haven't found anybody that would approve of such an unfair measure as this. But, they say the people of Portland want it; it will go to referendum. Now, that is the greatest appeal that they have got to use; go to referendum and let the people of Portland vote on it. From what I have just told you, how do you think the people of Portland are going to vote? With 95 per cent of them free from taxation, is there any question at all what they are going to vote to have me and have the professional men and the business men pay the tax when they go free? Can't you see that the dice are loaded at the start and the people that have to pay the tax haven't got a look-in?

I have played the game of 63 out here in the hall with one or two men and in that game if I hold the Ace, King, Queen, Jack, ten and nine of any suit of cards, I hold an unbeatable hand as everyone of you who plays knows. You send that to the people and they have got the Ace, King, Queen, Jack, ten and nine and all the rest against us before we start.

I say it still is unfair and I don't believe you are going to even submit it to the people of Portland who, if they vote at all, they will vote in their own interests as they probably will, the vote will be about 99 to 1 in favor of letting the other fellow pay the tax. Perhaps you have got the idea I was against this bill; I will state so. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Paine, that the House do accept the "Ought to pass" in new draft of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Enable Certain Cities to Impose a General Business and Occupation Tax. Is the House ready for the question?"

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

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I first want to take the document, 1559, from start to finish. I will be as brief as possible and trust that you will follow me along on this. This bill says: "An Act to Enable Certain Cities (which is plural) to Impose a General Business and Occupation Tax". "Authorization of tax. Any city of the state having a population of 60,000 or more" (I don't know of a city other than Portland that has 60,000 or more). First, this tax is opening a door. Two years hence they will come in here and the door will be open and cities of 2,000 and which they will be rightfully entitled to ask for. I think other cities and towns of this State are just as bad off and worse off than my city. I could recommend that they would come and ask a tax committee or a group to get together, we could arrive at a figure or a way of raising taxes so that we wouldn't have to have a discriminatory tax.

I do want to mention that Mr. Bernstein objected to this tax at the tax hearing. You will note the letter that was forwarded to each Legislator here, it was also signed by A. Bernstein, who was trying to just fool the boys in this Legislature. They did say that

they had sent these out to over 500 taxpayers. I solicited my district at Rosemont and I found not a single person who had received a card from the City of Portland. I didn't myself. Therefore, this letter I disregard because it is misleading, very much so.

Now, let's see what the city of Portland does want. They had a pamphlet that they mailed to all of the citizens of Portland, "A Gross Receipts Tax for Portland". Members, it's a sales tax, a gross income and sales tax. It's a short-range program which would equalize the property burden so every individual would pay their fair share. This has nothing to do with property whatsoever, although they stated that in their pamphlet and that certainly is not equal distribution of taxes.

Second, "a long-range program which would increase City funds by the levying of a GROSS RECEIPTS TAX on all business in the city." That is not true. A gross receipts tax, generally speaking, is a tax on a total intake of money through a specified business; that proves it doesn't take all business. These are their own printing. "All retail concerns, wholesale concerns, industrial concerns, the services, and the professions." Yes, gross receipts tax is deductible before income tax. Therefore, in most cases thirty to fifty per cent of it will be paid by Uncle Sam. If that isn't a good one. I have never seen a tax yet that Uncle Sam paid thirty or fifty per cent on.

Here is one of the things in that pamphlet: "Will the Gross Receipts Tax Cause the Cost of Living in Portland to be increased? To some extent it will." That's their own pamphlet.

Now, let's take the exemptions; this was very, very cleverly framed. "Receipts from sales of real estate and rents derived from real estate." In the City of Portland, we have three or four men there who hold upwards of a million and a half dollars worth of real estate; they

are deriving a profit from it. They are exempt from this tax and they are in a position to pay a good sized tax.

"Receipts from farming." There is not a farm in the confines of the City of Portland, the City limits. But this was very cleverly done and explained to me by one of the men on the committee. This does not exempt the Oakhurst Dairy, the Old Tavern Dairy; they have to buy their milk from farmers. They must deliver and they recently reduced their price, I believe a half a cent a quart. I was informed by a manager of a dairy last week they would have to put the half cent back if they have to pay a gross receipts tax. Now, believe me, members, this tax doesn't affect me in any way, shape or manner because as you will note down here "receipts from insurance companies and associations"; so, therefore, I am not trying to get out of a tax, battling against a tax that I will have to pay because I have not got to pay it, but my agents, and I have fifteen in the State of Maine, who make \$5,000, perhaps, they are exempt \$2500 and they must pay a gross receipts tax on \$2500 and that is very unfair to exempt one executive in the insurance business who is at the present time receiving \$22,000 salary and he is exempt. And my commission men must go on and pay a tax. That is why I say it is very unfair.

Another part of this bill, Section 162, says: "Returns to be secret." Well, you had a caucus here in this House, if I remember, when we first started. I was out in the lobby here and I found out from a man who wasn't here everything that happened; it was on the radio the next morning. In fact, at twelve minutes past eleven that night, they gave all the information on the radio. So you can see how much secrecy you have. In other words, it is a misdemeanor and a fine of \$1,000 if they give out any information or refuse to file a re-

turn. Now, certainly little girls working in the clerk's office are apt to tell a sister at home or someone at home and it is apt to get out. So, I don't think that should be in the bill.

In fact, there is another bill before the House but I just want to see how they wish to keep you in ignorance, especially in the City of Portland. They require a sworn statement, a sworn return and he goes on: "which will relieve the taxpayer of the burden of knowing the law." Now, that is over the signature of our city manager and that is certainly a funny thing to ask us to do. I take exception, not being an attorney, but I take exception with my colleague from Portland, Mr. Paine. I would have had a statement, today, from the Supreme Court in Maine but they are in session in Bangor and I could not get it until tomorrow. I was going to ask to postpone this but I thought best to let it go through. But New Hampshire did rule on January 27, 1949 that it was unconstitutional. Now, we have uniformity of laws between the two states as I am told by our own attorney general. This is a book which they are not giving out here. I receive one and perhaps the other members of the committee. I just want to read a section of the book that they published. First, I want to use the members of that particular committee. The chairman is a gentleman by the names of Jones, a co-chairman; he is in the Coca Cola business in South Portland; he does a tremendous business but he avoids paying a tax although he lives in Portland, he uses the facilities of our streets as much as a commission man. He can afford to pay a tax.

You have two presidents of banks, one the Bank of Commerce, which is my own bank down there. He is relieved of paying a tax and I believe they get a fair salary.

I, at the tax committee hearing, left with them fifty-six letters from merchants in the City of Portland and from attorneys objecting to this particular tax and I was informed,

today, by a member of the tax committee that they were not given those letters. Secondly, the Tax Committee has received information on redraft and amendments and what have you and they did not call the opponents in to tell them anything about it.

I read at that tax hearing, which I will do again, we have in Portland 23,600 family units in Portland of which 2,560 are renting furnished apartments. This leaves approximately 21,000 household units subject to taxation on furniture before consideration of the \$500 exemption allowed by statute. Of this number, 690 households were assessed in that category in 1948.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, to me that is very lax; a lot of laxness in chasing around and picking up. I happen to be one of those 690. My particular section got cracked on that furniture business.

Now, let's take concrete examples now. I have talked with the doctors, the attorneys, and all the professional men. I have made a survey on Congress Street in the City of Portland and it would have been well if perhaps the sponsors of this bill had done the same. They do not dare to come out in opposition to this bill. I will give you example of a young chap who has a store, I will give you round figures, he did \$90,000, a few cents over \$90,000 worth of business. He has a grocery store; he is in competition with the A. & P. and First National. He and his Mrs. and one meat cutter work in this store. His net income in 1948 according to his federal income tax returns was \$3112. He would pay a gross receipts, believe it or not, of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$900. Take that from his \$3100, that is the way it would be. He would have to close his shop. Take the barber getting \$7,000 and \$8,000 from his barber shop, gross receipts. Take a concern that might take a contract. I know of one contractor who has done \$900,000 worth of business last year. Let him lose just on one job, he still pays on the total figure, gross receipts and it's almost laugh-

able when you think of \$2500 exemption for a man doing a million dollars' worth of business.

