

# 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

VOLUME II

1951

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**SENATE**

Thursday, April 26, 1951

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Wilfred Mulley of Gardiner.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

**From the House**

"Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Reactivate Mile Light at Cove Point Gore." (H. P. 1778) (L. D. 1316)

Which was received by unanimous consent and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Driving of Deer." (H. P. 1753) (L. D. 1297)

(In Senate on April 24th, the Majority Report "Ought Not to Pass" was accepted in non-concurrence.)

Comes from the House, that body having insisted on its former action whereby the Minority Report, "Ought to Pass in a new Draft under the same title," was accepted, and the bill in new draft passed to be engrossed, and now asks for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Ela of Somerset, the Senate voted to insist on its former action and join with the House in a Committee of Conference.

The Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Motor Vehicles Following Fire Apparatus and Crossing Fire Hose," (H. P. 1038) (L. D. 603) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Comes from the House, the bill substituted for the report, and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A". (Amendment Filing No. 268)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Allen of Cumberland, the bill was substituted for the report and given its first reading; House Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

**From the House**

The Committee on Transportation to which was recommitted

Bill "An Act Relating to Signals for Stopping and Turning Motor Vehicles," (H. P. 93) (L. D. 38) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A". (Amendment Filing No. 69)

Comes from the House, report read and accepted, Committee Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A". (Amendment Filing No. 258)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Allen of Cumberland, tabled pending acceptance of the report.

The Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Relating to Emergency Lights on Police and Fire Department Motor Vehicles," (H. P. 1491) (L. D. 1098) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Amendment Filing No. 143) as amended by House Amendment "A" (Amendment Filing No. 251) thereto.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Allen of Cumberland, tabled pending acceptance of the report.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Repealing the Merit Award Board," (H. P. 1252) (L. D. 826) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Comes from the House, the bill substituted for the report, and passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Leavitt of Cumberland, the "Ought Not to Pass" report was accepted in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

The Committee on Claims on "Resolve, to Reimburse Robert Ballard of Hallowell," (H. P. 1573) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Comes from the House, recommended to the Committee on Claims.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin pending acceptance of the report.

The Committee on Claims on "Resolve, Reimbursing the Town of Falmouth for Certain Hospital Ex-

penses," (H. P. 1564) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, in Favor of Axel Nelson of Thomaston," (H. P. 456) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, in Favor of the City of Biddeford," (H. P. 963) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Open Season for Salmon, Trout, Togue and White Perch," (H. P. 385) (L. D. 221) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Trespass on Lands," (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 730) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act to Increase the Taxing Powers of Municipalities," (H. P. 1371) (L. D. 953) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Payments to Certain Towns in Lieu of Taxes," (H. P. 1134) (L. D. 701) reported that the same ought to pass as it is covered by other legislation.

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

The Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act Relating to Annual Reports of Certain County Officers," (H. P. 1594) (L. D. 1166) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Welfare on "Resolve, Providing for State Pension for Donald M. Laughlin of Plantation No. 33," (H. P. 1381) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Parks on "Resolve, for Development of State Park Facilities," (H. P. 1125) (L. D. 697) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Relative to Use Fuel Tax," (H. P. 332) (L. D. 191) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence, the bill and resolve read once, and

tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Majority of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Imposing a Personal Income Tax," (H. P. 1133) (L. D. 666) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

NOYES of Hancock  
WIGHT of Penobscot

Representatives:

SINCLAIR of Pittsfield  
CARTER of Bethel  
LOW of Rockland  
CHASE of Cape Elizabeth  
DOW of Falmouth  
DUQUETTE of Biddeford

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

(signed)

Senator:

ALLEN of Cumberland

Representative:

ROLLINS of Greenville

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and accepted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, tabled pending acceptance of either report.

The Majority of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act to Provide Facilities for the Peaceful Settlement of Industrial Disputes Through Mediation," (H. P. 1322) (L. D. 885) reported the same in new draft "B" (H. P. 1734) (L. D. 1293) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(signed)

Senators:

MARSHALL of York  
REID of Kennebec

Representatives:

LARRABEE of Westbrook  
BROWN of Baileyville  
WEST of Stockton Springs  
LETOURNEAU of Sanford  
WALLS of Millinocket  
CASTONGUAY of

Waterville

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported the same in new draft "A" under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(signed)

Senator:

COLLINS of Aroostook

Representative:

CASWELL of New Sharon

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and accepted, and the bill in new draft "B" passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate:

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the majority report "Ought to Pass in New Draft" in concurrence.

Mr. COLLINS of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, the two reports of the committee on this mediation bill are very similar. The committee was in agreement as to the merits of a mediation panel being set up. The only difference in the two bills is that in Report B, which the majority signed there was included an amendment to Chapter 25 of the Revised Statutes which changed that statute to allow an arbitration board to settle the determination of the bargaining agent.

I don't think this is of primary importance in cases of most industrial concerns, particularly those concerns that have dealings in inter-state commerce because practically all of them have a bargaining agency already determined under the contract that exists. I do feel that in the case of small industries or certain enterprises perhaps not unionized that the effect of section two of the bill would give considerable advantage, perhaps, to labor agencies that were trying to form unions in those communities, and while it might not make any material difference over a long period of time, I can visualize that there would be several instances where the determination of the bargaining agent might be a detriment to small business. That is the reason I signed the minority report. I felt that Report A was sufficient in itself to create the mediation board, we were agreed that such a panel was a good thing for settling labor differences, but the inclusion of section two, I felt, was unnecessary. The board referred to in section two is not the panel mentioned in the bill. It is the arbitration board. And for that reason I signed the minority report and I feel, of course, that the minority report is the one that should be adopted.

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, I think four years ago an effort was made to get together in the legislature on a state labor relations board. Both parties seemed to be in harmony at one time but the bill did not receive passage.

The situation appears to be in the State of Maine in intra-state operations that if a plant attempts to become unionized with rival unions or forces trying to unionize it the employer can deny the validity of the election and refuse to bargain with any agent. In inter-state operation governed by federal order, of course that is not the case.

If this law passes it is the hope and expectation of labor that if there is an election where there is disputed rivalry in any plant, that the Maine Board of Arbitration may determine the validity of the election and determine who should be the bargaining agent. Then the bargaining agent is established and the employer need not deal with him alone, need not deal with him at all.

It would seem to be a step in the right direction and in tune with the times, that this amendment to the arbitration law be enacted. That was the feeling of the majority of the committee.

The motion prevailed and the Majority Report B "Ought to Pass in New Draft" was accepted, the bill was given its first reading and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Report "A" from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Running Horse Racing in the Daytime," (H. P. 1021) (L. D. 580) reported that the same ought to pass.

(signed)

Senator: ELA of Somerset

Representatives:

STEWART of Paris  
MARTIN of Augusta  
THOMAS of Waterville  
BURKETT of Portland

Report "B" from the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought not to pass.

(signed)

Senators: WEEKS of Cumberland  
HASKELL of Penobscot

Representatives:

WOODCOCK of Bangor  
HAND of New Limerick  
HAWKES of Saco

Comes from the House, Report "A" read and accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate on motion by Mr. Weeks of Cumberland, the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, I rise to a point of Order.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator may state his point.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, on the vote taken on the previous bill, some of those in the Senate heard the vote doubted. I wonder if the Chair heard it.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair did not hear the doubting of the vote.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, in case that were brought to the attention of the Chair, what would be the ruling?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that if it had been brought to the Chair's attention before we had gone on to further business, the Chair would have entertained a standing vote. Inasmuch as the further business has been taken up, the Chair regrets that he cannot take a standing vote. The Chair heard no doubting of the vote. The Chair regrets the instance.

Mr. COLLINS of Aroostook: Mr. President, if it is in the order I would move that the Senate reconsider its action whereby it accepted the majority report on the New Draft B of L. D. 1293, bill, An Act to Provide Facilities for the Peaceful Settlement of Industrial Disputes Through Mediation.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Collins moves that the Senate reconsider its action whereby it accepted Report B on bill, An Act to Provide Facilities for Peaceful Settlement of Industrial Disputes by Mediation.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I am hesitant to speak on this matter which was before the Committee on Labor. Possibly the only excuse I have is that I

did serve on that committee in the previous session. It also happens that I have done a bit of conciliation work on such inter-state problems and several within the state dealing with the question of recognition in intra-state operations.

