

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-Sixth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1953

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Tuesday, March 17, 1953

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Frank A. Pitman of Belfast.

The Members stood at attention during the playing of the National Anthem.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate:

Resolve providing for the Printing of "Maine Pollen Survey" (S. P. 478) (L. D. 1333)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in concurrence.

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act relating to Combinations Restricting Use of Musical Compositions" (S. P. 479) (L. D. 1335)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence.

From the Senate:

Resolve Authorizing Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Land in Hancock County, Maine (S. P. 480) (L. D. 1334)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Natural Resources in concurrence.

**Senate Reports of Committees
Ought to Pass**

Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act to Control Vesicular Diseases" (S. P. 217) (L. D. 583) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 465) (L. D. 1296) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to

Minor Violations by Liquor Licensees" (S. P. 133) (L. D. 321)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Certain Violations by Liquor Licensees" (S. P. 134) (L. D. 323)

Report of the Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Allowance to Commissioned Officers for Maintenance of Uniforms and Equipment" (S. P. 195) (L. D. 432)

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

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence and the Bills read twice, and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Amend the Exemption in the Sales and Use Tax Law Respecting Hospitals" (S. P. 72) (L. D. 156)

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

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

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 72, L. D. 156, An Act to Amend the Exemption in the Sales and Use Tax Law Respecting Hospitals

Amend said Bill by adding thereto a new paragraph numbered XII-A to read as follows:

'XII-A. Sales to proprietors of unincorporated hospitals. Sales to proprietors of unincorporated hospitals of hospital supplies and equipment. By "hospital supplies and equipment" is intended all tangible personal property bought for the care, treatment and housing of patients of the hospital or any other purpose necessarily incident to the operation of the hospital.'

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

Tabled and Assigned

Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Clarify the Sales and Use Tax Law" (S. P. 141) (L. D. 341)

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

In the House: Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Peterson of Bar Harbor, the Report, with accompanying papers, was tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report in concurrence, and the matter was specially assigned for Tuesday, March 24)

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Salary of Commissioners of Aroostook County" (S. P. 74) (L. D. 158)

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

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

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 74, L. D. 158, Bill, "An Act Relating to Salary of Commissioners of Aroostook County."

Amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figures "\$1,500" in the 1st line of the 2nd paragraph thereof, and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures '\$1,250'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the last line of the 2nd paragraph thereof the underlined figures "\$4,500" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures '\$4,000'.

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

Refer to the Committee on Agriculture

Report of the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act Regulating the Manufacturing and Sale of Soft Drinks, Syrups and Non-alco-

holic Beverages" (S. P. 417) (L. D. 1127) reporting that same be committed to the Committee on Agriculture.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

In the House: Report of the Committee was accepted in concurrence and the Bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Regulating Fishing in East Branch Tributaries of the Penobscot River (H. P. 101) (L. D. 102) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence in the House on March 11.

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

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

Senate Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Reduce the Voting Age to Eighteen Years (S. P. 81) (L. D. 188)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. REID of Kennebec
WARD of Penobscot
HARDING of Knox
—of the Senate

Messrs. McGLAUFILIN of Portland
FULLER of Bangor
MARTIN of Augusta
TRAFTON of Auburn
LOW of South Portland
CIANCHETTE of Pittsfield
—of the House

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. FITANIDES of Saco
—of the House

Came from the Senate with the Minority Report accepted, the Bill amended by Senate Amendment "A" and then indefinitely postponed.

