

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-Fifth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1951

**DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

SENATE

Thursday, March 29, 1951.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend David W. Flower of Augusta.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

From the House

The Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Relating to Conveyance of School Children," (H. P. 683) (L. D. 413) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Raising the Bounty on Bobcats," (H. P. 524) (L. D. 286) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Bounty on Bobcat, Loupcervier and Canada Lynx," (H. P. 1003) (L. D. 591) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Providing for a Fish Screen at Outlet of Little Rattlesnake Pond in Town of Raymond, Cumberland County," (H. P. 1539) (L. D. 1132) reported that leave be granted to withdraw same.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Repeal Bounty on Bobcat," (H. P. 1409) (L. D. 1017) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Regulating the Taking of Togue in Cold Stream Pond, Penobscot County," (H. P. 1615) (L. D. 1175) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Appropriating Moneys for Repair of Fish Screen at Flying Pond, in the Town of Mount Vernon," (H. P. 1579) (L. D. 1151) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to the Ogunquit Village Corporation," (H. P. 1121) (L. D. 708) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Authorizing Board of Veterinary Surgeons to Issue License to Charles Bessey of Freedom," (H. P. 1550) (L. D. 1112) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Pension for Members of the Police Department of the City of Auburn," (H. P. 1180) (L. D. 736) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Permitting Roller Skating on Sunday," (H. P. 1349) (L. D. 924) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Conviction of Violation of Motor Vehicle Statute," (H. P. 1430) (L. D. 1036) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Appointment of Boards in the City of Lewiston," (H. P. 1235) (L. D. 805) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Parks on Bill "An Act Relating to the Baxter State Park Game Preserve," (H. P. 1264) (L. D. 843) reported that the same ought not to pass as it is covered by other legislation.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Baxter State Park," (H. P. 651) (L. D. 370) reported that the same ought not to pass as it is covered by other legislation.

The Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on "Resolve Relating to the Use of Seines in Medomak River, Lincoln County," (H. P. 1132) (L. D. 700) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Repealing Law on Interstate Transportation of Lobsters," (H. P. 1330) (L. D. 893) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the Number of Lobster Traps," (H. P. 1355) (L. D. 930) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Closed Time on Scallops," (H. P. 1445) (L. D. 1041) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Relating to Exempting from Taxation the Property of Indians," (H. P. 1449) (L. D. 1044) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

The Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act Relating to Sanitary Facilities for Certain Places," (H. P. 1328) (L. D. 891) reported that the same be referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence, and the bill referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs, in concurrence.

Ought to Pass

The Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Relating to Subjects to be Taught in Public Schools," (H. P. 1339) (L. D. 914) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Schooling of Children of Parents Who Reside on State-owned Property," (H. P. 1471) (L. D. 1083) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on "Resolve, Relating to Catching of White Perch in Pushaw Lakes, Penobscot County," (H. P. 1616) (L. D. 1176) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Closing Three Mile Pond to Ice Fishing," (H. P. 1614) (L. D. 1174) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Limiting the Catch of Trout or Salmon in Adams Pond in the Town of Boothbay," (H. P. 1541) (L. D. 1134) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Regulating Fishing in Province Lake, York County," (H. P. 1538) (L. D. 1131) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Relating to Closed Season for White Perch in Echo Lake, Kennebec County," (H. P. 1534) (L. D. 1127) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Salaries of Trustees of Community School Districts," (H. P. 1484) (L. D. 1091) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act Closing

Certain Clam Flats in Lubec, Washington County," (H. P. 1444) (L. D. 1040) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the Releasing or Dumping of Fish," (H. P. 544) (L. D. 369) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the Protection of Alewives in East Machias River in the Town of East Machias," (H. P. 1065) (L. D. 645) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence, and the bills and resolves read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on "Resolve Closing Pleasant Lake and Its Tributaries to Netting of Smelts in the Spring," (H. P. 527) (L. D. 289) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1667) (L. D. 1237) under a new title, "Resolve Closing Pleasant Lake and Its Tributaries to Dipping or Netting of Smelts," and that it ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Closing Certain Ponds in Dedham, Penobscot County, to Fishing," (H. P. 1388) (L. D. 956) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1668) (L. D. 1238) under a new title, "Resolve, Closing Certain Ponds in Dedham and Bucksport in Hancock County, to Fishing," and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Representations of the State House for Commercial Purposes," (H. P. 1429) (L. D. 1035) reported the same in a new draft, (H. P. 1669) (L. D. 1239) under a new title, Bill "An Act Relating to Representations of the State House in Liquor Advertising," and that it ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence, the bill and resolves in new draft read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Granting Additional Powers to Portland University," (H. P. 1340) (L. D. 915) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A"

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence and the bill

read once; Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Joint Order re Cloture (S. P. 519) (In Senate on March 27th read and passed.)

Comes from the House, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

Communication

STATE OF MAINE
House of Representatives
Office of the Clerk
Augusta

March 28, 1951

Hon. Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate
95th Legislature

Sir:

The Speaker of the House today appointed Mr. Archer of Brewer a member of the Joint Committee on Public Utilities to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Grover of Brewer.

Respectfully

HARVEY R. PEASE
Clerk of the House.

Which was read and ordered placed on file.

Referred to Committee

The following bill was transmitted from the Director of Legislative Research, pursuant to Joint Orders No. 138, and No. 265:

Mr. Weeks of Cumberland presented Bill "An Act Relating to Complainant and Witness Fees and Costs of Police Officers and Constables." (S. P. 522)

Which was referred to the Committee on Towns and Counties and the same ordered printed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Senate Committee Reports

Mr. Smart from the Committee on Claims on "Resolve in Favor of Morton Furber of Melrose, Massachusetts," (S. P. 371) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Vincent Hincks of Orrington," (S.