As the Senate knows, the question of recognition is almost without exception the basic issue to be settled in any attempt to organize a plant. It has been my experience that both sides of that question in an intra-state problem desire some means of fairly adjudicating the proposition of whether or not a union truly represents the majority voice in that plant and almost without exception the employer is perfectly willing to bargain if there is some reasonable method set up by which that question can be determined, namely, "do a majority of the workers in my plant really want the union or is it a small minority urged by an active labor leader in attempting to stir into a majority my employees," and without some means of honestly and fairly determining the question there have been many serious labor difficulties develop within the state. I don't think this is a state-wide practice but at least over in the locality where I live there have been two of us, a representative of the labor organization and myself, who have been invited by employees, under a stipulated agreement by both parties, to come in and act as referees in running what we call an agency election in the plant. Not long ago I did that in the largest garage in Bangor where both sides were satisfied that the question had to be determined. It happened in that case that the majority of the employees did not want union representation, and the settlement of that question took the union organizer out of the plant and peace reigned again.

As I understand this is a proposition of putting into the statute books an opportunity for a state board to settle union representation questions. It seems to me that both employers and employees would welcome some well-established method of determining the question, without which I believe any intra-state business will have continual squabbling over the ques-

tion, "Do a majority of my employees want this particular union or that particular union to represent them in collective bargaining?" You also have the situation among intra-state companies where two unions will claim to represent a majority, and that is disturbing to the employer as well as to the employees.

Listening to the statements of the members of the Committee on Labor I do not believe Maine employers would object to having such a bureau or board set up on the statutes so that there may be someone to whom they can go who will fairly represent both sides, and that is why I shall vote for the majority report.

Mr. COLLINS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I hesitate to speak against the authority of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, because I do realize that he has had a large and varied experience in labor relations. I would like to point out, however, that the words relating to the amendment of the statute just relate to the determination were to be made then there should follow logically the provision that the agent would determine as to conditions and that this would involve to some extent writing a labor relations act for the State of Maine. We have seen that attempted in past legislative sessions and it didn't get to first base. And I would think that leaving that section out entirely would leave the labor relations as they exist today, which are entirely satisfactory to a vast majority of employers and employees, and labor relations could be carried on successfully with just the mediation panel being set up but not including this change in Chapter 25 of the Revised Statutes. I hope the motion to reconsider will be accepted.

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, very clearly and accurately stated the factual situation and problem. There may be some of the Senators who doubt just exactly what the two reports, A and B, are. They are absolutely identical so far as mediation is concerned. Report B adds another

section which says it shall be the duty of the Board, meaning the Board of Arbitration, to settle questions relating to the determination of the bargaining agency. That is the only difference.

It was the position of labor that that one additional sentence would solve their problem with respect to the election of the bargaining agent. It was also their position before the Committee that they did not want and did not need a state labor relations board. They felt that the labor situation in Maine was very good and very smooth. They saw no reason to copy anything from the Federal Government and they did not care for any elaborate labor relations act and that it was unnecessary.

They did, however, say that this one sentence would very greatly help their problems and the problems of the employers in the State of Maine by allowing as the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, said in case of friction, by allowing the Board of Arbitration to tell which one was the bargaining agent. That is the only difference between the two reports. Mediation has nothing to do with this particular problem. When a dispute arises in a plant between the employer and the employees the first grave step to be taken is mediation. That is simply handled. It is simply trying to get, we will say, two hot-headed persons together with a third party intervening and trying to settle the dispute before it gets any further, and that is a good thing.

If the mediation board fails, then the Board of Arbitration comes into action. If that fails, there is a strike until one side or the other gives in. But the members of the Senate should know that there is unanimous agreement on mediation. But the only difference is that the additional sentence will enable the Board of Arbitration in case of dispute determines which union should be the bargaining agent.

Mr. COLLINS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Kennebec that there is no disagreement except on the second paragraph. But I do reiterate that I think it could create some hardship on small industries in the state

that perhaps at the present time weren't subject to unions and I move, Mr. President, that when the vote is taken, it be taken by a division.

The **PRESIDENT**: Is the Senate ready for the question? The Chair will state that the pending question before the Senate must of necessity be on reconsideration of the vote whereby the Senate assigned the bill for second reading.

The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Collins, moves that the Senate reconsider its action whereby it assigned the bill for second reading.

A division of the Senate was had.

Seventeen having voted in the affirmative and fourteen opposed, the motion to reconsider assignment prevailed.

The **PRESIDENT**: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Collins, now moves that the Senate reconsider its action whereby it accepted the majority report B.

A viva voce vote being doubted

A division of the Senate was had.

Thirteen having voted in the affirmative and eighteen opposed, the motion to reconsider the acceptance of Report B did not prevail.

Thereupon the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Report "A" from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Permitting Basketball on Sunday" (H. P. 106) (L. D. 53) reported that the same ought to pass.

(signed)

Representatives:

**WOODCOCK** of Bangor  
**HAWKES** of Saco  
**HAND** of New Limerick  
**THOMAS** of Waterville  
**STEWART** of Paris

Report "B" from the same Committee reported that the same ought not to pass.

(signed)

Senators:

**WEEKS** of Cumberland  
**ELA** of Somerset  
**HASKELL** of Penobscot

Representative:

**MARTIN** of Augusta

Comes from the House, Report "A" read and accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate:

Mr. **WEEKS** of Cumberland: Mr. President, I move acceptance of Report B, "Ought Not to Pass."

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Noyes of Hancock, the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Weeks, that Report B be accepted.

The Majority of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act for the Assessment of a State Tax for the Year Nineteen Hundred Fifty-One and for the Year Nineteen Hundred Fifty-Two," (H. P. 1675) (L. D. 1254) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(signed) Senators:

**NOYES** of Hancock  
**ALLEN** of Cumberland  
**WIGHT** of Penobscot

Representatives:

**SINCLAIR** of Pittsfield  
**CARTER** of Bethel  
**LOW** of Rockland  
**DOW** of Falmouth  
**CHASE** of Cape Elizabeth  
**DUQUETTE** of Biddeford

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

(signed) Representative:

**ROLLINS** of Greenville

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and accepted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Broggi of York, tabled pending acceptance of the report.

The Majority of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Relating to Taxation of Boats," (H. P. 1356) (L. D. 931) reported that the same ought to pass.

(Signed) Senators:

**ALLEN** of Cumberland  
**WIGHT** of Penobscot

Representatives:

**CHASE** of Cape Elizabeth  
**LOW** of Rockland  
**CARTER** of Bethel  
**DUQUETTE** of Biddeford

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought not to pass.

(Signed) Senator:

**NOYES** of Hancock



**Representatives:**

ROLLINS of Greenville  
 SINCLAIR of Pittsfield  
 DOW of Falmouth

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Noyes of Hancock, tabled pending acceptance of either report.

**Order**

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin it was

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the following bill be recalled from the office of the governor to the Senate: House Paper 1679, Legislative Document 1247; bill, An Act Relating to Fees for Boiler Inspection and Service.

**Senate Committee Reports:**

Mr. Brewer from the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act Relating to Indemnities for Control and Eradication of Bang's Disease," (S. P. 351) (L. D. 868) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

The same Senator from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for the Leasing, Operation and Maintenance of a State Office Building in the City of Augusta," (S. P. 248) (L. D. 547) reported that the same ought not to pass as it is covered by other legislation.

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Ward from the Committee on Judiciary on "Resolve Granting a Pension to Alice B. Grant, of Kittery," (S. P. 216) (L. D. 469) reported that the same ought not to pass.

On motion by Mr. Dennett of York the Resolve was tabled pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. Brewer from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve Providing Funds to Augment Institutional Appropriations," (S. P. 292) (L. D. 651) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which report was accepted and the bill read once.

Committee Amendment A was read:

"Amend said bill by striking out the figures \$10,000 and inserting in place thereof the figures \$75,487."

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

Mr. Haskell of Cumberland from the Committee on Judiciary on bill, An Act Relating to Retirement of Firemen Under Maine State Retirement Law (S. P. 526) (L. D. 1253) 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 read: "Amend said bill by striking out in the eighth line thereof the underlined words 'such member' and inserting in place thereof the underlined words 'a fireman'."

Committee Amendment A was adopted and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. Larrabee from the Committee on Natural Resources on bill, An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Outdoor Advertising Signs (S. P. 326) (L. D. 728) 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 read: "Amend said bill by adding after the words 'or above any public highway' wherever they may appear in the paragraph lettered Section 122-B, a comma. Further amend said bill by striking out the words 'in the town where the place is located and in adjoining towns' where they appear at the end of the third paragraph of Section 3 of said bill."