In the House: Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Fitanides of Saco, the two Reports, with accompanying papers, were tabled pending consideration and specially assigned for tomorrow)

On motion of Mrs. Christle of Presque Isle, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

**House Reports of Committees
Divided Report
Tabled**

Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Taking of Smelts from Songo River, Cumberland County" (H. P. 259) (L. D. 289) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. WEEKS of Cumberland
—of the Senate

Messrs. FRECHETTE of Sanford
HARNDEN of Rangeley
BUTLER of Franklin
VAUGHAN of Hallowell
WHITNEY of Bridgton
CURRIER of Caribou
—of the House

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. WIGHT of Penobscot
—of the Senate

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Center of Standish, the two Reports, with accompanying papers, were tabled pending acceptance of either Report)

**Divided Report
Tabled**

Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Muskrats in Cumberland County" (H. P. 804) (L. D. 888)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WIGHT of Penobscot
WEEKS of Cumberland
—of the Senate

Messrs. WATSON

of Moose River Pl.
CURRIER of Caribou
VAUGHAN of Hallowell
BUTLER of Franklin
HARNDEN of Rangeley

—of the House

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. WHITNEY of Bridgton
—of the House

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Whitney of Bridgton, the two Reports, with accompanying papers, were tabled pending acceptance of either Report)

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Miss Steeves from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to Manufacturers and Bottlers of Non-Alcoholic Beverages" (H. P. 317) (L. D. 389) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1195) (L. D. 1348) under same title and that it "Ought to pass".

Mr. Watson from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Hunting with Bow and Arrow" (H. P. 256) (L. D. 286) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1196) (L. D. 1350) under same title and that it "Ought to pass".

Mr. Senter from the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act to Establish a State Committee on Aging" (H. P. 541) (L. D. 522) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1197) (L. D. 1349) under same title and that it "Ought to pass".

Mr. Kelly from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Speed Regulations for Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 292) (L. D. 277) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1198) (L. D. 1351) under same title and that it "Ought to pass".

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

**Ought to Pass
Printed Bills**

Mr. Alden from the Committee on Claims reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve in favor of the Town of Sullivan (H. P. 717) (L. D. 1352)

Mr. Brown from same Committee

reported same on Resolve in favor of Eastern Maine General Hospital, of Bangor (H. P. 634) (L. D. 656)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Town of Knox (H. P. 638) (L. D. 1353)

Mr. Fogg from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Rodolphe H. Morais of South China (H. P. 498) (L. D. 1354)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse Clark-Mitchell Funeral Homes, of Bangor (H. P. 502) (L. D. 1355)

Mr. Hussey from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Town of Liberty (H. P. 637) (L. D. 1356)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Ray Spearen of South China (H. P. 908) (L. D. 1357)

Mr. Tuttle from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse White & Hayes of Bangor (H. P. 501) (L. D. 1358)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the City of Gardiner (H. P. 797) (L. D. 882)

Mr. Walker from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Town of Milo (H. P. 486) (L. D. 506)

Mr. Currier from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on Bill "An Act relative to Mapleton and Chapman Game Preserve" (H. P. 728) (L. D. 747)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bill read twice, the Resolves read once and tomorrow assigned.

Tabled

Mr. Vaughan from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Muskrats in Washington County" (H. P. 257) (L. D. 287)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Cates of East Machias, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report.)

Mr. Dicker from the Committee on Public Health reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Renewal of Licenses for Barber-

ing, Hairdressing and Beauty Culture" (H. P. 759) (L. D. 794)

Mr. Call from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Fees of Western Somerset Municipal Court" (H. P. 855) (L. D. 929)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Increase the Salaries of the Judge and Recorder of the Piscataquis Municipal Court" (H. P. 870) (L. D. 941)

Mr. Evans from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Salary of Judge and Allowance for Clerk Hire of the Pittsfield Municipal Court" (H. P. 854) (L. D. 928)

Mr. Hilton from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of the Van Buren Municipal Court" (H. P. 863) (L. D. 935)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of Certain County Officers of Sagadahoc County" (H. P. 1001) (L. D. 1088)

Mr. Peterson from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Payments to Somerset County Law Library" (H. P. 853) (L. D. 910)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Increase the Salaries of the Judge and Recorder of the Northern Aroostook Municipal Court" (H. P. 862) (L. D. 955)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of the Western Hancock Municipal Court" (H. P. 860) (L. D. 933)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of the Ellsworth Municipal Court" (H. P. 876) (L. D. 947)

