

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

SENATE

Thursday, January 13, 1949

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Douglas B. Robbins of Augusta.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Orders

(Out of Order)

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, out of order and under suspension of the rules, it was

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Tuesday, January 18th, 1949, at four-thirty o'clock in the afternoon. (S. P. 38)

Sent down for concurrence.

Subsequently the foregoing order was returned from the House, having been read and passed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, out of order and under suspension of the rules, it was

ORDERED, the House concurring, that no bills for private or special legislation be received by this legislature after one o'clock on the afternoon of Wednesday, February 2nd, 1949, and that no other bill or resolve be received by this legislature after one o'clock on the afternoon of Wednesday, February 9th, 1949, except by unanimous consent in the body in which it is introduced, and it was further

ORDERED, that any bill or resolve which shall be received in either body of this Legislature by unanimous consent, after the time above set, shall stand referred to the Ninety-fifth Legislature if unanimous consent for its reception is not given in the other body in concurrence. This order shall not apply to bills reported by any joint standing or joint select committee, in the regular course of business nor to such bills and resolves as are intended only to facilitate the business of the Ninety-fourth Legislature; and it was further

ORDERED, that the Secretary of the Senate cause a copy of this order to be published in all the daily and weekly papers of the State, commencing January 25th, 1949 and continuing up to and including February 9th, 1949. (S. P. 50)

Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I would like to say a few words to the members of the Senate concerning this cloture order we have just passed. As probably the senior member of the entire legislature, I have been here when sessions were only about ten weeks long. I was also a member of the last session which was twenty weeks long and I honestly believe that the length of the session was caused by the delay of the introduction of bills and their reference to committees for hearing.

I appeal to all members of the Senate, members of both parties, to get those bills in at once, to get them assigned to committees at once, and to hold hearings on them so that we may get out of here before the Fourth of July. I think I know the procedure. I think I know some of the problems we may have to solve before this session ends, and unless we act promptly I am afraid we will have another lengthy session. Some of you may well be able to afford to stay here all summer. I cannot. I would like to get home and try to get back into business as soon as possible. I know some of you, especially those who are farming, are anxious to get back and plant your peas before the Fourth of July.

The only way I know of that we can avoid a long session, is to get on the ball, get the ball rolling, get those bills reported.

Mr. SLEEPER of Knox: Mr. President, I would like to have the Senate reconsider its action whereby it passed the order introduced by the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, relative to the closed date on bills. Setting Feb-

bruary 2nd as the date is shortening up the usual period by more than a week. It doesn't shorten the session by any means if you shorten the time for the introduction of bills. In the state of Massachusetts, I think they follow the practice that all bills have to be introduced prior to the opening of the session and that certainly doesn't shorten the session in Massachusetts. I think if we shorten the period for the introduction of bills, we will only increase the number of bills introduced by unanimous consent. I would like to have the passage of that order reconsidered and the order laid upon the table.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, speaking in opposition to the motion to reconsider the passage of the order, I think I am correct in stating that the last legislature was the first one in many years that set the first week in February for the private bills and the second week in February for the public bills. It seems to me that in the next two weeks, if all of us get to work on these bills and tell our constituents who may wish to introduce bills into this legislature that they have only two more weeks in which they can present their bills, we can accomplish a worthwhile purpose. If there is merit in extending the time one more week, there would be some merit in extending it another week. I believe we should rather vigorously stick to the policy of getting the bills in by the second week in February. That will give us ample time to prepare them and once we do, the arguments of my good friend, the Senator from Knox are equally potent for a second or third or fourth week in February. Those of you who sweated this thing out until the middle of May last session, may have wondered why we didn't get our reports in. This is a pretty good time to make some firm resolutions about getting this session going and getting home in some reasonable time. If it is only for the purpose of stopping payment of five cents a mile for travel, I think the people of Maine will

appreciate our willingness to get this session adjourned at an early date.

I sincerely hope that the motion to reconsider does not prevail.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, I do not suppose there is a Senator in this hall who does not want to get through with this session just as soon as possible. I certainly do. There usually is quite a lot of sound and fury at this very early date in the session about adjournment. Then the noise subsides and for two or three months you don't hear any talk and then along toward the end of the session, there is a lot more sound and fury.