Let's take an example, now. I live in the City of Portland and I am a salaried man of \$12,000 per year. I am just going to give you that as a figure, and one of these presidents of a bank has \$12,000, I don't know his exact salary but this particular man lives in Cumberland. Let's assume that I live in Cumberland and I had a home the same as his, drove the same kind of a car. I'm in the City of Portland; I'm getting a salary of \$12,000 a year; he also has \$12,000 a year but he has to pay a tax on his \$12,000 and I go scot-free. I do not think that is fair taxation.

This tax, ladies and gentlemen, is a tax without representation, it is class legislation. To prove it to you, the people who live outside of Portland must pay a tax in the City of Portland if they have an office in that city. When they have a referendum, they cannot vote. The tax is upon themselves, they can't vote against that; they are just going to be closed up entirely and take it. And I say to you, ladies and gentlemen of this House, I ask you just to defeat this bill.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that it would not be necessary for me to say anything about this bill but as I have just listened to such an amount of misinformation I feel as a member of the Taxation Committee, I should say something.

I am also one of those persons living in a suburban town near Portland and doing business in Portland, who would be taxed under this measure. The description which has been given on it seems to me to represent a complete misunderstanding of its essential provisions. In the first place, the tax is not necessarily one per cent. It can't exceed one per cent. The terms have to be defined in the ordinance which has to be submitted to the people. It is a method

for taxing certain persons in a new way. As to the exemptions which have been described to you, all of those who are exempted from this act are still to be taxed on personal property in exactly the same manner in which they are now taxed; only those persons who are described in the act are removed from it and the reason for bringing them into a new classification, as I understand it, is to afford a method for taxing the right to do business in a community. Now those people are liable for personal property taxes now and it is believed by the municipal officers in Portland, and their view is supported by some of the leading citizens, that by this method they can collect from personal property assessed in this manner a reasonable amount of tax for the right to do business or to practice a vocation in the City of Portland.

Now, from what we have heard here, we might gather that the municipal officers in Portland and the assessors there were fools. I don't believe any such thing. I have paid taxes in Portland for twenty years; they have always been fair to me. I am in the type of business which I have heard would be ruined by this tax and the only thing which disturbs me about it is, in speaking here today, that as I read the bill I would pay less taxes under this bill than I am now paying. I ought to say that but that's not the reason, I hope, that I am for the bill. I believe that in a money economy, it is impossible any longer in a complex city like Portland to assess stock in trade under the old methods of assessing personal property. A new way must be found. This is a method, a rough method for determining the right to do business or to practice a vocation in the City of Portland. I don't believe there is going to be any injustice under it. We must find in such communities as Portland, some practicable way to assess personal property. Here is one city which dares to try a new way, and I repeat, I can't believe that under this bill, under the ordi-

nance which the people would approve under it, any great amount of injustice is going to be done to anyone.

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

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I want to call the members' attention to the fact that every last one of us who are included in this tax will pay one per cent and we also pay our real estate tax.

I think if you will analyze the list of people who I stated would not pay any tax, you will find that the amount of tax that they will pay anywhere will be exceedingly small.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Paine, to accept the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report.

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

Mr. ROUNDY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have only a word to say. It is true that we are facing very great needs which were pretty clearly outlined by the one who spoke first. It is true that eighty-two percent of the tax burden in Portland at the present time is upon those who own real estate and that means upon a relatively small proportion of the people as a whole. I am not quite certain, perhaps a third of the people. That would be my offhand judgment in the matter. And it does seem that under these circumstances something is necessary to meet our needs at the present time. Possibly there are inconsistencies; what tax does not have? I have no doubt but many of these inconsistencies may be adjusted in the course of experience in the matter. So far as I can read, not being a specialist in this matter, it seems to me this comes as near a fair way of getting the necessary funds that are very greatly needed to be used for very important ends and until some other way than simply relying on the real estate tax can be devised, using such judgment as I do have,

I am going ahead with this gross receipts tax.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Paine, to accept the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Enable Certain Cities to Impose a General Business and Occupation Tax". Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have shown me in this bill where it says that it is not one per cent. It says "up to one per cent". It also says in here, "class legislation", that's what it says, "certain classes".

I would also like to have Mr. Chase tell me how he arrives at the fact that he would pay less tax under this system than the other. Right now, I'll admit, the security business isn't quite as good as it was a few years ago, but I can see where he would pay more tax on this because all the brokers, and I have letters here from those brokers, and they tell me that they will pay more money by far under this system.

Now, let's take for an example, the real estate in our city. If you will check the assessed valuation of the City of Portland, house by house, in my own district, you will find it is as low if not lower than any other city or town in the State and our tax rate is \$55.80 per thousand, and I believe that is the exact figure. And, if the City of Portland needed this money—and according to this little pamphlet here, this will bring in from \$1,600,000 to \$2,100,000 per year, each year—I am one who would certainly be willing to pay, in the City of Portland, an additional \$5 per thousand on my home, if they need money.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Paine, that the House accept the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee. Is the House ready for the question?



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

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Like my colleague, the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, I have been somewhat startled and disappointed to hear the accusations of trickiness and disingenuous approach that have been leveled at the sponsors of this tax bill this afternoon.

I frankly am startled and disappointed by the statements that have been made about the personalities of the men involved. Since the statements have been made, however, I think it would be pertinent at this time to take a listing of the Citizens Tax Committee and go right down through it and correct some of the misinformation that has already been related to you.

For instance, the co-chairman, Mr. Jones, as you have been told, is a business executive; has a bottling plant in South Portland and distributing points in and about Portland. Those points are taxable and that directly relates to the business success of his own concern.

Number two man on the list is William M. Altenburg, a professional man, a business efficiency expert; he's taxable.

Number three on the list is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Benoit, one of our more prominent merchants. He has a very large clothing store and has a direct interest as the proprietor.

A gentleman by the name of Conary, who is, as most of you know, a labor union leader who is on the committee to represent the labor point of view.

A gentleman by the name of Holmes, who is the sole proprietor of a store of his own. The business success of his store is concerned and touched upon by this tax.

A gentleman by the name of Heulin is also on the committee. He is the proprietor of a linotype business. His business is seriously affected by the proposed tax.

A gentleman by the name of Maxim, who is a broker. A professional broker. He is affected by the tax.

A gentleman by the name of Mr. Leonard Pierce, a rather prominent attorney, whom you may know. As a professional man, he pays a tax.

As I go down through this list, as a matter of fact, I can find only three persons who are exempt under the provisions and the others, some fourteen or thirteen on the committee, are all affected. That seems to me to answer at least in part the rather damaging statements that have been made that this tax as sponsored is a tricky and, by implication, I would assume, dishonest measure.

With regard to the statements that have been made relating to members of the city council, the corporation council, of whom there are two, the county attorneys, certain other officers, I might add that they are all part-time personnel. They all have businesses and professions of their own. Both the corporation counsel and the assistant corporation counsel have their own law offices in the City of Portland and are subject to this tax or would be. The same thing is true of the county attorneys, although I don't know why they were dragged into this. The members of the city council, likewise, are either normal citizens of the community or in business for themselves. I don't think it is necessary to comment on the participation of the subordinate municipal officers because they didn't have anything to say about this, and persons like the city treasurer and the judges. We have always proceeded on the philosophy that personnel of that type should keep hands off political issues and, if my observations in Portland are correct, they really do.

My good colleague from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, has mentioned that this is a discriminatory tax; that the people who would be for it are not affected and I am not talking about the committee now, I am talking about the persons. The Chamber of Commerce in any city, and this is

true of the City of Portland, certainly represents the trade, professional and commercial business point of view. Some 600 business firms in the City of Portland are members of the Chamber of Commerce. When they met on this tax, this proposed enabling act, they endorsed this tax unanimously. Mind you, members, unanimously, and they pay seventy-five per cent of the existing tax burden right now in the City of Portland. Now, if that isn't a perfect example of the persons who are responsible for the tax.

Certain statements have been made in regard to a questionnaire which was circulated in the City of Portland, generally. Mr. Albee touched upon it just slightly. Five thousand questionnaires were sent out in the City of Portland, at large, to persons who paid taxes of \$100 or more, not to those who don't pay taxes and I don't want to make any slighting remarks about the Rosemont area and I won't. But the result of the poll is this, 83.34% favored this plan. I think that statistic speaks for itself, I am not going to enlarge upon it.