Mr. Scott from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of the Eastport Municipal Court" (H. P. 1002) (L. D. 1089)

Mr. Stanley from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of Recorders and Judges of Municipal Courts, Clerk Hire and Rentals of Such

Courts in Penobscot County" (H. P. 871) (L. D. 942)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Authorizing Arostook County to Contribute Funds to the Unorganized Territory Capital Working Fund" (H. P. 997) (L. D. 1084)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to the Powers of the City of Calais" (H. P. 1004) (L. D. 1091)

Mr. Finemore from the Committee on Transportation reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Non-Registration of Farm Tractors" (H. P. 696) (L. D. 731)

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

**Ought to Pass with
Committee Amendment
Tabled and Assigned**

Mr. Butler from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Driving of Deer" (H. P. 94) (L. D. 87) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Roberts of Dexter, the Report, with accompanying papers, was tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report, and specially assigned for Thursday, March 19.)

Mr. Butler from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Resolve Regulating Ice Fishing in Coffee Pond, Cumberland County (H. P. 267) (L. D. 304) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve read once.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 267, L. D. 304, Resolve Regulating Ice Fishing in Coffee Pond, Cumberland County

Amend said Resolve by striking out everything after the words "ice fishing" in the 3rd line from the end thereof and inserting the following punctuation '.

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. Winchenpaw from the Committee on Natural Resources on Resolve Authorizing the Commissioner of Education to Convey Certain Interest of the State to Town of Unity (H. P. 1059) (L. D. 1196) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve read once.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1059, L. D. 1196, Resolve Authorizing the Commissioner of Education to Convey Certain Interest of the State to Town of Unity

Amend said Resolve by striking out in the 4th line thereof the words, "town of Unity", and inserting in place thereof the words 'Unity Library Association'.

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and tomorrow was assigned for second reading of the Resolve.

Mr. Wylie from the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act relating to Requirements for Registration for Hairdressing and Beauty Culture" (H. P. 760) (L. D. 795) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 760, L. D. 795, Bill "An Act Relating to Requirements for Registration for Hairdressing and Beauty Culture."

Amend said Bill by striking out the last 3 lines thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

"I. Who is at least 18 17 years of age."

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

Mr. Travis from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Earth Movers" (H. P. 769) (L. D. 734) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"
to H. P. 769, L. D. 734, Bill "An Act Relating to Earth Movers."

Amend said Bill by indicating the striking out of the word "or" in the 2nd line of the 2nd paragraph by drawing a line through said word "or" and inserting immediately thereafter an underlined comma ;

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of the Junior American History Class from Farmington High School, under the supervision of Mr. Gray.

In behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you a cordial and hearty welcome. (Applause)

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Authority of Insurance Commissioner to Make Regulations re Health and Accident Insurance" (S. P. 163) (L. D. 409)

Bill "An Act relating to the Licensing of Life Insurance Agents" (S. P. 218) (L. D. 584)

Bill "An Act relating to Advances to Officers for Interstate Travel Expenses Incurred in the Administration of Criminal Justice" (S. P. 231) (L. D. 601)

Bill "An Act Repealing Law on Measure and Sale of Charcoal" (S. P. 234) (L. D. 598)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Clerks in Office of Register of Deeds, Oxford County" (S. P. 237) (L. D. 595)

Bill "An Act relating to Fire Wards" (S. P. 252) (L. D. 685)

Bill "An Act Repealing Laws on Inspection of Leather" (S. P. 278) (L. D. 769)

Bill "An Act relating to Requirements of Group Accident and Sickness Insurance Policies" (S. P. 288) (L. D. 826)

Bill "An Act relating to Circuses and Travelling Amusement Shows" (S. P. 289) (L. D. 831)

Bill "An Act relating to Cash Reserve in Banks" (S. P. 291) (L. D. 824)