P. 470) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Belva Leach of Penobscot," (S. P. 477) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

Mr. Weeks from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Perley E. Brooks, of Bangor," (S. P. 299) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Larrabee from the Committee on Natural Resources on "Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Grant Permits for Poles and Wires on Public Lots in Aroostook County," (S. P. 150) (L. D. 269) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(On motion of Mr. Brewer of Aroostook, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

Mr. Crosby from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Creating Greater Utilization of Wood Waste and Development of New Products," (S. P. 26) (L. D. 913) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Boucher from the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act Relating to Liquor Licenses in Unorganized Territory," (S. P. 415) (L. D. 974) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Town, County and State Officials in Military Service," (S. P. 423) (L. D. 983) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Dennett from the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act Relating to Liquor Licenses in Unincorporated Places," (S. P. 380) (L. D. 906) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 523) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

Which report was read and accepted, and the bill in new draft laid upon the table for printing under Joint Rule No. 10.

Mr. Dennett from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act Relating to the Transmission of Television Signal by Wire," (S.

P. 489) (L. D. 1169) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Larrabee from the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act Relating to Deposit of Potatoes into Waters of the State," (S. P. 417) (L. D. 977) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Wight from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Exempting Navy Clubs from Taxation," (S. P. 419) (L. D. 979) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted, and the bills read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. Sleeper from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on "Resolve Closing Certain Waters in Hancock County to Taking of Salt Water Smelts," (S. P. 339) (L. D. 755) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A"

(On motion by Mr. Noyes of Hancock, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

Mr. Allen from the Committee on Transportation on Bill, "An Act to Clarify Certain Provisions of Motor Vehicle Law," (S. P. 72) (L. D. 78) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A.

Which report was read and accepted and the bill read once. The Secretary read Committee Amendment A:

Committee Amendment A to L. D. 78. "Amend said bill by striking out all of Section 10 thereof. Further amend said bill by renumbering Sections 11 to 26 inclusive to be Sections 10 to 25 inclusive respectively."

Which amendment was adopted and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. Allen from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act to Clarify Certain Provisions of Motor Vehicle Law," (S. P. 72) (L. D. 78) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which report was read and accepted and the bill read once; Committee Amendment "A" was adopted, and the bill as amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Majority of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing for Payment of 1949-50 School Subsidy Shortage," (S. P. 316) (L. D. 717) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(signed)

Senators: BREWER of Aroostook
REID of Kennebec

Representatives:

JALBERT of Lewiston
JAMIESON
of Presque Isle
CAMPBELL of Guilford
JACOBS of Auburn
COLE of Liberty
PHILLIPS
of Southwest Harbor
FINNEGAN of Bangor

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought to pass.

(signed)

Senator: LEAVITT of Cumberland
On motion by Mr. Reid of Kennebec, tabled pending acceptance of either report.

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Relating to Digging of Clams in Northport Village Corporation." (H. P. 1064) (L. D. 644)

Bill "An Act Relating to Maranacook Game Preserve." (H. P. 1307) (L. D. 860)

Bill "An Act Relating to Interstate Carriers." (H. P. 1370) (L. D. 961)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Digging of Clams in the Town of Wells." (H. P. 1394) (L. D. 988)

Bill "An Act Relating to Sale of Liquor Near Togus Hospital." (H. P. 1485) (L. D. 1092)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the North Jay Water District." (H. P. 549) (L. D. 322)

Which were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Tuition in Normal Schools and Teachers' Colleges." (H. P. 882) (L. D. 524)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed, as amended, in concurrence.

"Resolve in Favor of the Town of New Sharon for School Building." (H. P. 109) (L. D. 83)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed, in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Board of Registration in Medicine." (S. P. 243) (L. D. 514)

On motion by Mr. Noyes of Hancock, tabled pending passage to be engrossed

Which were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Distribution of Antitoxins in Emergencies." (S. P. 418) (L. D. 978)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed, as amended.

Sent down for concurrence.

Enactors

Bill "An Act Relating to Suspension of Licenses in Drunken Driving Cases." (H. P. 320) (L. D. 178)

Bill "An Act Relating to Incurable Inmates in Reformatory for Men." (H. P. 403) (L. D. 247)

Bill "An Act Relating to Compensation for Members of State Racing Commission." (H. P. 444) (L. D. 273)

Bill "An Act Relating to Lucerne-in-Maine Village Corporation." (H. P. 537) (L. D. 296)

Bill "An Act Relating to Workmen's Compensation for Death of Employee." (H. P. 572) (L. D. 378)

Bill "An Act Relating to Payment of Wages in Certain Business." (H. P. 642) (L. D. 362)

Bill "An Act Relating to Full-time Supervisors." (H. P. 817) (L. D. 493)

Bill "An Act Relating to Expenses of the Reporter of Decisions." (H. P. 955) (L. D. 567)

Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Augusta in Regard to Criminal Fees." (H. P. 1109) (L. D. 689)

Bill "An Act Describing the Jefferson-Somerville Town Line, Lincoln County." (H. P. 1190) (L. D. 718)

Bill "An Act Relating to Recording of Highway Maps." (H. P. 1239) (L. D. 791)

Bill "An Act Relating to Savings Banks." (H. P. 1253) (L. D. 827)

Bill "An Act Relating to a Legal Day's Work." (H. P. 1275) (L. D. 844)

Bill "An Act Relating to Funeral Expenses Under Old Age Assistance Law." (H. P. 1285) (L. D. 823)

On motion by Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis, tabled pending enactment.