Certain remarks have been passed on the subject of exemptions, real estate, farms, banks, and insurance. The whole philosophy on which this Legislature has been thinking with regard to real estate taxes is on the matter of relief and I think we are indicative in our thinking of the thinging throughout the State, that real estate bears too large a share and a new form, and a broader base are the proper approach. Therefore, real estate ought to be exempt, or the receipts and proceeds from it, because if they are not exempt, you are just adding to your real estate tax. A very logical exemption, I should say.

There were certain remarks passed about the non-existence of farms in the confines of the City of Portland. It so happens they are there and I will take the gentleman, Mr. Albee, if he cares to this weekend, and show them to him. However, I don't think that is material because there aren't many farms there. It

is just another indication of a misleading fact.

Banks and insurance companies are exempt. They should be because they are already subjects of selective taxation under the general law. They pay enough.

Certain remarks have been passed on the subject of the secrecy of returns, and, if I understand the remarks of the other gentleman from Portland correctly, he said that he thought it was foolish to put it in the bill. I can't go along with him on that. Most tax returns require the filing of business information and we are familiar enough with it in the federal field; all require that the returns be kept on file in secret custody and that the only information that can be derived from it is statistical information which does not reveal individual data of those particular concerns. A very, very wise provision and I should say that it should be left in.

Certain remarks have been passed about the constitutionality of this measure. About seventy odd cities have already used this tax and used it successfully to my knowledge and I think I have been correctly informed and not one single city has abated it yet, abandoned it. And those seventy odd cities are spread over about fifteen states, in the mid-south and the mid west. It is not a novelty; its application, perhaps, to the State of Maine may be new but it is not an experiment, it is not a novelty; it has been soundly tested; it has been litigated as far as its constitutionality is concerned in other courts, courts in other states, and as far as the comparison between New Hampshire and the State of Maine is concerned, I think the point has been well made that the State of New Hampshire has a peculiar provision in its constitution which does not allow any graduated excise tax. Read it. You will find it in the Attorney General's office.

Remarks have been passed about the inequity of having persons who reside outside the City of Portland

pay taxes such as this one in the City of Portland. I think that point has been rather well covered by Mr. Chase. I will mention, just by way of reaffirmation, that the tax is levied only upon persons who do business or have places of business in Portland, thus relying on the public facilities and that they already pay various types of taxes upon which they had no opportunity to vote. Anybody in South Portland, who did business in Portland now, would not have an opportunity to vote upon the appropriations raised by the City of Portland and the appropriations raised by the City of Portland obviously would affect the tax on the business inventories. Those gentlemen from outside pay business inventory taxes now. The situation in that regard is no different, would be no different than it is now.

Last and in conclusion, I am sorry I have been so long on this matter, I would like to say that it seems to me a rather interesting reversal of our tax procedure to have a municipality come to the Legislature and ask for a tax rather than for us to be faced with the so-called bucking attitude which we have in taxes all down the line in our State discussion. We are asking for this tax; we are asking for the enabling act. It is a perfect example of the philosophy of home rule. We want to work out our family problems down in Portland where they ought to be, not on the floor of this Legislature and, if we are given a chance, members, we will do it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Fitch.

Mr. FITCH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe that in mentioning some of the names that Mr. Chapman has, for instance, Mr. Benoit, I can see where he might be in favor of this tax. I can't see that he would pay any. Living in a community that is only twenty-seven miles out of Portland, it is only natural that a

good many of the things that I purchase, I have to purchase in Portland. For instance, if I go in and buy a suit from Mr. Benoit, he is going to put enough on that suit so that I pay the tax. Our town reports in the town, the linotype is set up in Portland. The man in the linotype business is going to charge enough on that so that our town pays the tax.

If I go in and hire an attorney in Portland, he is going to charge enough so that I have got to pay the tax. I am living outside of Portland, sharing Portland's cost. It's true that the merchants probably didn't oppose this tax. They don't dare to. If they oppose this tax and it is defeated, the assessors will really sock it to them when it comes the next time for assessing their taxes.

If I go into Portland to buy an automobile, one per cent on a \$2,000 car is \$20. Why should I go to Portland? I'll shop in Westbrook. It is going to drive business away from Portland and the merchants don't dare to oppose it for the simple reason that they will get assessed much more if they do oppose it and I can see where all of the communities surrounding Portland are going to share Portland's tax burden and I believe it should be defeated right now.

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

Mr. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hesitated to become involved in the affairs of Portland. However, when this bill was introduced to the Legislature, I was interested in it and I took it up with our Bangor City Council. The Council came to the conclusion that they are certainly willing for Portland to pioneer in this new venture and if it proves practical possibly two years later we could come to the Legislature and have the population lowered so it would also apply to Bangor.

As has been pointed out, this is the unanimous report of the Committee on Taxation, it carries a

referendum. I am in no position to say whether it is a good or a bad bill, but I feel that the people of Portland can judge for themselves whether or not they want this new form of taxation.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Garland, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. **CAMPBELL**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think Mr. Webber has just brought out a very good point. If this act is granted, it won't be but a few years before we fellows in the small towns will be paying the bills on the larger cities. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland does not prevail.

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

Mr. **MAXWELL**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I, too, like Mr. Webber, hate to get involved in what seemingly is a Portland affair. I contend that it is not. Portland is a wholesale clearing house for a large part of the products used in the State of Maine. So, for that reason I feel that for myself as well as Mr. Fitch and those people in Portland that I am going to be paying that tax. In other words, I am going to be assisting the City of Portland in their own town and city affairs. It seems to me that even in the grocery line, we have a number of wholesale houses in Portland. This is a gross receipts tax and so, for that reason, I who live in some other town where my grocery store buys groceries from a wholesale concern, they would have to pay their tax. I call it an unfair and unjust tax. I am opposed to it.

The **SPEAKER**: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. **CHAPMAN**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can well appreciate the concern that the last several gentlemen who have spoken on this subject have. However, I do think there is an answer and I will try briefly and as clearly as I can to put it.

Portland is certainly about the only place in the State of Maine, where shopping on a large scale can be done. I do think that there is a certain risk attendant to the interests of the Portland merchants in assuming a tax which will raise the prices of their goods a little higher than that of the surrounding towns, but they are willing to take that risk. Consequently it seems to me that if the persons felt that they were going to be prejudiced by a possible raise in prices — and they aren't going to be so extreme — they can shop in the surrounding communities or direct from the other wholesale places. Portland is assuming a risk here, and desires to assume the risk and does not desire to pass it over. Economically, the thing can work itself out.

As far as the tax is concerned with regard to the possibility of its receding into the smaller towns by lowering the population limitation for its application, it would seem to me here again is another answer. If it is a good tax, if it turns out to be a good tax, a successful tax, it may be that some day you can drop the level. If it isn't a good tax, we will hear about it here and we will hear about it very soon and there will be no necessity to drop the level. The reason that the level of 60,000 was set was to make the tax applicable to the City of Portland, only. And that is proper. We are the persons who are asking for it. It had to be done that way because the request for the bill was in the field of general legislation and the distinction had to be made. Taxation, as any of the attorneys here can tell us, special excise taxation, is a matter of a special act, private and special legislation.

I still hope that the motion of my colleague from Portland, Mr. Paine, prevails.

The **SPEAKER**: Is the House ready for the question? The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, has moved that when the vote is taken, it be taken by division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Larrabee.

Mr. LARRABEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I come from a city of twelve to thirteen thousand population and in that city we have a paper mill making 400 tons of high grade book paper each day and we have hundreds of men and women who have offices in the City of Portland, doing business in that city. Now, I am not a lawyer, I am not a tax expert, but as I sit here and hear the details in regard to this bill, it looks to me like the City of Portland is asking the City of Westbrook to be a mill ticket to build up their financial condition.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stratton, Mr. Carville.

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I am neither for nor against this bill, as far as the bill goes, but, living in a community with a small population, I wonder, if this solves the problem of one of our densely populated sections of our State, what we will do two years from now if we want to raise some major tax. If their problems are solved, it looks to me that we would have hard work to get them to go along with us for some kind of major taxation that would take care of our troubles because I don't believe this would work in the smaller towns.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Paine, that the House accept the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Enable Certain Cities to Impose a General Business and Occupation Tax." The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, has asked for a division.