Bill "An Act Permitting Savings Banks to Loan on Life Insurance Policies" (S. P. 294) (L. D. 822)

Bill "An Act relating to Insurance Coverage Required Under the Financial Responsibility Law" (S. P. 460) (L. D. 1259)

Bill "An Act relating to Admission to Practice Law" (H. P. 175) (L. D. 171)

Bill "An Act relating to Educational Requirements and Fees for Chiropractors" (H. P. 232) (L. D. 216)

Bill "An Act relating to Marking of Containers of Skim-milk" (H. P. 310) (L. D. 382)

Bill "An Act relating to Exhibits of Agricultural Fair Associations" (H. P. 898) (L. D. 981)

Resolve to Reimburse the City of South Portland for Support of Margaret Dawson (S. P. 243) (L. D. 669)

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

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of thirty-nine pupils from Kennebunk High School Social Studies Class, under the leadership of Mrs. Edith Nunan.

In behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you a cordial and hearty welcome. (Applause)

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Deductible Fire Insurance Policies" (S. P. 107) (L. D. 307)

Bill "An Act relating to Liability for Wilfully Injuring or Killing Dogs" (S. P. 128) (L. D. 337)

Bill "An Act relating to Delivery of Ballots by Absentee Voters" (H. P. 271) (L. D. 299)

Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of County Attorney and Assistant County Attorney of Penobscot County" (H. P. 553) (L. D. 533)

Bill "An Act relating to Leave of Absence Under the Military Law" (H. P. 952) (L. D. 1006)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Commit-

tee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Resolve Closing Little Sebago Lake, Cumberland County, to Ice Fishing (H. P. 260) (L. D. 290)

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

Orders of the Day

The Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of Boards of Registration" (H. P. 606) (L. D. 605) tabled by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, pending assignment for third reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I now move that this bill be given its third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, moves that the first today assigned matter be now assigned for third reading at the hour of convening on the next legislative day. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the matter was so assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to the Examination of Insurance Agents" (S. P. 106) (L. D. 306) tabled by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, pending third reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to move that this matter be tabled again and definitely assigned for Thursday of this week.

I would like to explain briefly: As you may have noted today, under Bills in the Third Reading, we had three health and accident insurance bills going through, and there is quite a large amount of legislation on health and accident insurance this session. However, this one bill which I request to be tabled until Thursday does very definitely need an amendment in the eyes of many insurance people. I therefore request an opportunity

to offer an amendment on Thursday.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman so moves?

Mr. TOTMAN: I do so move, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, moves that the second tabled and today assigned matter Bill "An Act relating to the Examination of Insurance Agents," (S. P. 106) (L. D. 306) be retabled and specially assigned for Thursday, March 19, pending third reading. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act to Make Uniform the Legal Hours for Sale of Liquor," (S. P. 137) (L. D. 325) tabled by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, pending first reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: After conferring with the Chairman of the Committee on Liquor Control I now move that Bill "An Act to Make Uniform the Legal Hours for Sale of Liquor" be recommitted to the Committee on Liquor Control.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, moves that the third tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act to Make Uniform the Legal Hours for Sale of Liquor," (S. P. 137) (L. D. 325) be recommitted to the Committee on Liquor Control. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the Bill was recommitted to the Committee on Liquor Control in non-concurrence and was sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to License Plates for Motor Vehicle Owners Who Operate Amateur Radio Stations" (H. P. 197) (L. D. 213) tabled on March 12 by the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, pending the motion of

the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, to accept the Majority Report.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At the time I requested that I be given an opportunity to table this measure I explained briefly what my thoughts were, but if you will permit me again, and it may be very much repetition, and as somewhat explained in the proposed amendment which is now before you, I would say this: It has been my experience, while I was in the town office at Limestone, to make use of these mobile units, these so-called ham operators, and they are of great value to our Civil Defense system inasmuch as those men are capable of making repairs practically on the spot and performing a service which no other group could possibly perform throughout the State in a time of emergency.