Bill "An Act to Authorize Savings Banks to Invest in the Stock of Insurance Companies." (H. P. 1402) (L. D. 1013)

Bill "An Act Creating the Lubec Water and Electric District." (H. P. 1631) (L. D. 1192)

Bill "An Act Creating the Bangor Recreation Center" (H. P. 1656) (L. D. 1217)

Resolve, Closing Chemquasabamticook Lake, Piscataquis County, to Ice Fishing." (H. P. 151) (L. D. 134)

"Resolve, Relating to Working Capital for Institutional Farms." (H. P. 257) (L. D. 169)

"Resolve, Restoring Interest on Certain Trust Funds." (H. P. 372) (L. D. 215)

On motion by Mr. Brewer of Aroostook tabled pending final passage.

"Resolve, Regulating Fishing in Fifth Debsconeag Lake, in the County of Piscataquis." (H. P. 564) (L. D. 301)

"Resolve, Regulating Fishing in St. Georges and Little Saint Georges Lakes in the County of Waldo." (H. P. 574) (L. D. 381)

"Resolve Relating to Surplus Property Pool for Institutions." (H. P. 796) (L. D. 491)

"Resolve, Restoring the Frederick Robie Library Fund." (H. P. 801) (L. D. 1226)

"Resolve, in Favor of Knox Memorial Association, Inc. for Support and Maintenance of 'Montpelier.'" (H. P. 803) (L. D. 1225)

"Resolve, Appropriating Moneys to Obtain Plasma." (H. P. 869) (L. D. 517)

Tabled by Brewer pending final passage.

"Resolve, in Favor of State Military Defense Commission." (H. P. 871) (L. D. 519)

On motion by Mr. Brewer of Aroostook tabled pending final passage.

"Resolve, Closing all Tributaries of Big Spencer Pond to all Fishing." (H. P. 1227) (L. D. 781)

"Resolve, in Favor of Caswell Plantation." (H. P. 1259) (L. D. 1191)

"Resolve, in Favor of the Town of Hartland." (H. P. 1405) (L. D. 1190)

Bill "An Act Relating to Interlocking Interests in Liquor Licenses." (S. P. 85) (L. D. 109)

Bill "An Act Relating to Examination of Criminal Character of Prisoners." (S. P. 104) (L. D. 153)

Bill "An Act Relating to Vacations for Members of the Fire Department of the City of Lewiston." (S. P. 123) (L. D. 212)

Mrs. KAVANAGH of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I shall move that the Senate reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed and later I shall move for the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment A. I would like to explain this amendment. These firemen cannot receive the extra weeks vacation unless it is sanctioned by the finance committee. The reason for this is that it might set a precedent. It cannot set a precedent because these firemen work 80 hours a week. No other members of the city government work that many hours. These firemen work every holiday. They are simply asking that they receive the extra week vacation to take the place of those holidays when they work and I think it is a very fair bill.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Collins of Aroostook, the bill was laid upon the table pending consideration.

Bill "An Act Relating to Destruction of Old Records." (S. P. 206) (L. D. 459)

Bill "An Act Relating to Court Stenographers." (S. P. 221) (L. D. 496)

Bill "An Act Relating to State Aid to Towns Maintaining Evening Schools." (S. P. 229) (L. D. 501)

Bill "An Act Relating to Authorized Amount of Endowment for Bridge Academy in the Town of Dresden." (S. P. 318) (L. D. 719)

Bill "An Act Relating to Gambling." (S. P. 324) (L. D. 723)

On motion by Senator Reid of Kennebec, tabled pending passage to be enacted.

Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Union Mutual Life In-

surance Company." (S. P. 337) (L. D. 753)

Bill "An Act Relating to Group Life Insurance." (S. P. 451) (L. D. 1066)

"Resolve, Regulating Fishing in Sourdnhunk and Little Sourdnhunk Lakes in the County of Piscataquis." (S. P. 233) (L. D. 504)

"Resolve, Appropriating Moneys for Automatic Emergency Electric Power for State Police Radio System." (S. P. 246) (L. D. 548)

Which bills were severally passed to be enacted and resolves finally passed.

Emergency

Bill "An Act Ratifying Town Meeting of the Town of Hancock." (S. P. 512)

Which bill being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative vote of 28/0 members of the Senate, was passed to be enacted.

Emergency

"Resolve, for the Laying of the County Taxes for the Years Nineteen Hundred Fifty-one and Nineteen Hundred Fifty-two." (H. P. 1659) (L. D. 1228)

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I would request from the members of the Senate that this bill lie upon the table until later in the day because I am having an amendment prepared to change the amount of Androscoggin County, increasing it by \$3,000 per year for the purpose of civilian defense. At the time the County Tax was laid down they reported that we had no bill at that time giving us a legal right to appropriate money for the County of Androscoggin.

I understand the bill is ready to be signed by the Governor and would like to add an amendment. I move that the bill be laid upon the table until I prepare the amendment.

The motion prevailed and the bill was laid upon the table pending passage to be enacted.

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report "Ought Not to Pass" from the Committee on Liquor Control on bill, An Act Prohibiting Sale of Malt

Liquor in Non-Returnable Bottles (S. P. 119) (L. D. 208) tabled by that Senator on March 23 pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this is a very short bill. It simply states that no retail store licensee shall sell malt liquor in bottles which are not returnable by the purchaser for a refund of five cents. This was referred to the Liquor Control Committee, came out of committee with a unanimous report, Ought Not to Pass. I tabled this for the purpose of being presumptuous enough in face of a unanimous ought not to pass report to offer a motion to substitute the bill for the report which I will do and I will ask for a division, when the vote is taken.

However you vote on this measure I shall have accomplished a certain portion of my purpose in getting an opportunity to discuss this from the floor, and also give you an opportunity to express your opinion or the opinion of your constituents on the measure.

This was not introduced primarily as a liquor control measure. It is in my mind a conservation measure, an economy measure and a safety measure. It might as well have gone to various other committees instead of liquor control. I am aware that the members of the liquor control committee will be obliged to defend their position. I don't know what arguments they will put in. Possibly they may declare that the measure is discriminatory. Possibly they will bring up the stock argument that it is unconstitutional.