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Paine, will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Eleven having voted in the affirmative and sixty-two having

voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

#### Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee on Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Relating to Inspection of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 1516) (L. D. 889) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

Messrs. PLUMMER of Lisbon

HOBBS of Acton

JOHNSON of Gardiner

—Committee on

part of the House

CROSBY of Franklin

NOYES of Hancock

BREWER of Arrostook

—Committee on

part of the Senate

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the 3rd tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act Relating to Shipment of Clams" (H. P. 1535) (L. D. 810), Majority Report "Ought to pass," Minority Report "Ought not to pass" which was tabled on May 3rd by the gentleman from Vinalhaven, Mr. Ames, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. AMES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I understand that my friend from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, wishes this bill to be retabled as there is a bill which went through the Senate this morning, Legislative Document 747, that was intertwined with this bill in such a way that if we waste time on this bill this afternoon, we won't get anywhere. When this document comes from the Senate tomorrow morning, 747, we can settle the whole affair, so I would

wish at this time to retable this bill until tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the two reports and accompanying papers were tabled and specially assigned for Thursday, May 5th.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the 4th tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report of the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act Relating to Chiropractic Services Under the Workmen's Compensation Act" (H. P. 1581) (L. D. 903), Majority Report reporting "Ought not to pass," Minority Report reporting a New Draft under title of "An Act Relating to Practitioners' Services Under the Workmen's Compensation Act" (H. P. 2081) (L. D. 1540), tabled on May 3rd by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Atherton, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. ATHERTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It was originally intended to bring this matter up for debate, yesterday, but, at the request of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. White, who is very much interested in the bill and who was called home by a minor illness of his wife, it was deferred until today. I have been informed that he had to take his wife to the hospital this morning for a very minor operation, I understand it is not serious. He is unable to be here today but he will be here tomorrow. Therefore, out of courtesy to him, I move that the matter be retabled and specially assigned for tomorrow, Thursday, May 5th.

Thereupon, the motion prevailed and the two reports with accompanying papers were tabled pending acceptance of either report and specially assigned for Thursday, May 5th.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the 5th tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Housing and Redevelop-

ment" (H. P. 575) (L. D. 173) and New Draft of same (H. P. 2020) (L. D. 1406) which were recommitted. Majority Report reporting Second New Draft (H. P. 2089) (L. D. 1561) and that 2nd New Draft "Ought to pass", Minority Report reporting "Ought not to pass", tabled on May 3rd by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This will not take as long as it might seem to take.

Last December the Governor-elect of this State handed me a housing bill for presentation to this Legislature. He knew I was coming where all good fellows get together to work for the common good, both here at the Augusta House, where some matters pertaining to current legislation are seldom discussed. The Governor's idea was, and is, that since we contribute our share to the Federal Government in income taxes we should stand ready to receive any benefits in common with all other states. I concur in that view. You and I know that the State of Maine participates in many fields of government services, such as: highways, unemployment compensation, old age assistance and several others. These measures, at the time, were considered socialistic and undoubtedly we will hear about socialism again today. Our desks recently have been covered ankle deep on that subject. If this is socialism, then Norman Thomas has already captured the United States because 41 of our states have a Housing act. We are the only state east of the Mississippi River which has no housing legislation. It occurs to me that we, too, should direct our attention to the less fortunate citizens of our State.

With that end in view and with that preliminary background let us consider the bill before us. At the outset let me make it perfectly plain that this is not the National Housing Agency or the Federal Public Housing Authority, because the

funds for both of those measures have long since been exhausted. In fact, we have no Federal housing program in this country today. The present act now before Congress is a bipartisan effort signed by 11 Democratic and 11 Republican Senators. The measure passed the United States Senate two weeks ago by a vote of 57 to 13 and is now under consideration by the National House of Representatives. There is no doubt in my mind but what that body will give it favorable treatment. The declaration in that bill reads in part as follows: "A Bill to Establish a National Housing Objective and the Policy to be Followed in the Attainment Thereof, to Provide Federal Aid to Assist Projects and Low-Rent Public Housing Initiated by Local Agencies, to Provide for Financial Assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for Farm Housing, and for Other Purposes". This measure is keyed to the one now being considered by our national congress and is in keeping with the best traditions of our great State. It does not become operative unless and until our citizens in any community so desire it by appropriate vote at the annual town meeting in the case of any town and by the governing body of any city. This is not a slum clearance program but it is a redevelopment program for persons of low income only and with preference given to veterans. I am particularly proud of this phase of the act since I was once a poor boy myself and coming from a family that was hit rather heavy in World War II, it is likewise gratifying that veterans will have a preferential status. In passing may I suggest that we have done very little if anything at this session for either of these groups.

Assuming that a town or city has voted to create a housing authority under the enabling provision of this act we then come to the appointment and qualifications of the commissioners. You will notice that the act calls for five and they serve without compensation. Should the citizens of Portland de-

cide to exercise the rights and benefits enuring to its citizens and thus establish an authority, I'm sure no one would be more qualified to serve as one of the commissioners than the splended gentleman residing on Woodmont Street in that City. His heart reaches out for the underprivileged citizens of our State and his sincerity in that connection has been demonstrated time and time again on the floor of this House by his magnetic appeals made in behalf of our elderly people and other equally worthy causes. My close association with him during the past four months convinces me beyond any doubt that my distinguished and learned friend, Mr. McGlaufflin, would be eminently fitted to discharge the duties as one of the commissioners.

Following the appointment and qualifications of the commissioners we next come to the powers of the authority. This in line with the general corporation set-up of any enterprise of a similar character. The language of section 7 is plain and in practice every day by thousands of institutions of business in this country. It seems hardly necessary to dwell at length on this section. The balance of the act deals with the various details relating to the overall functions and it would serve no useful purpose to dwell at length on that. Suffice it to say that your committee has had the benefit of a government expert called in by our Governor to assist us in perfecting the necessary requirements to assure Federal aid should the citizens in any town or city desire to avail themselves of this opportunity. There is nothing compulsory about this act and no one is endeavoring to force anything on any one. It is permissive enabling legislation, nothing more and nothing less. A measure of similar design passed this House in 1947. In my judgment, it would require about two years for the authority to operate since there are no annual town meetings in any town before next March. Should the act be accepted by vote of any given town

and some of the details were found to be unworkable then the necessary corrections could and would be made at the next session of the Legislature. I have made two such corrections at this session on matters relating to our Probate Court.

I now would like to take up the possibility of failure and subsequent receivership which has been mentioned to me. This program has proved so attractive in some states that large insurance companies have found it to be a desirable risk in cooperation with the Federal Government. So if the insurance companies fail and the United States Treasury become insolvent then I would concede this program to be a failure. When that day comes, I think we not only can pray for the second coming of the Lord but also for the atomic bomb to deliver us from certain chaos.

Our history is replete with constant struggle in the effort of enacting progressing legislation. Our legislative record discloses fierce debate prior to the adoption of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Would anyone care to repeal that measure today? It required some years before teachers' pensions were finally adopted and I'm sure no one would suggest the abrogating of that provision which gives this class of people a small pittance for their many years of faithful public service to the youth of our State.

And one could go on indefinitely pointing out the hard work and years of effort for the betterment of mankind.

I can assure this House that not all the building contractors and real estate agents are opposed to this measure. Two of the leading contractors in my section have no objection whatever, they realize that should my City vote to take advantage of this enabling legislation they would receive their fair share of the business thus afforded. Four of our local real estate agents likewise have no objection, recognizing that we do have unsafe and insanitary dwelling accommodations and recognizing further that an improvement in this unwholesome

condition would add to our tax valuation. We all admit, I think, that we have many areas in our State that are overcrowded and unsafe which produce a menace in the spread of disease and crime which in turn exacts its toll in human suffering and in the increase of juvenile delinquency. I am certain that we would all like to see better conditions prevail for this low income group and veterans in particular for whom this act is particularly designed.

To show you the character of attack the opposition is making to this bill, let me quote to you from a letter received by me two weeks ago. The author of this letter and myself were classmates in Warren High School. He is exactly my own age. We grew up together, played together and graduated together in the class of 1921. Aside from the exchange of Xmas cards, we have not been in touch with each other since as we both left our native town at about the same time. That was 28 years ago. He writes me in part as follows: "Dear Stuart: My attention is called to the fact that you are sponsoring a Communistic Housing bill in the State legislature and I'm wondering if you have gone batty. Independent inquiry shows that you have been an outstanding success in life and have done better by far than any member of our class. As I understand it, you have been city attorney there in Rockland and also county attorney of our home county. It is hard for me to believe that you have turned communistic to which you had no leaning in our high school days. Won't you please wake up and see the danger signal before it is too late" end of quote. I am satisfied, as no doubt you must be that the technique and strategy of those who do not care to assist the poor people and veterans of our State have adopted the novel idea to get at me personally rather than by debating the merits of this bill. That is okay with me. Another letter of similar import is here on my desk and open to any member of this House who may care to read it.