Committee Amendment A was adopted and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. Collins from the Committee on Towns and Counties on bill, An Act Relating to Initiative and Referendum in the City of South Portland (S. P. 70) (L. D. 76) 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 read: "Amend said bill by adding after the underlined word 'voters' in the 18th line thereof the following underlined words: 'voting at the most recent gubernatorial election'."

Committee Amendment A was adopted and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. Collins from the Committee on Towns and Counties on bill, An Act Relating to Salaries of County Officers of Androscoggin County (S. P. 422) (L. D. 982) 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 read: "Amend said bill by striking out the second paragraph of Section 1 and inserting in place thereof the following paragraph: 'Androscoggin twelve hundred dollars except the Chairman of said commission who in addition to his regular duties shall superintend the county buildings and for all services his annual salary shall be the sum of eighteen hundred dollars.' Further amend said bill by drawing a line through the figures' \$1,456' in the fourth line from the end of section five and inserting immediately after the stricken-out figures '\$1,820'. Further amend said bill by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph: 'Section 10. Effective date. The provisions of this act shall be retroactive to January 1st, 1951.'"

Committee Amendment A was adopted and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Majority of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Open Season for Hunting Deer with Bow and Arrow," (S. P. 357) (L. D. 872) reported the same in a new draft, (S. P. 561) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(signed)

Senators:

ELA of Somerset

WIGHT of Penobscot  
SMART of Hancock

Representatives:

CARVILLE of Eustis  
WATSON

of Moose River Plt.

CHASE of Belgrade

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought not to pass.

(signed)

Representatives:

PLUMMER of Lisbon

BEARCE of Caribou

DENNISON of East Machias

FRECHETTE of Sanford

On motion by Mr. Wight of Penobscot the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending acceptance of either report.

#### Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Revise the State Civil Defense Law." (H. P. 152) (L. D. 84)

Bill "An Act Relating to Clerk Hire in the Office of the Recorder of the Portland Municipal Court." (H. P. 166) (L. D. 97)

Bill "An Act Relating to Definition of 'Teacher' Under Maine State Retirement Law." (H. P. 926) (L. D. 528)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Elevator Inspection Fees." (H. P. 1017) (L. D. 577)

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, it appears that there is an error in phraseology in this bill and I have prepared an amendment which I would like to present and have adopted.

The Secretary read the amendment: Senate Amendment A to L. D. 577. "Amend said bill by inserting after the underlined word 'or' in the sixth line of Section 3, the underlined words 'thus used for'."

Senate Amendment A was adopted, the bill was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed as so amended.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Expenses of the Brunswick Municipal Court." (H. P. 1069) (L. D. 649)

Bill "An Act Relating to Salary to the Deputy Treasurer of the County of Cumberland." (H. P. 1440) (L. D. 1051)

Bill "An Act Relating to Salaries of the Judge and Recorder of the Ellsworth Municipal Court." (H. P. 1763) (L. D. 1307)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Exemptions from Taxation." (H. P. 336) (L. D. 194)

(On motion by Mr. Noyes of Hancock, the bill was laid upon the table pending second reading.)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the City of Bath." (H. P. 1119) (L. D. 706)

Bill "An Act Providing for Safety Equipment for Large Trucks." (H. P. 1373) (L. D. 963)

Bill "An Act to Clarify Laws of Division of Animal Husbandry" (H. P. 1462) (L. D. 1078)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Attorney's Fee for Foreclosure of a Mortgage." (S. P. 362) (L. D. 876)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Judge of the Northern Aroostook Municipal Court." (S. P. 545) (L. D. 1286)

"Resolve, Permitting the Building of a Wharf in Maranacook Lake." (S. P. 556) (L. D. 1314)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Duties and Powers of Aroostook County Fire Marshal." (H. P. 1678) (L. D. 1246)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of the Van Buren Municipal Court." (S. P. 280) (L. D. 619)

Bill "An Act Clarifying Certain Highway Laws." (S. P. 478) (L. D. 1142)

(On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the bill was laid upon the table pending passage to be engrossed.)

Bill "An Act Relating to Prospecting for Minerals and Metals." (S. P. 548) (L. D. 1312)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

The Committee on Engrossed Bills reported as truly and strictly engrossed, the following Bills and Resolves:

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Deputy Clerk of Courts of Penobscot County." (H. P. 659) (L. D. 375)

Bill "An Act Amending the Act Creating the Maine Turnpike Authority." (H. P. 685) (L. D. 415)

Bill "An Act Relating to Salary of Clerk of Courts of York County." (H. P. 762) (L. D. 449)

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salaries of the Judge and Recorder of the Western Washington Municipal Court." (H. P. 1067) (L. D. 647)

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of the Calais Municipal Court." (H. P. 1068) (L. D. 648)

Bill "An Act Relating to Gardiner Water District." (H. P. 1062) (L. D. 642)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the City of Augusta by Providing for the Appropriation of School Funds by the City Council." (H. P. 1178) (L. D. 745)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Sheriff of Knox County." (H. P. 1237) (L. D. 789)

Bill "An Act Relating to Town Ordinances for Junk Yards." (H. P. 1431) (L. D. 1037)

Bill "An Act Relating to Funds of Volunteer Fire Departments." (H. P. 1489) (L. D. 1095)

Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the Town of Fort Fairfield Relating to the Number of Councillors." (H. P. 1588) (L. D. 1160)

Bill "An Act Relating to Automobile Junk Yards." (H. P. 1620) (L. D. 1185)

Bill "An Act Regulating Closing-Out Sales, So-Called, and Similar Types of Sales." (H. P. 1698) (L. D. 1278)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Wells Beach Sewer District." (H. P. 1699) (L. D. 1279)

"Resolve Relating to Taking Crabs in Cumberland County." (H. P. 850) (L. D. 489)

"Resolve Extending Appropriation of Money to Improve the Approach to the Fish Way at Aroostook Falls." (H. P. 1634) (L. D. 1199)

Bill "An Act to Clarify Certain Provisions of Motor Vehicle Law." (H. P. 72) (L. D. 78)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of Sheriff of Kennebec County." (S. P. 175) (L. D. 349)

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

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge and Recorder of the Rumford Falls Municipal Court." (S. P. 282) (L. D. 621)

Bill "An Act Relating to Salary of Register of Deeds of Kennebec County." (S. P. 385) (L. D. 911)

Bill "An Act Relating to Taking Animals and Birds for Scientific Purposes." (S. P. 454) (L. D. 1068)

Bill "An Act Relating to Refunds of Gasoline Tax." (S. P. 395) (L. D. 942)

#### Enactors

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Deputy Clerk of Courts of Penobscot County." (H. P. 659) (L. D. 375)

Bill "An Act Amending the Act Creating the Maine Turnpike Authority." (H. P. 685) (L. D. 415)

Bill "An Act Relating to Salary of Clerk of Courts of York County." (H. P. 762) (L. D. 449)

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salaries of the Judge and Recorder of the Western Washington Municipal Court." (H. P. 1067) (L. D. 647)

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of the Calais Municipal Court." (H. P. 1068) (L. D. 648)

Bill "An Act Relating to Gardiner Water District." (H. P. 1062) (L. D. 642)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the City of Augusta by Providing for the Appropriation of School Funds by the City Council." (H. P. 1178) (L. D. 745)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Sheriff of Knox County." (H. P. 1237) (L. D. 789)

Bill "An Act Relating to Town Ordinances for Junk Yards." (H. P. 1431) (L. D. 1037)

Bill "An Act Relating to Funds of Volunteer Fire Departments." (H. P. 1489) (L. D. 1095)

Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the Town of Fort Fairfield Relating to the Number of Councillors." (H. P. 1588) (L. D. 1160)

Bill "An Act Relating to Automobile Junk Yards." (H. P. 1620) (L. D. 1185)

Bill "An Act Regulating Closing-Out Sales, So-Called, and Similar Types of Sales." (H. P. 1698) (L. D. 1278)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Wells Beach Sewer District." (H. P. 1699) (L. D. 1279)

"Resolve Relating to Taking Crabs in Cumberland County." (H. P. 850) (L. D. 489)

"Resolve Extending Appropriation of Money to Improve the Approach to the Fish Way at Aroostook Falls." (H. P. 1634) (L. D. 1199)

Bill "An Act to Clarify Certain Provisions of Motor Vehicle Law." (S. P. 72) (L. D. 78)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of Sheriff of Kennebec County." (S. P. 175) (L. D. 349)

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

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge and Recorder of the Rumford Falls Municipal Court." (S. P. 282) (L. D. 621)

Bill "An Act Relating to Salary of Register of Deeds of Kennebec County." (S. P. 385) (L. D. 911)

Bill "An Act Relating to Taking Animals and Birds for Scientific Purposes." (S. P. 454) (L. D. 1068)

Bill "An Act Relating to Refunds of Gasoline Tax." (S. P. 395) (L. D. 942)

Bill "An Act Relating to Complainant and Witness Fees and Costs of Police Officers and Constables." (S. P. 522) (L. D. 1250)

Bill "An Act Relating to Automobile Travel by State Fire Inspectors." (H. P. 1194) (L. D. 759)

(Tabled by Mr. Haskell of Cumberland pending passage to be enacted.)