My purpose in bringing this measure before the legislature was simply to bring to your attention the conditions which exist on our highways. Anyone who has traveled the highways knows the conditions in which the banks of the roads are at the present time. I did not feel that it was necessary at the hearing to solicit letters or solicit people to appear at the hearing, because I knew that the members of the legislature have traveled the highways and are aware of the facts of the case.

I spoke of this being a conservation measure. I would remind you that the State of Maine is paying

thousands of dollars to advertise the State of Maine. I have received information, some of it in letters that if you go into the states of New Hampshire or Vermont or into Canada from either side, the conditions are entirely different. You see no such accumulation of bottles beside the road. One lady wrote that she had been traveling in some of our neighboring states and all the rubbish that she saw she could have carried in her hands. I doubt that even though my arms are long, I would be able to carry in them the bottles I find near my own farm, my son's farm at the present time. This shows the difference in conditions that exist.

This matter is also an economy measure. We have discussed here measures that involve expenditure of two or three thousand dollars, five thousand dollars and so forth. This measure I believe, would save the State of Maine thousands of dollars. I went over to the highway department to try to get some figures in this matter, but they have no definite figures. I talked with Mr. John Church who is in charge of the maintenance department. He couldn't give me any definite figures. He did tell me this. It costs the patrolmen for one day, over the state, \$7,500 to work just one day. Now you must have seen as I have in my locality, the patrolmen's trucks driving along the road and men walking along each side collecting those bottles. They work approximately a week every spring collecting the rubbish. Of course it is not all bottles, but a very large percent is bottles. They also tell me that in many localities, they have to spend a half day a week in the summer.

There is an opportunity. Your highway department needs more money. Our little towns need more money and there is a need right there. Several thousand dollars could be saved. It would be a saving also to individuals. I don't know how many of you have had the experience of having a truck or car tire ruined by running over a bottle. The other day I went up home to Newport on the paper truck to Guilford and in the course of the conversation the driver told me that at some times in the past he drove upon a bottle that had

become imbedded in the road, and his tire was completely ruined.

I haven't attempted to collect too much information on this point but I have one letter I would like to read. It was written by the Resident Manager of the Draper Corporation of Guilford, Maine.

"Senator Carroll L. McKusick
Senate Chambers
Augusta, Maine

Dear Senator:

Your bill which proposed the limitation of the sale of malt beverages only in returnable bottles is one that I think should be made a law.

For some years I have been employed by a concern that uses a large volume of logs annually. Those logs are delivered to our plant by truck.

The greatest cause of damage to the tires on these trucks has been the punctures caused by broken glass from bottles thrown along the highway. It is true that the area damaged in the tire was usually small but enough glass particles become embedded in the tire casing to make repair impractical. These embedded particles of glass will work through the tire and cause further trouble. Experience has indicated that a tire supporting heavy loads, as on a truck, should be discarded when it becomes punctured with glass. When this happens to a tire that has had very little wear the expense of replacement is very high. As a specific example it was necessary to discard in one week three truck tires costing approximately \$240.00 that had been run less than 1500 miles.

I am very much in favor of any legislation that will remove the hazard of broken glass from the highways of Maine.

Very truly yours,

DRAPER CORPORATION
Paul Morton
Resident Manager."

That is the way one of our plant managers feels about this.

Many of the farmers of the State of Maine have been to considerable expense to clear their roadsides. Those of you who are familiar with the building of roads in the olden days know that the rocks from the roadway were thrown out from the

sides and caused the sides of the roads to be rough. Many farmers, and I myself have done it personally, have gone to considerable expense to remove those rocks, so the fields are graded to the roadside and are used for hay. Now we find those bottles thrown anywhere from one to three rods away from the roadsides into the hayfield. There is a great possibility that they will be raked up with the hay and they are a serious menace to dairy cattle.

So here is an opportunity to save money for the state and also for the individual and last but not least is the safety factor. This glass will never decay. It is not like a tin can which will rust. It will be there for years and it has a tendency to accumulate. The broken glass from next year is added to the broken glass this year. The situation will grow worse and I would remind you that there is a possibility of an auto tire being seriously cut, the automobile going out of control, causing the loss of life, or serious injury.

Another situation is the matter of horseback riding. Probably you know that the fad has been growing in the state and more and more people are engaging in this sport. The horses keep on the shoulder of the road. They prefer it to the hard paved section of the road because it is bad for the feet. That exposes them to the danger of stepping on broken glass and their feet would be ruined.

And now I want to offer this broken piece of bottle as Exhibit A. This was not prepared. I picked it up yesterday morning on my way to the state house. I can present two witnesses who saw me pick it up. Now can you imagine what would happen if that became embedded in the road with the point up and an auto tire ran over it. Can you picture without shuddering what would happen if a child stepped on it. I simply offer it for your consideration. I shall not be concerned on the outcome of the vote but I hope you will vote your own opinion and vote the way your constituents would vote on it.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President, I want to say that I want to support this bill but I would like to comment with a few words

on what Senator McKusick has said in regard to the cost to the state for the patrolmen to pick up these bottles. If the state patrol were not picking up the bottles they would be resting behind a tree in the shade and I don't believe it will cost the department one cent more in taking care of these bottles.

Mr. TABB of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I have no bottle to show you for any Exhibit B. However, I want to defend the committee's action in bringing out the unanimous report on this bill. I will assure you that this was taken up in committee a great many times and every time someone would have some little thing they felt should be looked into and therefore we decided that we would keep on talking about it until we could get to the bottom of it all so we finally reported it out unanimously ought not to pass.