Now I am opposed to granting them a special license plate, but I have prepared an amendment which, if given an opportunity this morning, I will present, which would, in effect, make available to them, at their own expense, a marker which would have some official standing and carry on the marker their call number or license code, so-called.

I believe, if I am correct, Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House is to accept the majority "Ought not to pass" report. May I inquire if that is correct?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that that is correct.

Mr. BURGESS: So briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would explain that if the members of the House wish to give consideration to my amendment, I hope they will defeat the motion before the House, the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report, and then accept the "Ought to pass" report, and at the proper time I would offer an amendment.

I might say this in conclusion: I have talked this morning with the Adjutant General, and he believes that we have to make use of every available unit throughout the State on certain occasions, and he recommended very highly that some consideration be given to them.

I tried to have an appointment with the State Director of Civil Defense, to find that he was out of the State and would be for the remainder of the week, so I am unable to give you the benefits of his views. I can only repeat again, with your permission, that from the limited experience that I have had, these men are valuable in time of an emergency and that I believe some consideration should be given to them.

Again may I state that if the House wishes to consider this amendment, I hope the House will defeat the motion before it, and then accept the minority "Ought to pass" committee report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis.

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have looked over this amendment and personally I am in favor of it, for although I signed the majority report "Ought not to pass" I will join in asking that the House vote against my motion.

I spent quite a bit of time over the week-end considering this problem. For the benefit of the members of the House who are not fully aware of this bill, they didn't ask for a special license plate; they asked that their call letters be on a plate; in other words, the plate would be the same color as the regular plate, but I feel very strongly that the motion of the Representative, Mr. Burgess, would give them the identification that they need. Sunday I listened to their roll call. Inside of half an hour they covered every single county of the State, and Donald Dean, who is Assistant Chief of Communication, Amateur Radio Service of Maine, found that I was listening in and asked me to say a few words.

I do not think any more debate is necessary. The Transportation Committee has not seen this amendment but, personally speaking for myself, I am in favor of the motion and would be in favor of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, wishes to withdraw his motion to accept

the majority report "Ought not to pass"?

Mr. TRAVIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask permission to withdraw that motion and move that the minority report "Ought to pass" be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, that the minority "Ought to pass" report of the Committee on Transportation on House Paper 197, Legislative Document 213 Bill "An Act relating to License Plates for Motor Vehicle Owners Who Operate Amateur Radio Stations" be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Thereupon, the motion prevailed, and the minority "Ought to pass" report was accepted and the Bill had its two several readings.

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

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 197, L. D. 213, Bill, "An Act relating to License Plates for Motor Vehicle Owners Who Operate Amateur Radio Stations."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the Title thereof, the words "License Plates" and inserting in place thereof the word 'Markers'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the amending clause thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

'R. S., c. 19, §§ 37-B-37-D, additional. Chapter 19 of the revised statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto 3 new sections, to be numbered 37-B to 37-D, inclusive, to read as follows:'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined caption "**Special License Plates**" immediately preceding that part designated "Sec. 37-B" and inserting in place thereof the underlined caption '**Special Markers**'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined words "**license plates**" in the 1st line of the headnote of that part designated "Sec. 37-B" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word '**markers**'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 7th line of that part

designated "Sec. 37-B", the underlined figure "\$1" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$5'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 7th line of that part designated "Sec. 37-B" the underlined words "**license plates**" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word '**markers**'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined word "**plates**" in the 4th and 5th lines of that part designated "Sec. 37-C" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word '**markers**'.

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end of that part designated "Sec. 37-C", the following underlined paragraph:

'The markers shall be not more than 11 inches in length and not more than 4 inches in width and shall contain a slot on the bottom to facilitate attachment to the top of the regular license plate. The marker may be attached to some other part of the vehicle if desired. Such marker shall be valid so long as the license to operate an amateur radio station is in effect and so long as the holder of such marker continues to register a motor vehicle in this state.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined words "**license plate**" as they appear in 2 places in the 4th line of that part designated "Sec. 37-D" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word '**marker**'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of that part designated "**Sec. 37-E**".