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

### Emergency Measures

Bill "An Act Relating to Acquisition of National Forests in Oxford County." (S. P. 537) (L. D. 1274)

Which bill being an emergency measure, and having received the affirmative vote of 29 members of the Senate, and none opposed, was passed to be enacted.

Bill "An Act Providing for Funds for Civil Defense and Public Safety." (H. P. 792) (L. D. 472)

Which bill being an emergency measure, and having received the affirmative vote of 29 members of the Senate, and none opposed, was passed to be enacted.

### Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Brewer of Aroostook the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to Compensation of Justices of the Supreme Judicial and the Superior Courts Upon Retirement (S. P. 155) (L. D. 328) tabled by that Senator on April 25th pending enactment; and on further motion by the same Senator the Bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Senator Crosby of Franklin the Senate voted to take from the table Bill, An Act Imposing a Personal Income Tax (H. P. 1133) (L. D. 666) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. ALLEN of Cumberland: Mr. President, I move to adopt the Minority Ought to Pass Report of the Committee.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, I don't know that I should say anything more at this time except that I vigorously oppose the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen and I ask for a division.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I hate to oppose my good colleague from Cumberland County but I believe this bill would not raise anywhere the amount of money necessary to carry out the services which this Legislature knows are necessary.

Therefore, although I, personally do not care whether the tax that we pass is an income or a sales tax, this bill here does not carry

enough money to do the job and I, therefore, am against the motion.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, to my great surprise, again this morning I find myself in full accord with the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen.

I have been accused in this Senate in the past days of being opposed to all taxes. Well, this is the opportunity for me to come out and show that my accusers were wrong. I want to go on record as favoring this tax and I shall vote for it.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, in case I am not on record, I will now go on record as opposed to the income tax.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I think it is a matter of record that this body in in the 94th Legislature sponsored the state income tax by a resounding majority. I don't know why this particular type of taxation has become offensive with the passage of two years. It has been brought out this morning that it will not do the business but the same arguments exist for the support of an income tax that existed two years. And it is easy to amend it to a figure where it might do a good job and can do a good job.

As I mentioned the other day in objection to the sales tax, I have consistently in this Legislature stood for further aid to our teachers' colleges, further aid to the towns and cities of the state, increasing their educational subsidies, and it certainly would be hypocrisy not to be willing to stand up and vote for a measure to produce the funds to make these things possible.

I can't conceive of this Body in a two-year period going from the position of a vast majority in favor of legislation such as this to a position divergently opposite. Paying an income tax is distasteful. There is no question about that. The payment of all taxes is distasteful. March 15th is certainly not a red-letter day in our calendars. However, I think it is fair in saying that the best yardstick to measure anybody's ability to pay for government, be it on state or federal level, is their income.

This measure does not propose to take us out of the property tax field. I certainly believe we should remain in the property tax field and I certainly believe that if there is a deep enough sincerity in this body for this type of legislation, it is easy to amend it to a point where it might do the job and do it intelligently and I certainly hope that the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen, prevails.

Mr. CROSBY of Franklin: Mr. President, I think I should state my own position this morning. It is a matter of record that I have always voted against an income tax. In my area of the State, the people do not want it. We have a large group who come there to that section, purchase property and pay taxes and claim that as their residence, although their business may be in New York or some other place.

In fact, we have one man very close to my town who employs thirty-five to forty or more men the year around and he has told me over and over, ever since I have been down to the Legislature here, that if we impose an income tax in the State of Maine, he definitely will move back to New York and claim that for his residence. I think that that holds true to a large extent throughout the State. We have a lot of people here who are in this state claiming the state as their residence due to the fact we have no income tax.

I sincerely hope that the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen, does not prevail.

Mr. ALLEN of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, when I made my motion so abruptly and sat down, I was a little bit startled, myself, when it almost went under the gavel.

I think I made my position very clear last week on my personal stand on taxation and on why I signed the Ought to Pass Report for a personal income tax. Unlike the Senator across the aisle, in past sessions, I have voted and spoken for a personal income tax. This year, as I said a while ago, I found myself in a different position, the position in which I felt that the needs were very essential and that a personal income tax would not

do the job. I said at that time I was against a straight sales tax across the board and would not vote for it and I say that this morning. I said I would compromise and come to a sales tax with exemptions even though I personally did not like that type of taxation.

Obviously, therefore, I would not sign anything but a favorable report on a personal income tax because it is possible, as all things are possible in a Legislature, that we might need this bill. And of course, if the State did not go out of the property tax field, I said last week, I could not vote for a sales tax if we kept the State in the property tax field and simply had a sales tax on top of it.

I think it would be a mistake, gentlemen, to kill this bill now. I think we may need it. I certainly hope this bill will be kept alive by the Senate, even though in final passage you may not approve of it. We don't know what is going to happen to the other measure, as I said before, and I say again, I will vote for the other measure as long as it is alive and possibly it will pass and become law as a compromise measure. But if it should go down the drain, you won't catch me voting for any patchwork tax system, for a cent more on cigarettes or this that or the other.

I urge you to support my motion because I feel it would be in the best interests of the legislative proceedings over the next week or two to have this bill before us. We might very likely come to this bill. I state my position simply for the record so that you may know, as I said last week, where I, personally, stand on the tax committee and on the floor of this Senate.

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, I wish to concur with the remarks made by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen. Apparently it is unanimously conceded that the State needs more money and that there must be a tax. The amount of new dollars needed has not yet been determined.

I believe that the majority of the people in the State of Maine—I am sure it is so in Kennebec County—would prefer of all of the tax measures before us, not to have a sales tax.

I concur with the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen, in saying that he will compromise when the time comes and vote any tax bill given by the House and Senate to produce the amount of money appropriated. My preference is for an income tax, a personal income tax against the sales tax, and I shall, therefore, vote for the income tax at this time.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President, I want to take issue with the Senator from Franklin, Senator Crosby in this way. I don't believe that we should be advised as to the tax which we should put on here in the State of Maine by people outside of this State.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I think there is some element of unfairness in forcing a vote on this bill at this time. There is a sales tax at the point where it may or may not be enacted within a matter of days or hours. It seems to me the friends of an income tax in attempting to finally dispose of this tax at this time.

If I were going to vote this morning and were required to, I would vote against the income tax. But I do think that the sponsors of the income tax should not be put into the position of having their dead to enhance the passage of the sales tax. I am not making any motion to table.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, I can see the point the Senator from Somerset makes. However, we are facing two fires, in that there is one —

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that the statement is out of order and it will be stricken from the record.

Mr. NOYES: of Hancock: Excuse me, Mr. President, if I am wrong. But the purpose for bringing the income tax to a vote at this time, I believe, was to clarify the issue. If, in the opinion of the Senate, there is anything to gain by tabling the bill at this time, I, personally, have no objection to it.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I don't think it is necessary that I write into the record the fact that I favor the income tax approach to this problem over the sales tax. I think it

is also apparent to the Senator from Franklin, Senator Crosby, and the Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes, that before this thing is solved, probably we will do some compromising and I make the humble comment that this procedure doesn't make for good compromise and I am very hopeful that one or the other of those distinguished gentlemen will make the motion to table.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President, I would like to make my position clear in regard to an income tax. From the first day of convening of this Legislature we have been confronted up to this time with a sales tax for breakfast, for dinner and at suppertime.

Now, I did not come out of my cow barn, take off my cowhide boots, change my clothes and come here to this Legislature out of my own accord. I was elected a member of the Oxford County Delegation to come here and represent the citizens of Oxford County.

We have had extended debates on the sales tax and it seems as though we might have extended debates on the income tax. I am one of those who would like to go home at this time and my principal reason for that is that by debating here among ourselves, we are expending thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money. Personally, I would be willing to stay here all summer. In fact, I have been here in this State House from the beginning the first of the week, the middle of the week, the last of the week and over the weekend. In fact, I have had my nightdress in my locker. It may be there at the present time.