In the first place, my good friend the Senator from Piscataquis has answered a couple of questions I was going to speak about, discrimination and unconstitutionality. There is no question that this would be found to be unconstitutional for this legislature to pick on a poor beer bottle and pass this law. This law would be a price fixing law which I am sure we don't want to get into because we might even raise the price of returnable bottles up to a dollar and wouldn't be able to sell the contents if a dollar had to be paid for the bottle.

There is a law on the books now prohibiting the throwing of bottles. In the second place, non returnable bottles you can run over all day long and they won't hurt the tires. They are made either of soybean or plastic of some kind and therefore they would do no harm to the tires.

The next thing we want to remember is that during this war crisis there is a shortage of glass and also of cans and naturally these goods will be put into non returnable bottles which will do no damage. Now we pick on the poor little beer bottle but what about the milk bottle, the soft drink bottle, the whiskey bottle? Who is going to stop those from being thrown out? This bill won't do it. There is a law on the statutes today

making it against the law to throw bottles and rubbish in the roads and anyone doing so will be fined ten dollars. I would like to know how this bill is going to stop them from being thrown out. The one we have doesn't.

I agree that the highways need picking up, cleaning up etc. It is true that in New Hampshire they have signs all along the highway forbidding the throwing of bottles and rubbish on the highway and telling the amount of the fine they have to pay if caught doing so. We don't have that in the State of Maine. That might help to solve the problem. The malt beverage associations are trying to educate the people. They are spending money to prohibit this throwing of bottles on the roadsides. Senator McKusick says he did not have any figures. I have heard all kinds of figures. We heard all of them in committee from \$140,000 and that was about \$38,000 when we first had this bill.

This little item here is taken from the Press Herald and it says in headlines "Beer Bottles Not Only Plague to Highway Cleanup Squads." Mr. Church of the maintenance department says when telling how many bottles were picked up. "We pick them up with the regular trash. We make no special trips for beer bottles. I really couldn't tell how many, and of course, there are other kinds of bottles, too. We pick them up in the spring cleanup, which lasts a week. And in the summer, we spend a half day each week on cleaning up the roads." The question was asked if the highway commission had any opinion on the question. "The Commission has no opinion that I know of," said Mr. Church.

I think you will agree with me that that is where the trouble is. You have seen all along the road boxes of rubbish thrown and there are bottles and everything else and consequently that is what the trouble is with our highways today. They need to be cleaned up. Not only the bottles, but everything. But why penalize the poor little beer bottle like the top of the one the Senator brought in? I know he didn't throw it out. I know he is not a drinking man so

he wouldn't have it to throw out. We all know that is a dangerous thing that he showed us but that isn't the question. The question is beer in nonreturnable bottles. Now if we can't use glass, what are we going to put it in? Paper bags?

I can't see for the life of me why anybody would go along with the theory that it is going to help our highways and I can't see why the Senator should feel so embarrassed to think we don't feel the same way he does because I believe he was one that went all outdoors for this clean up stuff, at the time the bill was put in.

And so, I feel gentlemen, that in all due respect to the Senator and to support my committee, I am going to ask you to accept the committee report of ought not to pass.

Mr. McKUSICK: Mr. President, I think I should know that there is a law on the books providing a ten dollar penalty for throwing rubbish in a highway because, if you will look back on the records, you will find that I was the author of that bill several years ago. The bill doesn't work, as Senator Tabb has said, because we don't see them throw the bottles out. They arrive in our dooryards but we don't know where they come from. That is why the law is hard to enforce. One instance was called to my attention where someone threw a bottle out and it went through somebody's windshield and the law was enforced in that case and the offender fined.

Mention has been made about the non returnable bottles. I don't know any reason why the beer interests couldn't make those bottles returnable and require a deposit for them. Senator Tabb also speaks about the milk bottles. I wonder if he is forgetting that if you buy a bottle of milk in a store you have to pay five cents extra for the bottle and if you carry it back you get five cents for it in return. He speaks about the soft drinks interest. I wonder if you have thought how few coca cola bottles you see on the roadside. They operate with returnable bottles voluntarily.

There is another interesting sidelight on this. I noticed in a newspaper some time ago that the beer

retailers in Calais got together and agreed to sell beer only in returnable bottles and requiring a deposit for the bottles I have checked with the Senator who comes from Calais, Senator Christensen and also with the Representative in the House from Calais, and they inform me that it is so and that it is keeping a lot of bottles off the highways.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I rise to defend the action of the Liquor Control Committee, of which I am a member, and also to support our Chairman, Senator Tabb, in opposition to the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick. About a year ago I had a rather unfortunate occurrence which could be traced to this same action of picking up a beer bottle. I believe the Senator from Piscataquis means to bring out that if the bottles are returnable the children will scavenge in the roads and pick them up and turn them in for redemption and will thus clear up the roads. The committee agreed that this bill was possessed of some merit but inasmuch as it confined itself to beer bottles only they decided to turn it out "Ought Not to Pass." Now this experience of which I speak occurred about a year ago. I have a young son who was about eleven years old at the time and with a group of other boys he went up and down the highway near which we live and together they gathered about 250 bottles which they found on the highway. They didn't know exactly which bottles were returnable and which were not and consequently they had about a hundred soft drink bottles and beer bottles which were returnable and which they redeemed and got a little pocket money. But there were approximately 150 non-returnable bottles left over, and I will agree that this lot of 150 contained some non-returnable malt beverage bottles but the great bulk of them were whiskey bottles, wine bottles, vinegar bottles, medicine bottles, and bottles of all descriptions. As a result they found they could not return them so they broke them up into a huge pile of glass. I went out and picked up the fragments of the broken glass and I sustained a

grievous cut on the hand which required medical attention. As a result, I can remember about those bottles.