This is not the question. This debate is not framed along the lines that the Senator from Rockland and myself wish to prolong the session. We are as interested as anyone here in getting home, but I do not believe that the changing of the cloture rule to an earlier date will accomplish this purpose. All of us have certain matters that we already know we must introduce here and that being so we could make the cloture order even a week earlier than the one presented but I have found from my experience in both branches of the legislature that there are matters which come up after the cloture rule is effective, matters that are important.

I don't believe it would shorten the session one bit to pass the present cloture order. I think it should be moved beyond the time limit by at least a week in each case. I believe it would have the effect of shortening the session if we did this. We get debate when members wish to present bills by unanimous consent and also there is a very real danger that some bills which should be before this legislature would not receive unanimous consent.

If all the bills are introduced that were introduced two years ago, it is going to be mighty hard to adjourn this session early. I believe one committee, the Judiciary Committee had something like 221 public hearings during the last session. It is pretty hard to shorten that

situation. I don't believe we would accomplish the hoped for result if we pass this order. I hope that the motion of the Senator from Knox (Senator Sleeper) does prevail.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, I agree with Senator Sleeper. In the first instance, the last session of the legislature convened on New Year's day. This legislature met a week later approximately, and if this order passes, you have shortened the time for the introduction of bills, by approximately one week. It has been my experience in the brief time I have been in the legislature that the delay is caused, not so much by the introduction of bills as by the next order that will come along later, whereby any bill, the title of which is in the hands of the Revisor, may be received and then he will draft the measure and you may get it sometime the last part of March. Some bills written the last session of the legislature suffered the same fate, having been introduced by title and no one knew what they were and the committee was criticised for delaying the procedure of the legislature, so I hope the motion of the Senator from Knox, does prevail.

Mr. SLEEPER of Knox: Mr. President, I will have to beg your pardon for speaking a second time on the same matter, but I will have to introduce a personal angle. I have found that since I have been elevated to this Senate I am asked to introduce many more bills than was the custom in the lower Body. I have told several town officers and officials who have mentioned certain bills which they wish to have introduced that there was no particular hurry, that the cloture rule did not go into effect until the middle of February and I have to go back now and tell them they will have to hurry them up. I don't think they can hurry some of them up and I think I heartily concur with the idea put forth by the Senator from Hancock that the session has already been shortened one week because we didn't convene this legislature until the sixth or seventh of January where-

as the last session started the first day so I certainly hope that the Senate will render me the courtesy, and the people I represent, of giving us the extra week, at least, to introduce bills.

I am positive it will not lengthen the session. I might mention the fact again that in Massachusetts they have to introduce every bill before the session convenes and they don't ever adjourn until June or July. The best way to shorten the session is to make our weeks longer and start Mondays instead of Tuesdays, if you really want to shorten the session. I certainly hope the Senate will see the justice of my request and lay that rule on the table.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President this order was passed here about fifteen minutes ago. I have been here four sessions. This is my fifth session and I don't believe it will make any difference or that we will adjourn one day earlier whether the rule passes or not. I think it has been proven that bills put in by titles many times will be introduced later than we would hope.

I have, like other bodies, marched up the hill and down the hill and it seems a little bit foolish. These three gentlemen who are now putting on this debate let that order go through. They are all seasoned legislators and know what is going on. And why should they now want to reconsider what they did ten minutes ago. I don't understand it.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I didn't think my few remarks would start such an argument about cloture. I am not too much impressed with the cloture date. I am agreeable to go along with what we have passed and I will vote to sustain it. The second or ninth of February doesn't mean much to me. What is really important is that the bills themselves should be put in, and not just the title. It has been pointed out by those who are opposed to the cloture rule and the date when the title of bills are introduced the bills are not drawn up until afterwards and that

has been illustrated to me in the last session.

I think either the cloture should be granted with the understanding that no bills are to be introduced by title only or that we should hold to the cloture rule. I also believe, Mr. President—and that is the only reason I am addressing the Senate—that if the bills were brought in not by title only but in their entirety and if they were put in the hopper and went through the mill and hearings were started sooner and reports of committees went in sooner and if the committees instead of holding bills up after hearing would report on them within a week after they were heard, it would really shorten the term of this legislature.

In other words, Mr. President, I will be very blunt. To me there has been too much horseplay in the past, holding bills back to see what would happen to other bills. Let the bills come back from committees with their report on the merits of each bill and let both branches of the legislature decide what they want to do with them. Let us do away with horseplay and get down to brass tacks. Let us get the bills in and get them reported on as soon as possible and I think we will get out of here before July fourth.