Now, the extended debate on the sales tax, I don't believe has changed the mind of one member of the Legislature and the extended debate on the income tax, I don't believe, will change the decision of any member of the Legislature. The opponents of the income tax, say it is not enough revenue. I would be willing to go home without a major tax bill and cut the appropriations to the different departments of our state wherever they can be cut and in case we do pass the income tax, there are departments where a cut can be made which will be to the

interests and the best interests of every citizen in the State of Maine.

Now, I recall when we accepted federal aid in our Health and Welfare Department that one of our outstanding governors at that time said—and you know who I mean when I say an outstanding governor—“We are making a mistake to accept federal aid in our health and welfare program and in the future we will be sorry.” We are sorry today. We can cut the Health and Welfare Department a million dollars and do a service to every man, woman and child in our state and by doing this, we would be making a start toward building up our shaken homes by impressing upon our young men and our young women the idea of self-support, ambition, responsibility.

We have got to turn to this program sooner or later. We have got to make a beginning and this, I believe, is the time.

Mr. BROGGI of York Mr. President, the Senator from Franklin, Senator Crosby, in his remarks this morning stated that his objection to a state income tax stems from the fact that the people in his county do not want it. I admire the Senator's position. I believe him and I appreciate his position. I am positive he would not be called a hatchet man by those of us who favor this means of raising money. As a matter of fact, I reiterate, we respect his position and I am sure I speak for my colleagues.

He says his opposition stems from the fact that his people do not want it. I might state the position of myself, at least insofar as being antagonistic to the sales tax, as being based on the same premise. It represents the majority of the feeling of the people who elected me. I can certainly say that a sales tax will be much less offensive to me as an individual than an income tax. Being in the wholesale business, the problems of collection do not incur upon my particular business and from the dollars and cents angle, the sales tax would be much less offensive.

It seems to me that the first prerogative of any member of this Senate should be to try to represent the people who elect us in an

honest, efficient and straightforward manner. And I repeat that my position in favoring an income tax is based upon the fact that I have had no objections from anybody I represent to an income tax. As a matter of fact, I received a card this morning from the President of Nasson College, Roger C. Gay—“Vote no on the sales tax. We believe an income tax is more equitable.” I have had no letters opposing an income tax.

The income tax is more offensive to me as an individual but I realize we have a problem and I am willing to vote for this measure, as much as I dislike to raise the funds to cope with the problem we have at hand.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, having learned what is going on in the other Branch of the Legislature, I think there is good reason to support this motion which I am going to make. I move that the Senate recess for five minutes.

The motion to recess prevailed.

#### After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Mr. GREELEY of Waldo: Mr. President, I move that L. D. 666 be laid upon the table.

A viva voce vote being doubted

A division of the Senate was had. Twenty-one having voted in the affirmative and eight opposed, the bill, “An Act Imposing a Personal Income Tax” (H. P. 1133) (L. D. 666) was laid upon the table pending motion by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen, to accept the Minority Ought to Pass report.

On motion by Mr. Marshall of York, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report Ought to Pass in New Draft under Same Title (H. P. 1629) from the Committee on Public Utilities on bill, An Act Creating a Sewer System for the Town of Winthrop (H. P. 165) (L. D. 96) tabled by that Senator on March 14 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator the bill was given its first reading, House Amendment A was read and



indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence; and that Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

The Secretary read the amendment:

"Senate Amendment "A" to L. D. 1188.

"Amend said bill by striking out in the 10th line of Sec. 6 thereof the underlined word "five" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '3'

"Further amend said Bill by striking out Section 8 thereof and inserting the following in place thereof:

"Sec. 8. REFERENDUM. This act shall take effect 90 days after the adjournment of the legislature only for the purpose of permitting its submission to the legal voters of the territory embraced within the limits of said district, present and voting at a special election called and held for the purpose on petition therefor signed by at least 20 legal voters resident within said district. Such special election shall be held not later than one year after the effective date of this act and shall be called, advertised and conducted according to the law relating to municipal elections; provided, however, that the board of registration in said town of Winthrop shall prepare and furnish separate check lists for such of the voters within said district as are then legal voters of said town and reside in said district, and all notices, warrants or other proceedings shall be varied accordingly so as to show that only such voters as reside in said district as aforesaid are entitled to vote at such meeting. At such meeting the vote shall be by ballot bearing the question "Shall the act creating a Sewer System for the Town of Winthrop be accepted?" and the voters shall indicate by a cross or check mark placed against the words "Yes" or "No" their opinion of the same. This act shall take effect for all the purposes hereof immediately upon its acceptance by a majority of the legal voters voting at said meeting; provided that the total number of votes cast for and against the acceptance of this act equals or exceeds 20% of the voters on said check list. The result in said district shall be declared by the

selectmen of the town of Winthrop and due certificate thereof filed by the town clerk with the secretary of state."

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

On motion by Mr. Allen of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report Ought not to pass from the Committee on Legal Affairs on bill, An Act to Create the Maine State Safety Council (S. P. 207) (L. D. 456) tabled by that Senator on March 15 pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. ALLEN of Cumberland: I will try not to be any more lengthy than necessary although this bill cannot be explained in two or three words.

This bill comes out of the Committee on Legal Affairs with an ought not to pass report. It provides briefly, L. D. 456, to set up a state safety council made up primarily of department reads. Section 2 of the bill defines the powers and duties of the council and says: "The Maine state safety council shall coordinate and promote safety projects and serve as a clearing house for all safety work within the state."

If I am successful in disagreeing with the Committee on Legal Affairs, I will offer two amendments, one which would put the executive secretary under the provision of the Personnel Law instead of by statutory salary as suggested in the bill itself and secondly tacking on an appropriation clause appropriating ten thousand dollars for the first year and seventy-five hundred for the fiscal year ending June 1953.

Most of you on many occasions have heard me talk on safety and the problem it is in the state and in the nation. I will not go into any long discourse at this time on that subject but there seems to be a very definite lack of coordination in the State of Maine as to the various and sundry work that is being done by various groups, the PTA groups, the automobile associations, the Maine Good Roads Association, service groups, chambers of commerce and all the other groups. But there

is no real coordination of these efforts into safety.

I am not talking entirely on highway safety. I am talking on all phases of safety—safety programs carried on in industry under our Department of Labor and Industry, the safety work of Education, but primarily it is not just a department problem. You might say immediately, "Well, why don't the departments work together?" They do. But we need to set up here in the state a safety council such as is set up in 38 of the 48 states. It acts as a top Body through which all these programs can be handled. This lack of coordination is a great handicap here in Maine imposed on the various groups such as industrial organizations, insurance business and all the other groups who are waiting and willing to work on this subject.

Your next question no doubt is, "Is it really necessary?" I think that fact has been brought out by many people including myself. In highway alone in twenty years time we have had more fatalities than have been suffered by Americans in all wars from the Revolutionary War up to and including the present Korean conflict. It is serious and it is a menace. I just picked up a column here in this magazine a public safety magazine telling about highway safety and it states that by the end of 1952 there will have been one million traffic accident fatalities. A million people in other words will have been killed by traffic accidents by December of this year. There is a paragraph here which I thought was quite fitting to read at this time by the Director of the Texas Department of Public Safety. "Let's get it clearly in our own minds, that the persons killed or injured on our highways are just as true casualties as those in Korea and the persons who cause or are responsible for these casualties are contributing to the welfare of our enemy. I will sum up the problem in one simple statement of facts: The killing and maiming of our citizens and the destruction of property must be stopped as a necessary and vital contribution to the preservation of the nation."

This bill had its hearing before the Committee on Legal Affairs and many persons testified in behalf of the bill. The Junior State Chamber of Commerce took an active interest in the bill. I don't recall, and if I am wrong the committee will correct me, that there was any opposition to it. We feel, those of us who have done a little study on the subject, that it really is the key to our problem here in the state. We feel that in this way we really could get going in all phases of safety work.

I have a copy of an address which was delivered in Lansing, Michigan on March 22 and I will read it if I may, to show you what other states are doing. As I say, 38 of them now have this coordination of safety activities. The states that do not have it are Alabama, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, South Carolina, Oklahoma, North Carolina. The other states do have it. This has been endorsed publicly by such persons as the Secretary of State Harold Goss whose opinion I know is respected in this Body and in the state in general. It is endorsed by the Governor of our state who helped me to some extent by showing me what has been done in other states. I would like to read this address because I really think it is important. It shows you the need of coordination.