Now, the point is—and I think it is exactly the point we have been trying to bring out—we agree that this bill is possessed of some merit but it is confined to beer bottles. It doesn't touch a single bottle of any other description and it still leaves any number of bottles of various kinds other than beer bottles that would be left on the highways, and we felt that inasmuch as it discriminates against beer bottles, and beer bottles alone, that it should not pass. And I want to go along with my colleague from Kennebec in opposition to the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick.

Mr. FULLER of Oxford: Mr. President, to paraphrase the words of Stephen Leacock, it occurred to me that this measure might provide a means of helping to clear our far-flung bottle line.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, as the least and most humble member of this Liquor Control Committee from this honorable Body, I want to go along with my colleagues in defending the reasons for our reporting this bill "Ought Not to Pass."

I do not believe my good friend, Senator McKusick, wants to deprive the state of income but I believe this bill would not only deprive the state of income it would otherwise have but that it would cause additional expense to the state. I believe there would be more bottles thrown out if they were not returnable and one could get no money for them than there is now, because fewer people would carry them home, more people would throw them away, there would be more to pick up and there would be extra expense caused to the state.

I think the matter of safety is not involved here. The non-returnable bottles are safer, according to the statement of Senator Reid, than the bottles that are returnable and I fully agree that a non-returnable bottle won't break and that these bottles that are returnable for five cents are bot-

tles that are very breakable and will cut tires.

I would like to point out that the Maine State Grange, if my recollection is correct, opposes the bill of Senator McKusick on the question of returnable bottles. They are very much opposed to it. He also pointed out the fact that Vermont and New Hampshire roads are very much clearer of bottles and rubbish than our roads are, and I agree with him on that. I have driven many times from Boston to Montreal through New Hampshire and Vermont and I believe that is so. But I believe that is true, not merely because there is such a law in each of those states, but because the law of the state is posted on the highways about every mile, stating it is an offense to throw rubbish or bottles or garbage of any kind on the highway and that anyone doing so will be punished by a fine of twenty dollars or more. And I believe that those laws are enforced and that if the State of Maine makes it an offense to throw anything from a car, whether it is a bottle or anything else, and if that law is enforced, and especially if the highways are posted calling attention to that law, it would overcome a great deal of the trouble that Senator McKusick has pointed out to us.

If the returnable bottles were the only objection that I have to refuse being thrown on our highways I would have been inclined to report favorably on the Senator's bill but my experience, having driven over both sides of the state for years to all corners of the state, is that not only beer bottles are thrown out of cars but about everything else under God's sun. It has been pointed out that all kinds of bottles are thrown out, milk bottles, pop bottles, or anything else, and I have also seen garbage thrown out, and I have seen tin cans and those especially are dangerous. A tin can with a sharp edge will cut a tire a good deal quicker than a broken bottle, in my opinion. And I have gone along with the rest of the committee in reporting out this measure "Ought Not to Pass" for the reason that, with all the good intentions the Senator from Piscataquis has, it

would not correct this evil on the roads.

I say to you, members of the Senate, that instead of this bill we should have our roads posted calling attention to those laws, as they have in Vermont and New Hampshire, stating the law and what the penalty is for throwing refuse into the road.

Mr. MCKUSICK: If I may speak a third time, Mr. President, I would like to say that in regard to one point made by the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher, it is true that a gentleman appeared at the hearing who purported to be a representative of the State Grange but I seriously question that. I have been a Grange member for a great many years, I joined the Grange before I was sixteen years of age, and I seriously question whether that gentleman represented the State Grange or the members of the State Grange.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President, I want to go along with the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick, in his motion to substitute the bill for the report and I want to say as one who lives on a farm out in the country that possibly we can't completely cure all the ills of throwing bottles on the highways, but if we can control the beer bottles we certainly will have gone a long way toward clearing our highways. As far as returnable bottles are concerned, whether they are pop bottles or Pepsicola bottles or Orange Crush or any other kind, they do not remain too long on the highway before some youngster comes along, picks them up and returns them. As to the non-returnable bottles that aren't supposed to cut tires, and one thing and another, maybe we aren't in on the latest thing up in our county, but I would hate to run over any of them with any kind of tire that I have on any farm implement or truck or automobile because if they aren't glass I don't recognize glass when I see it. But I say to you, if these beer bottles have a value and can be returned we will have a lot less to contend with than we do with conditions at they now exist and we certainly pay dearly now for the promiscuous throwing of these bottles over our countryside. And

as I say, I believe Senator McKusick's arguments have merit and while I don't believe we would cure the whole trouble I do think there would be an improvement of eighty-five to ninety percent, and I hope the Senator's motion will have favorable action.

Mr. ALLEN of Cumberland: Mr. President, I rise merely to make one statement and that is as to the statements made by the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Tabb regarding a shortage of glass, I think you will find if you look into the matter that there is plenty of glass, in fact, there is more glass being used than ever before, more plate glass, more glass for storm windows, more glass for many other purposes. I notice in today's paper that automobile manufacturers are sending out cars without a spare tire because of a serious rubber shortage. I would like to reaffirm what Senator Brewer just said and that is, if my information is correct, the returnable bottles are made of Plexiglass which can cause a flat tire as fast as any other type of glass or glass compound. I think there are two sides to the question and anything we can do to clear up our highways is certainly a step in the right direction and I am in favor of the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick.

Mr. TABB: Mr. President, I am very pleased to hear what the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen, has said, but I would ask him where he got his news. On March 21st, at a meeting of the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington they predicted that there will be a shortage of glass. There is a shortage of glass and here is what they say, for your personal information: "On March 21, testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee, two top-ranking National Production Authority officials, Administrator Manley Fleischman and Deputy Administrator Ireland, testified that tin is a very scarce commodity and therefore, it is necessary to curtail the use of beer cans 25 per cent in the next quarter, 25 percent more in the third quarter, and 25 per cent additionally in the last quarter of 1951 and thereafter prohibiting the use of beer cans. Careful survey has

shown that bottle manufacturers will not be able to supply sufficient bottles in the third quarter to offset even a 10 per cent reduction in the use of cans."