Mr. SLOCUM of Cumberland: Mr. President, I am sure we are all in agreement that it is advisable to shorten the session as much as possible. There are a number, in fact I think a majority of the members of the House who are new members, trying to get their feet placed. Several of the Senators have said that to expedite the work of the legislature is in one instance getting the bills in, but if our committees can meet for their hearings and get reports in, we can expedite action much more than by merely closing the date of introducing measures.

I believe it is very worthwhile that this matter is brought up at this time as it will bring to the attention of the members of both Bodies that unless bills are in we cannot start the hearings and if the

committees can have their hearings and get their reports in, we can expedite matters that way.

As far as the closing date is concerned, those members who have not had previous experience are at a very great disadvantage. I was talking with two members yesterday who are trying to find out how to get legislation drafted. They are meeting with department heads and have contacted the municipal officers of the areas they serve and it will take them at least two weeks to make contacts to draft bills. It is unfortunate in that they have not had the experience that some of the members have had who have been here before. I do believe that if the two branches of the legislature would give unanimous consent to those members who are unable to get information to prepare legislation early, then it would be all right to make an early cloture date. On the other hand, those who have had previous experience have a great advantage in the early cloture date.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator Sleeper that the Senate reconsider its action whereby it passed Joint Order relative to Cloture.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin

A division of the Senate was had.

Fifteen having voted in the affirmative and fifteen opposed, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

Papers from the House referred in concurrence.

Communication
STATE OF MAINE
Office of the Governor
Augusta

January 12, 1949

The Honorable President
The Honorable Speaker
of the House
Ninety-Fourth Legislature
Gentlemen:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to transmit herewith a letter from the Honorable Percival P. Baxter of Portland, a former Governor of Maine, in which he offers an addi-

tional 14,286 acres of land comprised in three tracts in Piscataquis County, and one tract in Penobscot County, for inclusion in Baxter State Park. All of this land is designated for public purposes.

Please note that the Honorable Mr. Baxter's communication is accompanied by two Acts. First, an Act accepting the 14,286 acres, and, second, an Act amending by mutual consent certain provisions of the laws of 1945 and 1947 relating to construction and maintenance of roads with the Park area. The Honorable Mr. Baxter states that in his opinion, the original deed of gift provisions as to roads seem somewhat too severe, and it is his desire to change them, in order to provide latitude for road construction and maintenance in future years.

If you accept this extraordinary gift, the Baxter Park area will contain 141,712 acres, which will be maintained in the natural wild state of this beautiful region. Prior gifts have been ten in number, and have been accepted by ten legislative Acts and by two Resolutions of the Forestry Commissioner and the Governor and Executive Council.

Mr. Baxter's altruistic beneficence will make certain that this vast area be kept in its natural state for the enjoyment of all Maine citizens and for the pleasure of thousands of visitors who come to Maine each year in search of unspoiled, healthful recreation, and will guarantee in perpetuity this immense area of the State which includes Mount Katahdin.

It is urged that you give your most serious consideration to the immediate acceptance of this gift under the terms and conditions as defined in the acceptance Act and the Act amending by mutual consent certain provisions in the current law relating to construction and maintenance of roads within the Park area.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. PAYNE (S. P. 25)

Which was read and ordered placed on file.

Sent to the House.

Communication

January 3, 1949

To the Honorable Frederick G. Payne, Governor and the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the Ninety-Fourth Legislature.

During the period from March 3, 1931 to January 8, 1947 inclusive I have donated and conveyed to the State of Maine one hundred twenty-seven thousand four hundred and twenty-six (127,426) acres of forest land in Piscataquis County, the same being the area known as Baxter State Park. These gifts, twelve in number, have been accepted by ten (10) Legislative Acts and by two (2) Resolutions of the Forest Commissioner and the Governor and Executive Council.

Since the last gift was made by me and accepted by the Legislature, Chapter 1 of the Private and Special Laws of 1947, I have acquired three (3) additional tracts of land in Piscataquis County and one (1) tract in Penobscot County, the four (4) totaling fourteen thousand two hundred eighty-six (14,286) acres. I now come to you offering these four (4) areas as an addition to said State Park. If you accept this gift the Park area then will be one hundred forty-one thousand seven hundred twelve (141,712) acres in extent.

The three (3) areas in Piscataquis County I now offer you are, 1-six thousand two hundred forty-seven (6,247) acres and 2- five hundred thirty-six (536) acres both in township six (6) range nine (9), and 3-six thousand seventeen (6,017) acres in township three (3) range ten (10).