"Our basic problem today is how to get along together, in our community, our state, our nation and with the rest of the world. Government—local, state, national and international—is one of our chief devices for getting along together.

"It is thus imperative that we develop and adapt our governmental structures to fit the rapidly changing conditions and problems created by our complex, mechanical society. Nowhere is the impact of this need greater than in the case of the state governments in relation to highway transportation and traffic.

"The traditional and logical structure of government is in terms of such major functions as: construction and maintenance of facilities for the public use, including streets and highways; policing, to protect the public safety and

health; education; taxation. A serious problem arises when a great new development such as motorized highway traffic cuts across this basic structure. Then, some enthusiast always suggests the easy panacea — just set up a 'traffic czar' to handle everything.

"But this, like all panaceas, would create more problems than it would solve. We just can't separate traffic safety education from education in general, or traffic policing from other policing. We can and should combine in one department a group of related traffic functions but we can't combine them all. Nor can we make any one department primarily responsible for traffic and give it authority to set policies and programs which other co-equal departments must follow. To attempt anything of this sort is to jump from the frying pan into an even hotter fire. To combine in one department all highway and traffic engineering all highway policing, and training is so absurd as to require no discussion.

"The fact remains that the engineering, enforcement and educational responsibilities of the state, with respect to highway traffic, are very closely interrelated. If we cannot summarily combine them, what can we do?

"The answer is simple: Coordination. This has been recommended in all the reports of the President's Highway Safety Conference during the past five years, and before that by the National Safety Council, the Automotive Safety Foundation, and others. No responsible person or agency has ever, to my knowledge, disputed this recommendation.

"Just what do we mean by this much used word 'coordination'? I have observed that almost everyone is willing to coordinate everybody else but not nearly so many are willing to be coordinated.

"There are certain things which coordination does not mean. It does not mean that any one person or agency is to tell everyone else what to do. It does not mean that any agency is to give up its own authority and responsibility. It means, rather, that the people concerned with a particular problem, each retaining his full authority and

responsibility, are to sit down together, talk over the objective they are all trying to reach, what each is doing toward that end, how their several activities overlap or perhaps conflict, how these duplications and conflicts can be remedied, and how any gaps in the total program can be filled.

"During recent years this kind of coordination has been developed among the dozens of national associations and agencies, official and other, concerned with traffic safety. This has been done through the President's Highway Safety Conference, the Traffic and Transportation Conference of the National Safety Council, and joint committees on specific subjects such as uniform laws. I don't believe anyone would question that the President's Conference has been a powerful force for traffic safety, and I am equally sure no one would assert that it has interfered in the slightest degree with the authority, responsibility or initiative of its participants. It has helped all of us; it has hurt none of us; above all, it has furthered the cause for which we all are striving.

"The same kind of cooperation, the same approach, the same general methods apply at the state level; first, among the official departments having primary responsibility for safety on the highway; then, among the unofficial groups, business, civic and other; and between the officials and the private organizations. Such is, as I understand it, precisely the aim and objective of the Michigan State Safety Commission and its Advisory Committee.

"It would be futile in any state, for the highway authorities to erect stop signs or establish speed zones which the police would then ignore. It would be futile for the educational authorities to set up a system of driver training which would not equip the trainees to pass the examination for a driver's license.

"It would be futile for any agency, official or private, to conduct a big educational campaign and put up thousands of posters saying for example that 'drunk drivers go to jail' (or lose their licenses) unless through the efforts of enforcement

officials drunk drivers actually do just that.

"It would be futile, or at least a great waste of energy, for one department to propose legislation which would be opposed by other departments or by even a large minority of the unofficial groups. It would be futile for any state agency to embark on any project involving the communities in the face of opposition or indifference from the communities themselves.

"To achieve coordination in official functioning there is need, first of all, for policy agreement at the top. Such agreement obviously can be reached only by the heads of the departments concerned.

"The administration of these policies remains the day-by-day job of the departments concerned. I repeat that coordination does not mean that any official surrenders one iota of his statutory authority and responsibility. When the heads of, for example, the highway and police departments have agreed that there shall be official cooperation on such matters as stop signs and speed zones, this policy is carried out through personal contact in the field between the representatives of the departments. Only if unexpected problems arise or serious disagreements develop does the subject have to go up again for further discussion and agreement by the department heads.

"Exactly the same principles and methods apply to cooperation between unofficial agencies such as motor clubs, highway transporters, safety councils and so on; and to cooperation between the official and the private groups."

I am not going to read all of it because the hour is late. I am just trying to bring out to you the importance of coordination. This isn't just another wild idea; it is not just another bill thought up by me or anyone else. This works in 38 states. And when we are losing in the State of Maine on our highways more lives than we are losing in the war in Korea, and other wars, I think it is about time that the legislature in this state started to do something about it.

I have talked on this subject before. I have stood in the House and I have stood in the Senate and

I have battled for safety. I say the people of the state are interested. I say that some day, here or somewhere else we have got to spend more money on public safety projects rather than thinking quite so much about the bridge across North Overshoe or the cities of Portland, Bangor or Lewiston. It is easy to see a bridge and it is easy to see a new highway but it is darned hard to see money going for safety work. It's easy to pick out a store and plunk down a hundred dollars for a chair. You see what you are getting. But it is a little bit harder, gentlemen, to see money spent for safety purposes.

Two years ago I asked for \$25,000 for highway safety. We paid twenty-two million for highway matters but couldn't afford to pay \$25,000 for the people who are getting killed on these same highways. This year the bill is in again and I hope it will go a little further and I think perhaps this year we may have some support either through that resolve or another. This bill is a means by which you can get a program going in the State of Maine, take all the scattered groups, put them all together under one responsible head and carry out a program of education and safety; safety whether you are standing behind a lathe or a saw in a machine-shop or whether you travel along the highway. These are all problems of safety. Safety today is the biggest problem in the country, believe it or not.

Gentlemen, I am hot on this subject, but I think the legislature has dilly-dallied around here long enough. I hope some day this project will get started. I have an amendment which I will offer. I think the cost is reasonable. I frankly disagree with my good friend and colleague on my right and all the members of the Legal Affairs Committee. I just couldn't understand that one and I certainly hope that you will support my motion against that of the Legal Affairs Committee.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, the Committee on Legal Affairs recognized that safety measures are necessary and recognized the zeal and ardor of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen. He is to be commended for that

zeal. But, zealous as he is, everything he recommends in this measure along the line of safety can be done with the now existing department heads. This measure sets up a new bureau and an organization at some expense which as time goes on may increase. We did not feel that was necessary and thought it was one of the things which we could do without. It might even hamper the different departments in their safety work, such as the Department of Labor, the Secretary of State and the highway safety program, if they had to conform to other peoples' ideas on the matter of safety. The Committee saw nothing in this bill that can't be done at the present time. For those reasons we reported the bill unanimously ought not to pass.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen, made a motion?

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. President, I tried to make clear to the Senator from Somerset, Senator Ela, the fact that although we realize that the departments have safety programs we are trying to look beyond that point. We know they still will have programs but they are all operating their programs independently and these outside groups are also all operating independently, and with the six or seven state departments there are also about fifteen outside agencies all working separately.

It seems to me that this is a state responsibility and it would not alter the other programs. It merely means that the department heads would meet, perhaps once a month, with this bureau, go over the general program, and work together in a way that would effect some co-ordination in this work. And when you have co-ordination, as everyone knows you have effective results.

As far as money is concerned I can't get excited about this thing being expensive when you consider the millions of dollars damages being done and the hundreds of people killed on our highways and you can't tell me, in view of all that, that ten thousand dollars would be expensive. I think fifty thousand dollars would be more like it. Ten thousand dollars the

first year and seventy-thousand the next, to me is not expensive for the results you would get. The State of Maine has certainly spent ten times that amount on things not nearly as important. And personally I believe every one must agree with that statement. You understand, this money would come out of the general fund. Some might say it should come out of the highway fund but, as it is set up in most states, it seems advisable that the money should come out of the general fund.

So I make apology for the ten thousand dollars the first year and twenty-five thousand the second year. I am convinced that this is worth the price tag, and I move, Mr. President, that the bill be substituted for the ought not to pass report, and when the vote is taken I move it be taken by division.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Allen, moves to substitute the bill for the ought not to pass report of the committee and the Senator has requested a division.

A division of the Senate was had.

Two having voted in the affirmative and twenty-seven opposed.