And so, my friends, the issue today for us is very simple. It is this: Are you willing to vote to allow the local towns and cities of our State to have them determine whether or not they would like low cost housing and rentals within the low income group. That is all this bill seeks to do and I want to emphasize again that this is permissive and enabling legislation under local option, which, if adopted, would place us along with the 41 other states that already have this type of legislation. The housing bill now being considered by the Congress has an appropriation of one billion five hundred million attached to it, the one we are now considering has no appropriation and no price tag. Is it fair to our citizens to sit here and have these other 41 states get everything and stand idly by and do nothing about it? Is it not to our advantage to secure all we can for our State rather than to adopt a repugnant attitude and one of non-cooperation? I submit with all the sincerity at my command that we are indeed remiss in our duty if we do not take this enabling step — and now. We are living in a highly competitive world, we need all we can get that rightfully belongs to us through legitimate channels. The State of Maine pays a tremendous sum to Uncle Sam each year. It seems only fair and honest that we too should join the other 41 States in their announced legislative intent and thus assume our rightful place in the participation of this program for the advancement of our people. Whatever it is, life is a strange condition. We each arrive in it mysteriously, and, so far as we know, without a settled state of choice respecting it. We find our feet after a short period, and start on the road to learning and experience. We pass through endless events, accomplishments, failures, joys, sorrows. All of us are on some adventure, but the course of each is uncharted and no two trips are alike. We have our own individual journey and we all

preserve our own individuality. We function more or less imperfectly and ineffectively, although some we meet have brains that seemingly operate with absolute precision. We associate with each other through choice or chance or environment. To some we are magnetically drawn, some we tolerate and by others we are repelled. Finally, at some unknown time and under unexpected circumstances comes disappearance. It is a startling development that ends the journey. There is no escape and no opportunity to evade the conclusion. It is a strange career for each and all of us. It is a pilgrimage that is interesting though impossible to understand. We begin without our consent, we travel together and separately with little power to guide the course, and finally against our wishes we are closed to existence. An indistinct picture in the mind of some acquaintance is all that remains to prove that we have ever been. We expect that we go on.

Thus do I conclude my humble contribution to the 94th Legislature. It is my first and only service in this body. It has been a grand experience and I don't regret a moment of it regardless of the result of this bill. The lasting friendships here made are a source of genuine satisfaction to me. May I thank my associate members of the Judiciary Committee for their patient cooperation in the consideration of this measure. The two public hearings conducted occupied by far more time than any other. To the two minority House members who saw fit to divide with us I have nothing but praise and I impute nothing to them but lofty ideals and holy purposes. I especially want to pay tribute to Senator George Barnes who has labored with me for hours in the perfection of this bill. I shall never forget his kindness to me which I accept with thanks and with real appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I ask for a division, and I move for the adoption of the majority committee report.

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

Mr. **ROBBINS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I simply want to say this: When I returned from my tour of military duty I had the unnerving experience of for three months living in a four-room house with nine in-laws. I got along as well with my wife's family as could be expected under the circumstances, but, nevertheless, it was an experience that I would not wish on my worst enemy.

In the Houlton area there are still dozens of veterans who are still in the same deplorable condition that I was in at that time, and if this bill will result in the construction of as much as one house for a veteran where he can have his own home, I am for it.

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

Mr. **McGLAUFLIN**: Mr. Speaker, I greatly admire the gentleman who spoke at the opening of this debate—not that I do not admire the other one also, but I have a particular reason for liking Mr. Burgess. He has stayed with me on almost everything that we have taken up together, and it is with real regret that I oppose a measure that to him is something of a pet measure.

We come here, each of us, trying to do our duty as we see it. I differ very much in my judgment and opinion from some of the members of this House, and yet I still admire them though they are my opponents. I do not hesitate to say that I include such men as Mr. Woodworth, who has been with me many times but who opposes me when he thinks he should. I have real affection for this old fighter over here, Mr. McClure. I think he is wrong lots of times, but I respect him just the same.

I am not speaking here on this bill for the sake of having my way; I am speaking on this bill to call your attention to some of the things that I see, so that when you vote

you may vote intelligently, and, however anyone votes, I shall think no different regarding them.

My brother has stated that housing provisions have been made in forty-one states. I do not question that, but I say emphatically that this bill has not been introduced in any forty-one states. I am reading from a quotation I just picked up regarding New York. "The State of New York has just brought forth a solution. Governor Thomas Dewey signed into law this week a bill enabling the municipalities within the State to use private capital in getting rid of slums."

That is a very different proposition than this bill. We had—I think that this is the third edition that came before us. The first bill that was presented I knew nothing about. The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, came in and called attention to about a dozen holes in it big enough for a train to go through. Then they brought in a new edition, trying to avoid some of the pitfalls that had been pointed out, and we had two hearings on that one. There was about an equal amount of propaganda for it as there was against it; and finally they came out with this bill.

Now in thinking of this housing proposition I naturally think of Portland, because it seemed to me that Portland was more likely to try it than any other city I know. And I think Portland, the city by the sea, with its Eastern and Western Promenades, its Lincoln Park, its Oaks, its Baxter Boulevard with the lights in the evening, and the fine, new stores that have been built there, its tall buildings, its immense granite structures, and its beautiful homes, its fine streets and its forest trees, and I hate to think of any slum development being put up in Portland.

They tell us that this is primarily for the soldiers. It is a combination of slum and soldier proposition. And I am thinking if we should have a development in the only sections that I can think of where it might be, which would

be Wards 2, 3 and 4, somewhere in that section; and supposing you developed a lot of houses there, I want to point out to you that I do not see why the soldiers themselves would want it, for this reason. This creates a class that would be known inevitably as the poor soldiers' quarters. They do not pay any taxes; they cannot live there unless they are poor. If the houses are low rate and if they are of such a rate as is provided for by Congress if that bill goes through allowing \$2500 to a room, there are not many soldiers with a family that can get along with less than four rooms, and you will find that there are but few of them who can afford to pay \$10,000 for a house. They can get one cheaper than that now.

The point I make is that there is not a soldier in this House—and there are a lot of them here—that would live in slum development, if you made it, because it creates class distinction. The soldier today can hold up his head and say "I am as good as any other man," and he can say that whether he has got a dollar in his pocket or whether he owns nothing but his shirt. But the minute you segregate them and put them in classes—that must have been some such fool way that they built up the castes in India in ancient times.

But I have a much more serious objection to this bill than what I have outlined just now. Take the matter of eminent domain. It says that this board can take any real estate. They could take Union Station if they wanted to; they could take any real estate by eminent domain. And when I pointed out that that was giving a lot of authority to five men who are to be the commissioners, the answer was, "Why, these are the best men you can find." Mr. Burgess tried to pick out me as a candidate. I wouldn't serve on that if you paid me a salary. They said, "These men work for nothing, and they can be trusted." I want to point out

to you that I know of four men, three bankers and one lawyer, that everybody thought could be trusted, who served terms in the Maine State Prison, they were so honest! I want to say to you members of this House that I do not trust anybody with unlimited power that works for nothing.

You think that is all the power they have got? You read that bill. I want to tell you first that you can read that bill, you can read it three times, and I will bet dollars to doughnuts you won't know what it means when you have read it three times. I have been studying it here for a month, and I do not know what it means yet, except that I know it means something that I don't want. That I am sure of.

They can issue bonds to an unlimited amount. Now understand, it doesn't say it as plain as I am making it, but read the bill: There is no limit to the bonds that you can issue. They can issue bonds for a billion dollars if there was anything to back it up. They can issue bonds enough to take over half the city. And let me point out to you this fact: That every bit of property they take is exempt from taxation.