The fourth (4th) area of one thousand four hundred eighty-six (1,486) acres is in township six (6) range eight (8) Penobscot County, all W. E. L. S. Except for one small undivided ownership of less than seventy-five (75) acres in this Penobscot County tract which I expect to acquire in the near future, all of the land heretofore and now donated to the State of Maine is one unbroken area free from undivided ownerships.

It is fortunate that I was able to acquire for the State these four (4) areas, for we now have a Park with its northeast corner bordering on the East Branch of the Penobscot River and on First Grand or Matakamog Lake. Its southwest corner borders on the West Branch of that River. Mount Katahdin, Traveler Mountain and the other thirty peaks and mountains in the Park lie between these two branches of this river.

With this communication I am offering the State two (2) Deeds that convey the four (4) areas referred to; one is a Deed from me as an individual and one from me as a Trustee. The Deed from me as Trustee of the six thousand seven-hundred (6,017) acres in township three (3) range ten (10) conveys to the State land bought by me from the Trustees of a Bangor estate under a Decree of Honorable Raymond Fellows, Justice of our Supreme Judicial Court. This method of acquiring this area was necessary in order to clear away certain legal technicalities.

ROADS IN BAXTER STATE PARK

In my former Deeds of January 2, 1945 and January 8, 1947 as recorded in Chapter 1 Laws of 1945 and Chapter 1 Laws of 1947, certain restrictions as to the construction and maintenance of roads within the Park were imposed in the gift. Although I want this area always to be left in "its natural wild state" as provided in all my Deeds to the State, I also want this area to be reasonably accessible to those persons who enjoy the wilderness and who wish to go there for rest and recreation. That of course is my principal reason for creating this Park.

On mature deliberation I now have come to the conclusion that my restrictions as to roads are somewhat too severe. Without proper access roads the number of persons who would enjoy the Park would be limited. In view of this I deem it best to allow the existing roads to remain open and to permit the State in the years to come to

construct such additional roads as may be necessary to accommodate those persons who wish to enjoy the great, unspoiled area that now is the property of our State.

I now present to you an Amended Act of Acceptance together with a Deed, which makes the necessary changes in the former Deeds of Trust that contain the road restrictions herein referred to. In order, however, that there may be some reasonable check in the future on the construction and maintenance of roads in the Park it is provided in these Amendments that no roads or ways shall be constructed or maintained that will interfere with or detract from "the natural wild state" of this region. In this, however, I must rely upon the good faith of the State of Maine and am confident that the State will live up to the terms of this TRUST and will not break faith with me.

The other conditions in the two (2) Acts of Acceptance and in the three (3) Deeds which I now present to you are the same as those contained in my former Deeds. I shall be pleased if you will accept these Gifts in the spirit in which they are offered.

Respectfully

PERCIVAL PROCTOR BAXTER
(S. P. 26)

Which communication was read and ordered placed on file.
Sent to the House.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I will present a bill and move that the rules be suspended so that it may have its two several readings and pass to be engrossed without reference to a committee.

Very briefly I will say that this bill is the liberalization of the restrictions that ex-Governor Baxter has placed on his prior gifts to the state. Those restrictions were rather complete with reference to what future legislatures might do. With the fine gift he has given to the state, and in his generosity through this bill which has been approved by the Attorney General, he leaves to future legislatures more liberal opportunities for using the fine gift

that he has given the state of Maine. So I present the bill, Mr. President, and move that the rules be suspended that it may be given its two several readings and be passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee.

Thereupon, Mr. Haskell of Penobscot presented Bill "An Act Amending the Deeds of Gift of Land in Piscataquis County Donated to the State of Maine by Percival Proctor Baxter dated Jan. 2, 1945 and Jan. 8, 1947 and Accepting the Amended Deed of Gift Dated January 3, 1949." (S. P. 27)

Which bill was accepted, and under suspension of the rules, without reference to a committee, was read twice and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. WARD of Penobscot: Mr. President, I am presenting a bill accepting the gift by Percival Proctor Baxter of 6,247 acres, and another tract of 536 acres in Piscataquis County and 1486 acres of land in Penobscot County.

This bill has been given careful examination by the Attorney General and in his opinion it is in correct form. I recall that ex-Governor Baxter began in 1931 giving land in this section to the State of Maine so that now if we accept this present gift we will have a State Park which will total over 141,000 acres in which is situated Mount Katahdin which has been described as being the most picturesque mountain east of the Rocky Mountains.