House Amendment "A" was then adopted and the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Orders of the Day.

Mr. Hand of New Limerick, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. HAND: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill. By way of explanation, I can assure this House that this is nothing of a controversial nature. It is a bill to incorporate, under special act of the Legislature, and should not in any way delay the progress of this Legislature.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from New Limerick, Mr. Hand, requests unanimous consent to introduce a bill. The Clerk will read the title.

The CLERK: Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Northern Finance Company."

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the unanimous reception of this bill? The Chair hears none, and the bill is received.

Thereupon, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Judiciary, ordered printed and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Kelly of Rumford, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. KELLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the town of Roxbury needs a new school building badly. The town applied for money under the Maine School Building Authority but the loan was not approved because it would cost twelve and a half percent of the town's valuation.

This bill was handed to me last Thursday, and they did plan on getting a loan from the State but the loan was refused and this is the only chance they have to get the money. The school at present is not fit for use.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Kelly, requests unanimous consent of the House for the introduction of a resolve. The Clerk will read the title.

The CLERK: Resolve in favor of the Town of Roxbury.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the introduction of this bill by unanimous consent? The Chair hears none, and the bill is received.

Thereupon, the Resolve was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, ordered printed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The House is continuing under Orders of the Day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House very briefly.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, requests unanimous consent to address the House. Does the Chair hear objection? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Perhaps three weeks ago a statement was made by me before this House which was misunderstood, and I would like to clarify that statement. At that time I made a statement that a teacher from Ashland said the conditions in the Ashland schools were terrible. I did not intend to create the impression that the system of the Ashland schools was terrible, and I did not think the teacher intended to create that impression, but I called the teacher and asked her and she said "No". What she meant was that there were children in the schools of Ashland who were not having the things they needed, glasses and other things, because of drinking parents, and that is the thing that she meant when she said that the conditions were terrible.

I decided to clarify the statement because I didn't want anyone to think I was condemning the school system of Ashland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take from the table the third tabled and unassigned matter.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, moves that the third tabled and unassigned matter, House Divided Report, majority report "Ought not to pass" and minority report "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Liquor Billboards and Signs" which is House Paper 275, Legislative Document 262, tabled by that gentleman on February 19 pending acceptance of either report, be now taken from the table. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to speak briefly in regard to this bill, and I move the acceptance of the minority report.

You may ask why we propose prohibiting neon signs and bill-

boards on licensed liquor premises. First of all, we feel the streets and highways of Maine would be much more attractive without them. It might even help in reducing traffic problems, for often the blazing neon signs are so prominent that there is danger of overlooking traffic lights placed so near them.

The idea of such action as we recommend is not unique. Pennsylvania prohibits all outside liquor signs. The Montana Supreme Court has upheld the Liquor Control Board in its ruling that liquor advertising on billboards is illegal in that state.

One argument which you may hear against this bill is that if there were no signs, people would not know where they could buy alcoholic beverages. THAT might be a good thing, for if that were true, some of our citizens who are tempted to drink would possibly be able to get home with their paychecks, so that their families would have the necessities of life rather than having the weekly wages spent for beer.

Some may say: "But the State is in the liquor business and we need the revenue, so we should not work to curtail the sale." My reply to that is that the increased costs to the State of operating our police departments, our jails and other institutions responsible for the care and control of the drinking public; the increased poverty which can in a large measure be charged to drinking; the loss of manpower resulting from the more than five thousand alcoholics in our State; all these help to offset the revenue. If to the economic loss due to liquor we add the social cost of broken homes and the unhappiness of homes in danger of breaking, and the suffering due to liquor-caused accidents and deaths, we find we are paying a terrible price for the revenue received from liquor.