I cannot understand why, if the government of the United States wants to help the soldier, why in Heaven's name doesn't it give him some money or loan him some money and let him pick out a house in a place that he wants it. You go into this slum development or this poor soldier development and you can have just so many rooms. You have got to take just what they give you, you have no choice of where you are going at all, you are going just where they put you, because you are in a class.

My first objection to this bill is that it gives too much authority to these commissioners. And bear this in mind: These commissioners are green, they do not know anything about this housing proposition; whoever they are, they have had no experience in it at all, and it is

just like turning out dynamite for a boy to handle who does not know anything about it to turn it over to a bunch of green men who do not know what this bill means. You are giving them power to take by eminent domain the whole City of Portland or any other town in this State, and then you are giving them the power to issue bonds to try to pay for what they take.

The hour is passing and you have heard me pretty near long enough. I can imagine that some of you are praying that I will stop soon. I could go on for a long time, but I am going to try to make it short.

The next proposition you have got in this bill is that it is accepted, as far as Portland is concerned, by the city council—and haven't they got good judgment? Well, if seven of them wanted that bill that I just opposed and that we just defeated, I am not so sure that they have got good judgment to trust in matters of this kind. But they can give away the city. I have no intention of misrepresenting anything, but just read it and see if you do not think that under this bill they can give away Lincoln Park and the next thing they will do will be to give away Baxter Boulevard as a bonus. They can provide streets and paving and everything necessary to make it a success, but the commission that takes this property doesn't pay any taxes. If you follow this through you will find that they can pay back what they please, but when will they ever please? I am going to stop now. If this bill passes, before it gets through, I will give you some more facts.

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

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to ask Mr. Burgess a few questions, if he cares to answer. First, is this legal for Maine savings banks, the bonds that they issue? What style of house are they going to build? Is it going to be on cement posts or a concrete cellar complete? Next, I would like to

know how much the veteran has to pay down on this house before any bank will take it. Then it says in here it says, "government insurance guaranteed." Now how much of a guarantee do they give this veteran if he takes one of these homes? If you would care to answer those, I would like to have you, please.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess, who may answer the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Thompson, if he wishes.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to answer in so far as I can. There are many things about the mechanics that I do not know about. I am frank to say that. I did go to New York and New Jersey at my own expense and examined some of these places. I found them to be very desirable; they were of various sizes and varied in number of rooms. What was your other question?

Mr. THOMPSON: How much does the veteran have to pay down on this house?

Mr. BURGESS: That also varies.

Mr. THOMPSON: If the government guarantees a five thousand dollar house and it is in the slums, this nine thousand dollar home, will the bank go down there and loan 80 per cent on that house, or do they have to lower it down to fifty or sixty per cent in order for the veteran to have it?

Mr. BURGESS: That is entirely up to the bank, sir, I would say.

Mr. THOMPSON: What I am trying to find out: Is it good for the veterans to go down there and buy one of these homes before they go to some bank and find out whether the banks are going to take these loans before the veterans take them?

Mr. BURGESS: Are you not confused with the previous legislation?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would suggest that if the gentlemen can get together somewhere on the way, they might discuss the matter.

Mr. THOMPSON: What I wanted to find out was this: I have

been interested for a good many years in appraising homes for banks, and I have found, in different localities where these houses are placed, it depends on the location of the home whether the bank will take them on the 80 per cent which the federal government asks. Now a veteran goes in and he is entitled to fifty per cent, the government fifty and the bank fifty. Now we have to go into some of these places to find out what they are doing. I am wondering, if they are in slum districts, whether or not the banks would take them.

Mr. BURGESS: This is not a slum clearance program.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess. He may answer the question of the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Thompson, if he sees fit.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to answer the question in so far as my ability will permit. My answer is this: This is not a slum clearance program; it is a redevelopment program. The first act we had before our committee had slum clearance in it and that was stricken out.

Now when you ask me about the financing and the banking you get me into a field where, when I cannot even keep my own checkbook, I do not believe I can intelligently answer the questions.

Mr. THOMPSON: Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess, that the House do accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I understand that the manager of the Veterans Administration Facility here at Togus, Col. Malcolm Stoddard, favors this bill; he feels that it is workable and may assist to solve the veterans' problems. If he thinks that it will work, I am wil-

ling, for one, to go along with the majority of the committee.

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

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will try to be extremely brief. First, I must say that I admire everybody in the House. South Portland has had some experience with this housing from a practical standpoint. I cannot discuss the legal affairs; but during the war, with the shipyards in South Portland, with the defense workers, many federal or national housing projects were established, many of them with federal funds, some with private funds.

We have in South Portland at the present time a group known as the South Portland Housing Authority, which handles the national projects. I am sorry to hear that Judge McGlauffin is so suspicious of human nature. I imagine he finds it very difficult to get along. We have in South Portland a group of men in our housing projects of unquestionable integrity. I do not think anyone could find fault with them or be suspicious and believe they are either going to steal the houses or steal the city. We have to place our trust in somebody.

Of these housing projects, many of them have been demolished or furnish housing at our colleges and other places. We still have such projects as Broad View, Broad View Extension, Perry Village, Red Bank Village. During the war the police did have a problem with some of these projects on account of the type of occupants that inhabited some of the places; but at the present time the citizenry there have stabilized themselves and I am proud of the people that live in those projects, and those people that live in those projects are proud to live there, too. They have in Red Bank the Red Bank Community Club; they have their own president, they have their own directors; they carry along a lot of their own social activities and those people are proud to live in Red Bank.

After the war, when the shipyards were closing down, we did have a quite a bit of activity with the Navy, because stationed there was the North Atlantic destroyer fleet. As the base gradually, you might say disintegrated, men were there for a certain amount of time, a year or two years, and these men had to find homes where they could live, and they desired to have their families with them. These projects were excellent for the service men. The service man had his wife, his children, and possibly eight or nine of his in-laws—I don't know.

At Perry Village they also have their own community club. At Broad View they also have their own community club; they have their own place where the inhabitants there can assemble and carry on many social activities. I do not mean by that they they are exclusive at all, but they certainly are proud of the places that they live in.

Since I have been here in the last week, and the other two representatives from South Portland, we have received numerous letters and telegrams, particularly and naturally from the people who live in these dwellings. We each have received about thirty-five or forty letters and six or eight telegrams from the inhabitants there.

I am quite proud of these places in South Portland, and I am quite proud of the citizens who live there. We have passed through a stage, and are still in that stage, of where certain businesses are taking large profits. And, as Judge McGlauffin has said, why you can go out and buy a house for \$10,000. Sure enough you can, if you have got the \$10,000; but if a man has an income of forty or fifty dollars a week I do not know how he is going to buy a house that is going to cost him \$10,000.

In these housing projects they are supposed to give the ex-service man preference. I suppose that is class legislation again. The service man has been away for a period of years, and he returns. Maybe he hasn't a family and maybe he has,

but he still has responsibilities. He has a preference in these housing projects when he puts his name in, and he knows he has a preference over a lot of other people who have their application in too. These projects are always full and there are no vacancies. They generally have a waiting list of, well, I don't know, but, as I remember, from twenty-five to forty names.

I think it helps our citizens to be better citizens, and I think it helps our citizens to be healthier citizens. If any of you are in South Portland in the future, whether this bill passes or not, I think it would be well worth your while to just drive through these housing projects to see how the people in the low income brackets can live in low-value rents.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure.

**MR. McCLURE:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Augusta (Mr. Campbell) bring up the name of Malcolm Stoddard, Regional Director of the Veterans Facility in Togus. For the benefit of the non-veterans in the House, I can state that when I was discharged from the service in the first World War on the 25th of January back in 1919, one of the first men I contacted was Malcolm Stoddard. He then was in charge of the Veterans Administration in Maine. Gentleman, that was many years ago, but he has been interested and at the head of the veterans' department since that time. He should be an authority on the needs of veterans.

I might say that I have been contacted, either by mail, telegram or personal contact, by leaders of the State Department of the American Legion, the American Veterans Association and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They endorse this enabling act.

Now, gentlemen, housing and rentals are close to my pocketbook, due to the fact that the largest percentage of my income is derived from rental property, and the Lord

knows that we who have been renting property during the past few years have not had too much income, due to government restrictions. So, naturally, I feel you all know I am not too much in favor of big government, be it national or state.