Thereupon Mr. Ward of Penobscot presented Bill "An Act Accepting from Percival Proctor Baxter the Gift of 6,247 Acres and 536 Acres Township 6, Range 9 Piscataquis County, 1,486 Acres Township 6, Range 8 Penobscot County and 6,017 Acres Township 3, Range 10, Piscataquis County." (S. P. 28)

Which bill was accepted and under suspension of the rules, without reference to a committee, read twice and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Order

(Out of Order)

On motion by Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis, out of order and under suspension of the rules; it was

ORDERED, the House concurring, that in order that the records of the Gifts by Percival Proctor Baxter, individually and as Trustee, to the State of Maine as Trustee in Trust of fourteen thousand two hundred eighty-six (14,286) acres in township six (6) range nine (9) and in township three (3) range ten (10) W.E.L.S. Piscataquis County, and in township six (6) range eight (8) W.E.L.S. Penobscot County (Baxter State Park), be complete and in enduring form, the Communication dated January 3, 1949 addressed by said Baxter to Honorable Frederick G. Payne and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the Ninety-fourth Legislature, together with the Message of Governor Frederick G. Payne, transmitting the said Communication to this Legislature, be printed in the Laws of Maine for 1949. (S. P. 29)

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, sent forthwith to the House.

Reception of Bills and Resolves

The following bills and resolves were received, and on recommendation by the Committee on Reference of Bills, were referred to the following committees:

Claims

Mr. Haskell of Penobscot presented "Resolve in Favor of Earl Swett, of Brewer." (S. P. 41)

Mr. Edwards of Oxford presented "Resolve in Favor of Francis Miltett, of Norway." (S. P. 42)

The same Senator presented "Resolve in Favor of Dr. Walter O. Dixon, of Norway." (S. P. 43)

The same Senator presented "Resolve in Favor of Alfred O. Snow, of Norway." (S. P. 44)

Mr. Cobb of Oxford presented "Resolve in Favor of Abraham Krasker, of Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts." (S. P. 45)

Sent down for concurrence.

Inland Fisheries and Game

Mr. Baker of Kennebec presented Bill "An Act Relating to Veteran's Permit to Hunt and Fish Free." (S. P. 46)

Sent down for concurrence.

Judiciary

Mr. Haskell of Penobscot presented Bill "An Act Relating to Ballots in Elections." (S. P. 47)

The same Senator presented "Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Codify the Constitution." (S. P. 48)

(Ordered printed.)

Sent down for concurrence.

Taxation

The same Senator presented Bill "An Act Relating to Application of Cigarette and Tobacco Taxes to Federal Income Tax." (S. P. 49)

(Ordered printed.)

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. SLEEPER of Knox: Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege to ask a question of parliamentary procedure.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator may state his point.

Mr. SLEEPER: Mr. President, in the recent difference of opinion regarding the cloture rule, I carefully counted the votes as they were cast and there were fifteen to support my motion and fourteen in opposition. I was under the impression that in parliamentary procedure, unless the presiding officer of the parliamentary body voted at the same time as the others voted, he could not vote except to break a tie. Am I right?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will rule that the presiding officer did vote and not having received a majority of the vote cast, the motion to reconsider did not prevail. The Chair will inform the Senator that the Chair registered his vote with the Secretary.

Order

Mr. Savage of Somerset presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Clerks of all committees shall be required to keep reasonably complete notes of all committee hearings, which notes shall include the names of all of those who make appearances as proponents or opponents, together with a brief summary of their comments. Such summary reports accompanied by the printed bills, shall, prior to the end of the Legislature session, be filed with the Director of Legislative Research, who shall maintain these records properly filed. (S. P. 39)

(Tabled by Mr. Noyes of Hancock pending passage.)

Mr. Baker of Kennebec presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that free telegraph service be provided to each member and officer of the Senate and House to the number of ten messages reasonable length, and that each member and officer of the Senate and House be provided with a card, to be certified by the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House; the cost of this service to be paid to Western Union Telegraph Company at regular tariff rates. (S. P. 40)

(Tabled by Mr. Williams of Penobscot pending passage.)