Now that, members of the Senate, is direct from Washington. I don't care anything about plate glass windows. We cannot put beer in plate glass windows and drink it. It is bottles we are interested in and they cannot make bottles out of plate glass.

As far as the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Brewer, goes, I am sorry he has to admit he doesn't know the difference between glass bottles and plastic bottles. I suggest he run over a plastic bottle and if it breaks his tire I will present him with a new tire. Actually, it is what they are coming to, plastic bottles.

The Senator from Knox, Senator Sleeper, has a very good idea of this. He owns a sheep pasture. I don't know how many sheep he has but he has a stone wall alongside it. He takes a walk up there every so often—I don't know whether to collect bottles or not—but anyway, he takes a walk, and he tells me these bottles are thrown from the road toward his land and he finds a lot of these non-returnable bottles that do no damage whatever.

It only stands to reason, gentlemen, that it is the glass we are worried about, and you all know as well as I do that no matter when or where we ride in a car and have bottles with us we don't take the bottles back. I don't care if we pay a quarter for them, out they go, out the window. It would not make any difference. One of the good Senators has said it gives someone a chance to make a few cents. A good many bottles break when they go out the window. Therefore, that part is not a profitable angle to look at in considering this bill, as I see it.

It is the poor little beer bottle that they are worrying about, gentlemen, and it is all the argument they have. They want to get rid of the poor little beer bottle and put the beer in returnable bottles.

I hope the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen, will read some other paper besides the Press

Herald and get the real news regarding bottles.

Mr. HASKELL of Cumberland: Mr. President, as a more or less interested bystander in this debate I would like to ask some member of the committee who heard the bill, if similar legislation prevails in New Hampshire or in any other state, if I am in order in asking that question.

Mr. TABB of Kennebec: Mr. President, I will be glad to answer the question. There is no state in this country that has any law whatever pertaining to these bottles. The only thing in New Hampshire they have is a law regarding the highways. To answer the question, there is no law in any state.

Mr. HASKELL of Cumberland: Mr. President, I thank Senator Tabb for providing the information. The reason I asked that, members of the Senate, is that if you are familiar with the highways of New Hampshire and drive over them, I think you will have to admit in fairness that they are not cluttered up the way the highways in the State of Maine are. I am very sympathetic with the thoughts of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick, also those expressed by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Brewer. Personally, I cannot help feeling, however, that if this is the problem, are we not attacking it in this bill piecemeal? I have particular reference to a bill that was given public hearing yesterday before the Committee on Judiciary, Legislative Document 731. I'd like to read just a portion of this proposed legislation: "No person, firm or corporation shall throw, place or cause to be placed any material, bottles, rubbish or garbage of any nature within the limits of the right of way of any public highway." Now, if that is what we are trying to correct, and I think it should be corrected, I offer merely as a suggestion to the Senate the thought that if we are going after bottles, let's have a law that will take all kinds of bottles. Let's publicize it if we have to. This proposed legislation which I have just read carries a penalty provision of a fine of fifty dollars. It seems to me if those who are interested in

this particular problem could devise a way, whether by signs or whether by actual conviction of the violators of this law, something would be accomplished. It seems to me if it has worked in New Hampshire, as apparently their law has, we should follow along the same line because of the conditions we have on the highways in Maine. For that reason I would prefer to see a measure similar to Legislative Document 731 passed, rather than the one now under debate.

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President, I am speaking rather frequently but I simply rise to pass along a little information that came to me. Someone told me the other day that the State of Michigan has a similar law, and the person who told me that said that they traveled through the state of Michigan and was impressed by the lack of bottles on the roadside. I have not checked it, but am passing along the information which was given me.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President, if in order, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate at this time is on the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick, that the bill be substituted for the "ought not to pass" report of the committee. A division has been requested.

A division of the Senate was had.

Seven having voted in the affirmative and twenty opposed, the motion did not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Boyker, that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Leavitt of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table, Bill, An Act Relating to Inspection of Children's Homes (H. P. 1142) (L. D. 674) tabled by that Senator on March 20th pending passage to be engrossed in concurrence.

Mr. Leavitt presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption:

"Senate Amendment 'A' to H. P. 1142, L. D. 674, Bill, An Act Relat-

ing to Inspection of Children's Homes. Amend said bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following: 'R. S., c. 22, S. 243, amended. The 3rd sentence of section 243 of chapter 22 of the revised statutes, as enacted by chapter 177 of the public laws of 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows: Said written statement shall be furnished annually thereafter, in those cases where the home is licensed to board more than 2 children.'"

Mr. LEAVITT: Mr. President and members of the Senate, that is the purpose of this bill, No. 674, and this amendment merely simplifies it and says it in good English instead of the complicated way it is in this bill.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted, and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table, Emergency Resolve for the Laying of the County Taxes for the Years Nineteen Hundred Fifty-one and Nineteen Hundred Fifty-two (H. P. 1659) (L. D. 1128) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending final passage; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Boucher presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption:

Senate Amendment "A" to H. P. 1659, L. D. 1228: Amend said resolve by striking out the first line of the sixth paragraph thereof and inserting in place the following line: 'Androscoggin 159,768.25 159,-168.25'"

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted and the resolve as so amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Fuller of Oxford, the Senate voted to take from the table, Bill, An Act Relating to the Trustees of the University of Maine (S. P. 515) (L. D. 1234) tabled by that Senator on March 27th pending its first reading; and on further motion by the same

Senator the bill was given its first reading.