I do feel, however, that the enabling act presented by my seat mate, the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess, is a step that will aid in taking some of our veterans out of some of the foxholes that they and their families are living in. Our veterans were ready to remain in foxholes when they proved beyond a doubt that they were citizens first. But should we now keep them in living quarters that are in many instances worse than those selfsame foxholes? An ungrateful Legislature would reward the victims of the greatest war known to man by putting them back in foxholes. I trust that this enabling act will have your support.

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

Mr. **PAYSON**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was one of the signers of the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

I think, perhaps, there has been some confusion here in the minds of the members as to just what this bill does. As I understand it, this bill is designed solely to provide a housing authority; to provide rentals at a low rate, at a low figure, for a low income group.

Now, Congress, being aware of the fact that there are a lot of substandard dwellings in the United States, and wanting to take some action to rectify that, passed this legislation which enables local authorities to receive guarantees for bonds which they issue to finance that housing project.

I believe Mr. Thompson will find that there are no houses under this act that would be sold; they would all be rented, the idea in back of it being to take care of this group which cannot afford. As Mr. Mc-

Glauffin pointed out, why don't they buy a house of their own and let the government loan them the money? The answer to that is that their income is so small now they cannot afford to pay back the loan. So this legislation is designed primarily to take care of that group. Your housing authority would be created by the vote of the municipality in a city or town. You do not have to have it if you don't want it. So if any substandard unit exists in the town that you wish to close up, tear down or take out of the market, you would replace with another unit built by the housing authority. Now, this has a veterans' preference in it and it would help the veteran but is not primarily veterans' legislation. It takes in all groups and all peoples and all society, and all cities and towns.

Now, you can argue against the bill on the grounds that it is the wrong kind of legislation, that it is socialistic or legislation of that nature if you want to. But I don't think anybody can rightfully say that where this legislation has existed that it has ever been a failure. It has been a fact that in the forty-one states that have it, it has provided greater impetus to do away with juvenile delinquency; it has improved the health, morals and standards of the community. Wherever these bonds have been issued by the housing authority, they have not once failed. It also results in less fire hazard; those dwellings that are to be either closed up or torn down when the authority is built.

Now, private builders might be opposed to this bill but I can't see where it could possibly compete with them. Private builders can't possibly build housing units which these veterans can afford to rent at a low price. Therefore, they are not going to be in the market for those people. This legislation is designed to take care of those people, because private housing can't do it and can't afford to do it. Furthermore, I would remind you that it is merely enabling legis-

lation. No city or town has to have it if they don't want to but if there is a need for it, the city or town thinks they will have to have it, they can by a proper vote of the municipal officers enact the housing authority.

I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rockland (Mr. Burgess) prevails.

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

Mr. ROUNDY: Mr. Speaker, in the later years of my active service in the work in which I was assigned in our Congregational conference, there was a very definite interdenominational agreement which was assigned to me to see what could be done to establish a church and furnish church services in one of these South Portland areas. I became very much interested in the project we have in mind growing out of that experience. I am glad to report that that church is going on. I came to realize then the need for lower rent than is ordinarily possible where needs are very real. I think enough of the varied elements that go into this bill have been talked about and I need not spend time in that direction. I have one or two testimonies that I do want to add to this discussion, among the several letters which I have received. For example, this one:

"My five sons were all in the recent conflict and I know the difficulty they had to find a place to live." A request from the Executive Committee of the American War Dads have probably received this same message that support should be given to this project. A request from the Citizens Housing Committee of Portland indicating that they were unanimously favoring the passage of this document, "An Act to Create Public Bodies to be Known as Housing Authorities." I am very glad to indicate my interest in this project and my hope that this Legislature will see its way to make it possible for communities to establish these

housing units, which, to my mind, are in a reasonable direction and reasonably forward looking in the attempt which they are making.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It has been my custom to try to look at a matter as impartially as possible. I was born in the town of Webster in this State, just outside of Lewiston, brought up and educated in Wilton and Jay; I helped my father out on a rocky farm and developed some independence of thought or I would not arise after so many gentlemen have spoken in favor of this bill and only one against it.

I am reminded of the remarks of the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar. We have had some tax measures before the House and, as I recall it, he spoke in opposition to the first one and referred to it as a pig in a bag. Later, another one came along and I believe he referred to that as the same old pig in a bag, and thereafter the same reference was made as each one came up. Now, this is not the same old pig but this is a different kind of pig in the same old bag.

I sat in the Judiciary Committee room four afternoons, two public hearings, two private hearings, with representatives for the housing authority from New York in attendance. I studied this bill several times and I assure you that there isn't a member of this House, or anyone in this State, who can tell you what the provisions of the federal law are or will be or how this law will operate.

We have come, in this State and throughout this nation, to believe in Santa Claus. Of course, as a small child, most of us did, and it is rather a pleasant myth.

Our great white father in Washington is fostering that belief but I want you to take into consideration the fact that every penny that comes back from Washington in any community has to come out of your pocket and mine and that



this case is rather worse than that in my judgment.

I am going to deviate from that thought for just a moment and touch upon the effect upon the building program in this country. In our United States, in your private enterprise building, we have well over four hundred square feet of housing per individual. In England, where they have tried public housing for some time they have 105 square feet per individual and in Russia, forty square feet. Our Saturday Evening Post of December 11, 1948, editorially says: "That labor and material in the building trade are already utilized to full capacity and that our government subsidy of housing would have little effect except to make housing more expensive." Then, I have another reference here, in Redwood City, California, when the first housing authority was being considered in 1946, that 1946 bill, there was enough material on storage by the federal government at a time when building materials were being rationed to build 6,000 homes.

I submit to you that that is about what happens when the federal government and the government on a large scale engage in enterprise. You or I, as an individual, can perform an operation at less expense than any government agency. Our local talent can do it cheaper than the State. The State can do it cheaper than the federal government. It is true as stated that this is permissive legislation, but all legislation that is questionable comes in as permissive legislation.

I would like to point out a few of the things the bill does. First, the property that the housing authority builds is tax exempt. The bonds that they might issue, the interest on them is exempt. If they destroy or tear down property and resell it because it is not suitable for housing, it is a capital loss. As I recall the remarks of the gentleman, Mr. Hillman, from New York, the local authority or the

municipality have to share one-third of that capital loss. I would like you to keep that point in mind.

These projects would be expensive. As you know, government operations are expensive. The rents are to be left, as we were informed, at from \$18 to \$25 per month. If that is true, someone, somewhere, has to make up that other \$25 or \$30 per month that it would cost under a more efficient private operation. The federal government contributes a part of that subsidy, the local town or city where the authority builds contributes the rest. The property is tax exempt. It is true that the authority may contribute something toward the government operation if they wish, but the city or town must contribute more than twenty per cent of the subsidy. They do that either through furnishing tax exemptions, through public services, electricity or what have you but in some way they must furnish more than one-fifth.

This bill we have before us provides that it is for low income groups, that your income must not exceed five times the annual rental. At \$25 per month, that would mean a person earning \$1500 per year. I don't know what they are going to do if you get a raise of a dollar a week; whether you would move out or just how they would operate. If you have a family, there is an additional \$100 income permitted.

It seems to me any housing authority building on a large scale is going to absorb and use the material and make it impossible for large scale builders to operate but make it impossible for the young and ambitious fellow who is earning a salary that would permit him to build a little house to do so. The fellow who is earning an extra \$5 a week above the amount that is permitted will, through taxation, have to help support this house which is subsidized. That will make it impossible for him to rent a decent home or build one of his own.

If you look into the pattern of legislation in those countries that have developed a centralized state or socialistic state, you will find that one of the first fields in which they operate is housing. Why does that start the ball rolling which is impossible to stop? Simply this: Once you start building, the next income group above that comes in and needs assistance and you move into that income class and the thing grows, year after year and month after month. Then they branch out into the utility field and into the other industries.