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I would like to inquire whether or not the cloture order which we passed earlier this morning, is still in the possession of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that the Order is in the possession of the Senate.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. President, I will make a motion with reference to that order and in making it, I will make the general comment that certainly this is too early for the Senate to divide itself on such an unimportant order as this. The vote was close. I appreciate the support of those who voted with the order but I am quite certain that no Senator should be denied the privilege of a reasonable re-

quest in such a matter as this and for that reason I move that the order be indefinitely postponed.

The motion to indefinitely postpone prevailed.

Order

Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, out of order and under suspension of the rules, presented the following order and moved its passage:—

ORDERED, the House concurring, that no bill for private or special legislation be received by this legislature after one o'clock on the afternoon of Wednesday, February 9, 1949, and that no other bill or resolve be received by this legislature after one o'clock on the afternoon of Wednesday, February 16th, 1949, except by unanimous consent in the body in which it is introduced, and it was further

ORDERED, that any bill or resolve which shall be received in either body of this legislature by unanimous consent, after the time above set, shall stand referred to the Ninety-fifth Legislature if unanimous consent for its reception is not given in the other body in concurrence. This order shall not apply to bills reported by any joint standing or joint select committee, in the regular course of business nor to such bills and resolves as are intended only to facilitate the business of the Ninety-fourth legislature; and it was further

ORDERED, that the Secretary of the Senate cause a copy of this order to be published in all the daily and weekly papers of the State commencing February 1st, 1949 and continuing up to and including February 16, 1949.

Mr. SAVAGE of Somerset: Mr. President, I note the absence of the Senator from Knox, Senator Sleeper, and I therefore move that the order be laid upon the table.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate—

The PRESIDENT: For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. President, I

rise for the purpose of debating the motion to table.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will rule that the motion to table is not debatable except as to the matter of time.

Thereupon, Mr. Haskell of Penobscot was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I think possibly we have become confused with this cloture order and that we possibly should not carry that confusion any further. The order which Senator Savage has just moved to table, I would advise the Senate, is exactly what the Senator from Knox, Senator Sleeper wanted.

Mr. SAVAGE: Mr. President, with that information, Mr. President, I move that the order be taken from the table and receive a passage.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will inform the Senator that the motion to table has not been put.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Order received a passage and was sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Order relative to free telegraph service, tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session, pending passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot: Mr. President, I move that this order be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BAKER of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this order was introduced by me earlier in the session by request. I have made a few inquiries and I find there is a machine set up in the post office by the Western Union Telegraph company for the convenience of the members of the legislature. It makes no difference to me whether this order is passed or not, but if the order is not passed, the machine will be taken out.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this seems to be a morning that we may be rising on trivial matters. To me this matter is not trivial, it is

basic. The members of the Appropriation Committee for the next few weeks or maybe months, maybe years the way we are moving, will be listening to requests of different departments. We will look very closely at their requests. I have made inquiries and I have yet to find one member who in their previous legislative experience has sent one telegram during the session on legislative business. Why should we go to the point of spending this sum of money? This may be trivial to some but to some of us folks in the back woods, when you consider there will be nearly 200 people having ten telegrams, and when you recall the length of your telephone calls which are not of the same length as they would be if we were paying for them out of our own pockets, very few of them on state business, some of us do not consider that trivial.

For that reason I move the indefinite postponement of the order. There may come a time when we will ask the people of Maine for new tax money and we may be made ridiculous when we add a service for ourselves which we all admit we never use. I have no particular regards for the telegraph company. I believe they will still continue to do business whether we pass this order or not. I sup-

pose they feel that we give a subsidy to the telephone company and we should give one to the telegraph company. But I think we should stop here on subsidizing as far as this order is concerned.

A viva voce vote being had,

The motion to indefinitely postpone prevailed.

Passed to be Enacted

Bill "An Act Amending the Deeds of Gift of Land in Piscataquis County Donated to the State of Maine by Percival Proctor Baxter dated Jan. 2, 1945 and Jan. 8, 1947, and Accepting the Amended Deed of Gift Dated January 3, 1949." (S. P. 27)

Bill "An Act Accepting from Percival Proctor Baxter the Gift of 6,247 Acres and 536 Acres Township 6, Range 9 Piscataquis County, 1,486 Acres Township 6, Range 8 Penobscot County and 6,017 Acres Township 3, Range 10, Piscataquis County." (S. P. 28)

Orders of the Day

The PRESIDENT: Is there any further business to come before the Senate?

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot

Adjourned until Tuesday next at 4:30 o'clock in the afternoon.