The motion to substitute did not prevail.

Whereupon, on motion by Mr. Weeks of Cumberland the ought not to pass report of the committee was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Cumberland the Senate voted to take up for consideration bill, An Act Relative to Revision and Publication of Municipal Ordinances H. P. 1543) (L. D. 1136) which was recalled from the office of the governor by joint order.

The Secretary read the parliamentary history of the bill: "In the House, read a third time and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A on April 18th. In the Senate, on April 20th, passed to be engrossed in concurrence."

Mr. HASKELL, of Cumberland: Mr. President, for the purpose of offering an amendment I will now move that the rules be suspended and the Senate reconsider its pre-

vious action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Thereupon the rules were suspended and the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

The same Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption: "Amend said bill by adding after the underlined word 'city' in the third line of that part designated Section 83-B, the underlined words 'or town'. Further amend said bill by striking out the underlined words 'of the mayor' in the third line of that part designated Section 83-C."

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 the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes

Recessed until this afternoon at four o'clock.

#### After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act to Authorize the Building of a Road Across Massacre Pond, in Scarborough (H. P. 61) (L. D. 27) tabled by that Senator on April 11th pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A"; and on further motion by Senator Ward of Penobscot, Committee Amendment A was indefinitely postponed and the same Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

The Secretary read the amendment:

Senate Amendment "A" to L. D. 27.

"Amend said bill by inserting in the title before word 'Road' the word 'Private'

Further amend said bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Gladys I. Jordan authorized to build a private road. Gladys I. Jordan, of Scarborough, in the County of Cumberland and State of Maine, her heirs and assigns, are hereby authorized and empowered to build

and maintain a private road across Massacre pond, so called, a great pond, situated in Scarborough, in the County of Cumberland, said private road to extend from land owned by said Gladys I. Jordan on the northwesterly side of said Massacre pond to land owned by her in common with another on the southeasterly side of said Massacre pond; provided that a bridge be constructed in said road at least eight feet in length and of sufficient height to permit the free passage of rowboats, canoes and their occupants under said 'bridge.' "

Mr. WARD of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill was presented to the Legislature by Mr. Chase and it was heard by the Committee on Natural Resources and at that time Mr. Robinson Verrill of Portland appeared in opposition to the bill, representing the Sprague interests. It seems that Miss Jordan owns the land on one side of Massacre Pond and that she, together with the Sprague interests own in common the land on the other side.

Since the hearing before the Natural Resources Committee, the Sprague interests and Miss Jordan have gotten together on this proposition and this bill as now amended meets the approval of both parties and Mr. Verrill has withdrawn his opposition to it as amended.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Ward, moves the adoption of Senate Amendment A. Is this the pleasure of the Senate?

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

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook the Senate voted to take from the table Bill, An Act Relating to Fees in Small Claims Law (H. P. 1270) (L. D. 830) tabled by that Senator on April 23rd pending acceptance of the Minority Ought to Pass report of the Committee.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, in support of my motion to accept the Minority Ought to Pass Report on this bill, I will just explain it briefly. As a mat-

ter of fact, I think this bill probably should have been referred to the Committee on Towns and Counties because it is a bill relating to fees, but it came to the Judiciary Committee and it increases the filing fee on small claims that are brought before the Municipal Courts from two dollars to four dollars and makes provision for what shall be done with this filing fee.

The judge used to receive seventy-five cents out of the two-dollar fee and now he would receive \$1.75 and the county where the offense is committed—there should be an amendment there. I don't know what offense this is, unless small claims are offenses, anyway—but the County gets the balance of it.

My only reason for signing the Minority Report in this matter is because in the last two sessions of the Legislature we have generally increased the fees, both in the offices of the clerks of courts and registers of deeds and other county offices on the theory it costs a little more to operate now than it did a few years ago.

I believe this section was passed, the small claims court bill, in 1945, six years ago and I believe the fees that are set up, the two-dollar filing fee has not been changed since that time. I feel that the four-dollar fee is justified and I therefore move the acceptance of the Minority Report and if it prevails, I will try to present an amendment to take care of that "where the offense is committed" business.

Mr. HASKELL of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I think in many ways I could agree with my friend the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes, with reference to the Committee which heard this bill. Perhaps it should have been heard by the Committee on Towns and Counties. But in that connection, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the companion bill which appears as L. D. 838, also dealing with the small claims law.

Eight-thirty-eight was reported out of committee unanimously Ought Not to Pass. L. D. 839 which is now under consideration came on a nine to one or eight to one,

I believe. Why I take these two bills together is the fact that it has always been my understanding—and I was a member of the Legislature in 1945 when the original small claims law was passed—that the basic or fundamental purpose of that law was to provide a speedy and uncomplicated and inexpensive method for the adjustment of small claims, claims under thirty-five dollars.

Now, it seems to me when we are faced with companion bills—and I say they are companion bills because they were sponsored by the same individual—you have got to more or less read the intent of those bills into the action being taken. Instead of coming forward, it seems to me, and saying, let's repeal the small claims law, they have done it in a manner of attacking both of the fundamental points. By requiring, as they hope to do in L. D. 838, that even these small grocery bills or similar items all had to be itemized, they were, I believe, taking away an uncomplicated legal procedure and substituting one which was intended to make it complicated. And perhaps realizing they might not accomplish that purpose, L. D. 839 also appears, in which, instead of making it an inexpensive process, they endeavor to make it more costly, both for the small merchant who really wants to collect an eighteen or twenty-dollar account, but more especially for the defendant who has to pay the costs.

For that reason, I felt that it was entirely proper to sign a report indicating that this should not pass. I can't believe that if we are to sustain as a part of our law the theory that the collection of small claims are a matter which should be handled in a little different manner than those which we ordinarily associate with court actions of that nature, that we should compel the merchant who wants to collect a seven or eight-dollar account which is justly due him, to have to pay a filing fee of four dollars and in turn have the defendant have to pay that four dollars back to the merchant and have it added to the bill.

Now, I am a little bit in sympathy with the fact that a dollar of that amount presumably as the bill

was written would go to accounting. But I am also rather strongly inclined to believe that our courts should not be operated necessarily on a money-making basis.

I think if a merchant has a small claim or any individual has a small claim of under thirty-five dollars, that it is desirable legislation, both for him and for the party whom he seeks to collect from, to have a tribunal where they can come in and have the matters decided on a non-technical basis and have neither party pay excessive costs.

I don't believe that there is any present necessity of increasing the filing fee in the small claims court from two dollars to four dollars and for that reason I hope that the Minority Report does not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes, that the Senate accept the Minority Report "Ought to Pass."

A viva voce vote being had

The motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Haskell of Cumberland the Majority Report "Ought Not to Pass" was accepted in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Wight of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game; Majority Report "Ought to Pass in New Draft" (S. P. 561); Minority Report "Ought Not to Pass" on bill, An Act Relating to Open Season for Hunting Deer with Bow and Arrows (S. P. 357) (L. D. 872) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. WIGHT of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I believe it was four years ago that a similar bill was in this legislature and was not taken very seriously as I remember it but when the sponsors of this bill came to me earlier in the session, I was rather reluctant to take the bill, but after thinking it over, I did take it and put it into the legislature. Shortly after that I came into possession of some advertising matter from Wisconsin and some of the western states and I found that those states were capi-

talizing on bow and arrow hunting and endeavored to furnish this sport for their residents and also to bring in non-residents into the state.

I find that several of the western states have open season, particularly Michigan which has an open season of thirty-five days previous to the open season for firearms. They issued in 1950 fourteen thousand bow and arrow licenses for residents and 878 non-resident licenses. New York has 14 days—2 weeks open season prior to regular firearm season. They issued 1151 non-resident licenses in 1950. Wisconsin has open season 45 days prior to the open season for firearms for deer and Wisconsin issued 15,000 bow and arrow licenses to residents and 2400 to non-residents.

I might say here that Wisconsin attracted those 2400 non-residents from twenty different states. The number of deer killed in Wisconsin was only 383 that year. I have a letter here in my files which came from a man interested in archery in Massachusetts. He writes a very interesting letter and in the last paragraph he tells about going to Wisconsin last fall about the first of October to hunt and apparently he had a wonderful time. He didn't get a deer because he didn't mention it and I am sure he would have had he got the deer. He did tell about the wonderful woods, the beautiful trees and so forth. They are capitalizing on that. I don't see any reason why we shouldn't do that very thing here in the State of Maine.