In closing I merely want to recite something that happened after one of our informal hearings. One of the chief proponents of the bill, when I made a statement similar to the one I have just made, said that he didn't think I needed to be worried on that point. He mentioned some of our Maine members in the Senate and Congress and some from the mid-west who are in favor of the bill and I told him that was one of the reasons why I was afraid of it. It showed that we are moving down that road to socialism rather rapidly. I asked him this further question. This gentleman happened to come from Portland and Cumberland County, and some of you know, at least the gentlemen from Portland do, there is a company operating in Portland, the Cumberland Company, which owns a great deal of real estate. I asked this gentleman if he thought that any private individual would build a home for rental, any kind of a building, where there was any possibility of a housing development. He said: "Oh, yes, it wouldn't interfere at all." And I asked him this further question; I called his attention to the fact that in Rumford the Cumberland Company has built a fairly large housing project. I asked him what he thought the Cumberland Company would have done had this law been on the books and had a few people in Rumford been asking for a housing authority. He laughed and stated emphatically that he

did not believe they would ever have built a house in Rumford.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Baileyville, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, if solving the housing problem in this country is socialism, then I am going to be a socialist. Every move, united move, that we hear about in our day to relieve problems such as we have facing us at the present time in this country relative to housing is always labelled socialism. Anyone who travels over this country and sees some of the conditions under which people live, I should think we would all realize that it was time that some move should be taken to try and solve that problem.

I think and I made this statement once before in this House before a committee, that if this problem had been presented at the time the German hordes were streaming across Europe, we certainly would be here today digging down and trying to do something to solve the housing problem for our veterans who did save this country and everything that we hold dear in this country. And I have heard them speak of the right of eminent domain in this bill. We are so afraid that they will use that right of eminent domain. We never hesitated down through the years to give the right of eminent domain to our railroads and some of the other utilities. We had no fear that they would abuse that right of eminent domain. And yet when we have a problem as serious as the problems of today in this country for housing, we pick all of these petty little things out of it and say we should not pass that because we are afraid, it is leading to socialism; we are afraid the right will be abused. Why any piece of legislation that we pass in this Legislature, we could all shoot it full of holes if we only dig underneath, and I don't think this bill here is any worse than some of the others that we have passed.

Our late President told us in one of his major speeches that fifty per cent of the population of this

country was living in abodes unfit for human beings. And I think, as you travel around, you will agree with him. And when our boys had to come back and live with their relatives and let me say that that is one of the causes of our divorce courts being so full of cases of divorce is the fact that a soldier has returned and married and is compelled to go with one of his relatives to live. They can't be by themselves; they cannot enjoy life as they should and so they are compelled to separate and that's the reason we see the condition such as it is today.

Maybe this bill isn't perfect, but I believe it is an approach to the problem we have facing us in this country today. Let's pass it and let's take a chance on it. If there is anything wrong, I am sure, like every other law we have in this country, we can rectify it at some future date. But if we take an attitude of this kind forever on matters as serious as this, we are never going to make any progress. So, I want to go along with my good friend and colleague, Brother Burgess, here, and support him in this worthwhile measure.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth.

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise as a signer of the majority report in support of the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess.

The fact that we have to have at the outset a slum clearance project indicates to a certain extent that the right of eminent domain will not be abused. I feel that every community which might seek to utilize this bill that eminently qualified citizens should be found to take over the duties of authority.

The fact that the bonds must be sold at par indicates that there will not be an excessive issue of bonds and I think the chances of a loss by the community are very slight. As it was explained to us by the officials who came down be-

fore your committee and we had at least three hearings and I think four, a donation is usually made to the city or municipality to equalize the tax lost. I think there is no loss there.

This bill was passed primarily for the benefit of veterans. We have very few localities in the State who might seek to take advantage of it. I do not believe that we should deny the veterans of this State advantages which they could secure in other states, and for that reason, I hope that the majority report on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland (Mr. Burgess) will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Merritt.

Mr. MERRITT: Mr. Speaker, I have heard quite a little on this this afternoon and I have come to the conclusion which way I shall vote if it comes to a vote, and I now move that it be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to support this measure on behalf of His Excellency, the Governor of Maine. I am sure that we are all aware that this is one of the very few pieces of legislation that he asked us for earlier in the sessions, or rather asked us to give serious consideration to. I do not attempt at this time to make any explanation of the bill; that has been amply done. I am speaking from a personal standpoint. It so happens that I live in a community which is fast becoming probably the greatest defense location in the whole United States and perhaps the world. I can see in that community problems which it cannot solve of its own accord and because of those two reasons, I hope you will not vote for the indefinite postponement and will eventually, when the motion is put, vote to accept the majority "Ought to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Merritt, that the report and the Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Muskie.

Mr. MUSKIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House; I realize you are all very impatient to get this over with and I am going to speak very briefly, as a signer of the majority "Ought to pass" report in support of the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Burgess. It is a pleasure to see him get the McGlauffin treatment this afternoon. He is a very nice fellow but Mr. McGlauffin and I have used that on each other all session. (Laughter)

I would only like to give you a few statistics that I think might be appropriate. Before doing so, I would like to make some comment here on the suggestion that we are looking for a Santa Claus; that we look to the great white father in Washington to solve our problems. I have noticed that the gentleman who made the remark has been very concerned during this session with a condition which you will find described in Section 2 of the bill under consideration, and I will quote the section: "that these conditions cause an increase in and spread of disease and crime and constitute a menace to the health, safety, morals and welfare of the residents of the state; that these conditions necessitate excessive and disproportionate expenditures of public funds for crime prevention and punishment, public health and safety, fire and accident protection, and other public services and facilities."

A large part of our endeavors during this session has been in an effort to raise money to meet the results of those conditions. We have seen pressure brought to bear to raise more money for aid to dependent children, old age assistance and more money for our institutions which are filled with inmates brought there as the result of these conditions. We are to assume that

those efforts to raise that kind of money are perfectly legitimate but efforts which would tend to eliminate the cause or the need for such expenditures are socialistic. It doesn't seem to me that the two positions are consistent.

If we were to be debating here the feasibility of the State housing authority, it would be as to the need for such housing. Now I don't feel prepared myself to say which communities or how many communities are in need of additional housing or which are facing an acute housing shortage but here, as I see it, is an attempt to put the problem on a local basis by providing enabling legislation which will permit local communities an opportunity to determine for themselves whether they are facing a housing shortage and if they are to take the necessary steps to solve it.

Now the statistics to which I referred have to do with the veterans of Maine. It is a fact that since the end of the war, Maine has lost its veterans of World War II at the rate of 1500 to 2,000 per year or a total of over 11,000 at the present time because of lack of opportunities, lack of jobs, lack of future, lack of housing, because of lack of an opportunity to provide living conditions for their families.

Recently a poll was taken of veterans who are still living in this State. This poll covered 2500 veterans in over 140 of our communities. The poll was taken for the purpose of learning under what conditions those veterans are living today. Of the 2500 interviewed, 800 owned their own housing facilities, 1776 rented. Of the 2500 interviewed, 2,000 would like to be able to own their own houses.

I am not going down through all of the statistics that were compiled from this poll but I think these additional would be significant. This had to do with the quality of rental housing which is available to our veterans. Now, as I go down through three or four of these items, you will find if you total the figures, that over fifty per cent of the dissatisfac-

tion on the part of veterans with their rental housing is directly connected to the cost of that housing and their ability to pay for it. Poor maintenance by the landlord is given as a cause of dissatisfaction by twelve per cent of the veterans interviewed. Excessive rental, twenty-eight per cent; excessive cost of upkeep, eight per cent; too small, nineteen per cent. Inadequate facilities, ten per cent. Bad location, eleven per cent. Now these statistics, if they prove nothing else, prove to me that there is a serious housing shortage in the State in some localities and that those localities should be given the opportunity and authority to proceed on their own to solve what other problems they may be facing in that regard.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Merritt, that the report and the Bill be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question? The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, has requested a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Mapleton, Mr. Merritt that the report and Bill be indefinitely postponed will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and sixty having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee, and

the new draft having been printed, the Bill was given its two several readings under suspension of the rules and assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Consideration has been given to the late hour in considering whether or not an evening session would be wise. So, at this time, I want to make a motion that the House do now adjourn until 8.30 A. M., Eastern Standard Time, tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: While the Clerk is preparing to read the notices, the Chair at this time will particularly wish to thank the reporters of the House who have spent yesterday and today very faithfully at unusually hard work and I hope the members of the House appreciate the strain that they have been under and this is one of the factors much as I realize many of you members might have desired a night session tonight, we do have to consider the physical wellbeing of the reporters and the members of the staff of the Clerk. (Applause)

The Clerk will read the notices.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, now moves that the House do adjourn until 8:30 A. M., Eastern Standard Time, Thursday, May the 5th.

Thereupon the motion prevailed and the House so adjourned.