Mr. Fuller presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption:

"Senate Amendment 'A' to S. P. 515, L. D. 1234, Bill, An Act Relating to the Trustees of the University of Maine. Amend said bill by adding at the end thereof the following underlined sentence: 'No person shall be a trustee of the university who is over 70 years of age, nor, with the exception of the member appointed under the provisions of chapter 196 of the public laws of 1883, who is not a legal resident of this state.'"

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted, the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table, Bill, An Act Relating to Uniforms of Deputy Sheriffs (H. P. 440) (L. D. 258) tabled by that Senator on February 20th pending second reading; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was given its second reading.

Mr. Boucher presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption:

"Senate Amendment 'A' to H. P. 440, L. D. 258, Bill, An Act Relating to Uniforms of Deputy Sheriffs. Amend said bill by striking out all of said bill after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following: R. S. c. 79, § 167, amended. The last sentence of section 167 of chapter 79 of the revised statutes is hereby repealed and the following enacted in place thereof: "Upon approval of the county commissioners, uniforms required by this section, but not exceeding two for any county, shall be furnished by the county."

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted, and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. GREELEY of Waldo: Mr. President, I'd like to inquire if H. P. 523, L. D. 285, Bill, An Act Relating to Fishing and Hunting Licenses for Residents, is in the possession of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will inform the Senator that the document is in the possession of the Senate, having been held for reconsideration at the request of the Senator.

Mr. GREELEY: Mr. President, being one of those who voted to accept the minority, "ought not to pass" report, and as a matter of courtesy to the Senator from Oxford, Senator Boyker, I move we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby we voted to accept the minority "ought not to pass" report of the committee.

The motion to reconsider acceptance of the minority "ought not to pass" report of the committee prevailed.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I cannot agree with the policy which was presented by my friend, the Senator from Somerset, Senator Ela, in the discussion which we had on this bill yesterday, and that is, that by allowing our young men between the ages of 16 and 20 to hunt without a license, in the end it would be a good thing. On the contrary, I believe that if we should require our young men between the ages of 16 and 20 to procure a license, it would lead them along the road to self-support, not only for themselves but for their town, their county and their state, which in the end, would be a good thing.

Now, members of the Senate, we have all been of the age of 16 years and we have been proud—we were at the time—of owning something, ourselves, perhaps an animal, perhaps a piece of land. Our young men between the ages of 16 and 18 are of that same feeling today. As to the expense to our young men,—they are not poor. They are earning good money. They spend their money for other forms of recreation in our state, and they would be glad, I am sure, to pay the price of a fishing license which would place them into that group of persons who are interested in the wild life in our state.

I want to ask this question: If we allow our young men between the ages of 16 to 20 to hunt without a license, at least until they are 18, where will we land? I am recalling that we, here in the Senate, are interested in doing away with the

idea of giving, giving, giving. At the age of 20 those who do not have to have a license, will ask for something else, won't they? Yes. Those who have their license and are proud to have it in their pocket at the age of 18, will not be asking for anything.

I certainly hope that the majority report "ought to pass" will be accepted.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state at the moment there is no motion before the Senate.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, I move the minority report "ought not to pass" be accepted. The action which we took yesterday was, in my opinion, fairly explained, and I believe was proper action.

To explain it a little more clearly, I would call to your attention that this concerns youth not between 16 and 20 but between 16 and 18. There is no giving of anything now. It is merely that we do not require something in the form of license up to the age of 18. However, in the hunting category, if a youth wants to hunt now without accompanying a parent, and if he can get permission of a parent, he now goes to get a license.

Regardless of the present business conditions, it is still hard for many families to provide extras over and above the necessities of life for children, and many of those children for whom the necessities of life come hard live in sections of the state where hunting and fishing are readily available. Furthermore, in those sections there are not so many other things for the youth to do.

I still maintain that by not requiring a license for that two year period the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game can in the next 50 years of a person's life recoup not only the license fees of those years, but probably many additional dollars for the operation of the department. If a youth wishes to feel self-reliant there is nothing to hinder him from going and buying a license now at an age under 18.

This will have no effect on the general funds of the state because these funds are allocated to the Fish and Game Department. The Fish and Game Department is currently operating in a satisfactory

manner as far as finances are concerned. Let's have a little longer period for the youths to do things which are good for them.

I hope the motion to accept the "ought not to pass" report of the committee will prevail.

Mr. WIGHT of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I think probably everyone here understands what this bill means. It had a fair debate yesterday and today. I felt that the bill had merit and I supported that bill. I still think so. If the majority of the Senate feels it should not pass it is okay, but I think it is fair.

Mr. GREELEY of Waldo: Mr. President, asking for reconsideration doesn't mean that I have changed my mind. I shall vote to support the motion of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Ela, to accept the "ought not to pass" report. When the vote is taken, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Ela, to accept the minority "ought not to pass" report of the committee. The Senator from Waldo, Senator Greeley, has requested a division.

A division of the Senate was had.

Eighteen having voted in the affirmative and seven opposed, the motion to accept the minority "ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table, Senate Report "Ought Not to Pass" from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill, An Act Relating to Private Carriers in Operating Motor Trucks for Hire (S. P. 441) (L. D. 1004) tabled by that Senator on March 23rd pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, this is a bill that had a unanimous "ought not to pass" report from the committee, but there has been an amendment proposed that will take care of, as far as I know, the objections to the original bill. I would, therefore, at this time like to move to recommit this

bill to the Committee on Public Utilities.

The motion prevailed, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Public Utilities.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table, Bill, An Act Relating to Penalties for Violations of Liquor Laws by Unlicensed Persons (S. P. 381) (L. D. 907) tabled by that Senator on March 28th pend-

ing adoption of Senate Amendment "A"; and on further motion by the same Senator, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted, and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Greeley of Waldo

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.