I have another interesting letter here from the Department of Conservation in Wisconsin and you might be interested in just a little of this letter. "During our past 45 day season beginning on September 23 and ending on November 7 the total of 383 deer were bagged with bow and arrow. All of Wisconsin's 71 counties were open to bow hunting. Deer taken during the 1950 season were bagged at an average distance of 28 yards and were recovered at a distance of 150 yards.

"A total of 2400 non-resident bow and arrow licenses were sold. This



was an increase of 782 over the previous year. Out of state hunters came from 20 states."

Wisconsin gets out various advertising booklets and so forth to advertise bow and arrow hunting and I have one here in my hand. One paragraph here printed in the year of 1949 says that during the fall season, a total number of arrow-killed deer during the 15 years of legalized bow hunting was less than 1900, less than the salvaged illegal deer killed either in 1947 or 1948.

Our deer herd would not suffer any if we advertised archery in the northeastern part of the country, where there are archery clubs and those people who have archery for a hobby are just as interested in it and it would induce people to come into Maine just as much in coming to Maine as other people who use firearms.

I figured that if we could attract two thousand out of state hunters to Maine each fall to hunt with bow and arrows, the State of Maine would take in something like \$500,000 from those people. They all have money to spend. They would spend it with our guides, they would spend it at our hotels and that is what we live on in Maine, the money which is brought in by sportsmen and other people who come in here on vacations.

I have here a pamphlet put out by Michigan and various states and very interesting. They advertise to get people into their states to enjoy the woods. A person can hunt with a camera—and I am sure my associate here from Penobscot County enjoys hunting with his camera and does no damage either—incidentally he does a wonderful job I think you all will agree. I cannot see any harm in this plan to get people in here to hunt with bow and arrow.

I have another letter here from the State of Michigan which gives some insight on the situation there. They are endeavoring to get outside people in their state to hunt with bow and arrow. I would like to read a paragraph from that letter:

"The earlier and longer bow hunting seasons have been criticized by

some gun hunters. They maintain that this bestows a special privilege to the archers; that archers 'stir up' the deer which makes for more difficult hunting during the regular season; and that many deer are seen with arrows sticking from them. The Department has found the relatively few archers in their quiet manner of hunting do not 'stir up' the deer and that the number of deer wounded by arrows is proportionately no greater, if as great as, the number wounded by firearms during the regular season. Stories of deer with arrows sticking from them are almost 100% unfounded. Hits with arrows are not as numerous as some critics would believe and any protruding arrow is soon broken off when a deer takes to cover. Furthermore, the special season is not discriminatory in that anyone, who is entitled to hunt deer, may purchase both a regular license and an archery license. If the gun hunter wishes to do so he may take out a bow license in October and then hunt later with a gun if he is not successful."

I talked with Everett Groaton down in our department here that advertises Maine. I think they are doing a good job down there, and he suggests a folder of this kind, for instance, which we could send out to the various archery clubs in New England and maybe New York State and New Jersey, advertising our open season in archery in the State of Maine and if a few deer are killed here in the State in that open season, which I hope we will have next fall, and those deer can go out of the State of Maine on automobiles to these various big cities just west or south of us and to each deer will be attached a good-sized tag which will say on it, "This deer was killed by bow and arrow in the State of Maine," in big letters on it so that everybody will see that that deer was killed here in the State of Maine. We can get a tremendous amount of advertising from that.

Now, here is a tag which we attach to non-resident license and each deer that is killed in the State of Maine with a firearm in the state has one of these tags attached to it. Formerly it was plain. It did not have anything on it at all.

Deer going out of the State of Maine on an automobile had nothing on them to show that that deer was taken in the State of Maine. But today every deer has one of those tags on it like this right here. It has one of those tags on it. Also, every out of state hunter who takes out a bear must register it and pay twenty-five cents and for that twenty-five cents he gets a big license tag about two-thirds as big as that which is attached to that bear and that goes out of the state attached to that bear so that everybody will see it was killed in the State of Maine.

Now, we can build up something from this open season in bow and arrow. Wisconsin has done it. In 1945, for instance, Wisconsin sold 388 non-resident bow hunting licenses; in 1946, 763 non-resident licenses; 1947, 1112; 1948, 1285; 1949, 1628; and in 1950, 2400. Now, the total killed has run from 160 to 256, 368, 279, 551 and 383. So, you can see that the deer herd does not suffer from the bow and arrow hunters.

I think that we can get a lot of them here to enjoy our woods about the first of October right when the trees are aflame with color and they are going to leave us a lot of money. So, Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass Report.

Mrs. KAVANAGH of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would like to go on record as opposed to this bill. It may be good sport but I think it is poor sportsmanship. I think many people are proficient in archery. But many people who are not proficient will go out with bows and arrows and what is going to happen to those poor deer who are not killed instantly? They are going to suffer and I think it is cruelty to animals. I don't think that the State needs that publicity. I think they can get it in another way and I hope this bill does not pass.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate, the committee which heard this bill spent a great deal of time on it and we did give particular attention to the thought as expressed by the Senator from Androscoggin and went at some length into the question of whether or not it was

a more cruel method than hunting with guns, and the committee was sure that the bow and arrow method of hunting is probably far more deadly than hunting with a rifle, once you hit the deer. One of these arrows such as is mentioned in the bill has far greater penetrating ability than your highest powered rifle and in almost every case that was brought to our attention the deer succumbed more quickly and readily and there weren't the wounded deer running around in the woods that you have with rifles.

I think many people have different ideas of enjoyment. Things which one person likes to do, another person may not like to do, but we are a sporting state, we have a great quantity of fish and game, we recognize that it is alright to hunt and take fish and game and if that is so why quibble with one group that wishes to do it one way when we reserve to ourselves the right to do it another way? Let's be open-minded in the matter. It is something which is growing. I see no particular objection to the activity, which was freely allowed to the gun men to have a little season for the bow and arrow men if they wish.

This bill is confined to four counties; Franklin, Somerset, Piscataquis and Penobscot. I feel it is a good bill and fairly presented by Senator Wight, and I hope it receives passage.

Mr. WIGHT of Penobscot: Mr. President, I think my colleague, Senator Ela, has answered the cruelty question but it says in this book here, "There is very little verified evidence of a considerable number of arrow-wounded or later-found dead deer. Undoubtedly, there are more crippled and wasted deer than were reported. Instances of these undesirable conditions are not as evident as the number of wasted deer resulting from other types of hunting. The killing power of an arrow has been demonstrated by many big game hunters. During recent years, bow hunters have taken moose in Canada, Kodiak bear in Alaska, grizzlies in the Rockies, cougars in the western states, and lions in Africa.

I might say that I have here a letter from Essex Bowmen, Inc., of

Lawrence, Mass., and I want to read one paragraph of this letter: "Without question if Maine should have either a pre-season or special areas reserved to bowmen, it would draw a great number of bow hunters from this state. Maine has, no doubt, the greatest deer herd of the New England states, and the topographical features of this state are most favorable to this type of hunting. The facilities awarded out-of-state bow hunters are equal if not superior to all other states. If such a bill should be passed, it is in my opinion that the majority of bow hunters in the Essex Bowmen, for example, who now hunt the state of New Hampshire would hunt Maine."

I might say while I am on my feet that here is one of those tags that are attached to bears that come out of Maine, and it is very good advertising.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, my colleague, Senator Wight, knowing my experience with bows and arrows, asked me to tell you how little damage these devices do to deer. In a truthful recitation of my experience with bow and arrows I am sure that no great damage will be done. Some twenty years ago while in the Maine woods, and well in — and it seemed that time of day when it is possible to find deer and go where they are located and see the outlines of them — a

group of bow and arrow enthusiasts came into the camp where I was staying, very full of enthusiasm, and I had equal enthusiasm to help them so I took them out where I suspected they would get some good bow and arrow hunting. We walked through a long field and passed up several good bow and arrow shots until we found a good-sized buck well up at the end of the field, and as I say, it was that time of day when it was easy to do that sort of thing, and six good bow and arrow men stood in a row behind me and I had that kind of device with me that made it very clear where the deer was and they unloaded whatever the device is that holds the arrows, the entire sheath, and that deer I assure you wasn't hurt in the least. I don't believe a great deal of pain and suffering is going to result to the deer from those enthusiasts, I really don't.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Wight, that the Senator accept the majority, Ought to Pass, report of the committee.

A viva voce vote being had

The majority, Ought to Pass, report of the committee was accepted, and the bill was laid upon the table for printing under the joint rules.

On motion by Mr. Wight of Penobscot

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.