Finally, many may say this bill is discriminatory. To that I would say that the nature of alcoholic beverages makes it necessary to treat them differently from the way in which we treat other commodities.

Food, clothing, furniture and hardware businesses are not under any such restrictions as we place on alcoholic beverages. The very

nature of alcohol demands a different treatment, so we have strict laws to control the sale. We prohibit sale to minors; we do not allow sale on election days and special holidays; we control hours of sale; we punish those convicted of drinking and driving; we police places where liquor is served. The alcoholic beverage business is a special-privilege business. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the famous *Crowley vs. Christianson* case, declared, and I quote:

"There is no inherent right in a citizen to thus sell intoxicating liquors by retail; it is not a privilege of a citizen of the State or of a citizen of the United States. As it is a business attended with danger to the community, it may, as already said, be entirely prohibited or be permitted under such conditions as will limit to the utmost its evils. The manner and extent of regulations rest in the discretion of the governing authority."

Thus we can see it is well within the authority of this Legislature to place any restrictions it deems best on the advertising and sale of alcoholic beverages. Our contention is that liquor advertising is against the public interest and should be limited or even prohibited by law.

As members of the Maine Legislature we are here to work for the welfare of the citizens of our State. Do alcoholic beverages or the advertising of such contribute to that welfare? I am sure you will agree with me that they do not. For that reason I hope the House will vote to accept the minority report. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, moves the acceptance of the minority "Ought to pass" report.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to tell you of a little experience that I had some years ago. I was employed by the Lawrence, Lowell and Haverhill Street Railway Company during my summer vacation years and I got acquainted with quite a number of the workmen. I went away from there to school and five years afterwards I returned. I went up to a man I knew and I said: "Where is Herb

Faulkner?" He was one of the foremen on the track. "He's dead." "Dead? What happened to Herb?" "Rum." I said: "Where's Barney Cornish?" He was one of the workmen on the road. He said: "He is dead." "What happened to Barney?" "Rum." "Where is Tim Murphy?" He was also a workman. "He is dead." "What happened to Tim?" "Rum."

I asked for two more whose names I do not now recall, and both of them were dead, and the answer was from rum. Those were able-bodied men who ought to have lived for years, but they were all dead in that short time, because of alcoholic drink.

I came to the conclusion then, and I haven't changed my mind since, that alcohol can be pretty bad medicine. I suppose that the liquor traffic is saddled on this State so thoroughly that probably none of us will ever live to see it fully abolished, but we can, here and there, cut down a little. Why do the liquor dealers want to advertise? They want to advertise to get more sales, so they can make more money. They don't care anything about the health or lives or the souls of men; it is just to grab a little more money. We have had it recently demonstrated that liquor men will bribe to get business. We have had bills introduced here to try to get liquor sold on Sunday. You will find that some want to get liquor sold on holidays, and you will find an effort made to extend the time of sale beyond midnight. And why? All for the purpose of getting a little more money.

Now this bill, in a small measure, it seems to me, would tend to cut down. Perhaps, some say, it might result in saving the life of some man. A man that drinks may go into a town and have no thought whatever of taking a drink, when suddenly he sees before him a sign advertising the liquor, and then he immediately thinks he is thirsty and he gives in and has a drink and probably another and then another.

Another thing that occurs to me is when the parents and teachers of children are trying to teach those children the evils of alcohol, and the children go out and see these signs and billboards advertising

intoxicating liquor, they can reasonably ask: If alcohol is so bad, why does the State of Maine advertise it so as to tempt the people to drink?

I am going to vote for this motion, to accept the minority report. I want to say here also that I admire the lady from Presque Isle (Mrs. Christie) who, when she thinks she is right, is willing to stand alone as she has on this report. That is a philosophy that I have advocated many times in this House, but this time she is not standing alone. She has got at least one man with her. I hope she has many.

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

Mr. ROUNDY: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, and I am thinking too of the matter of the whole situation, the matter of billboards, and I am quite thoroughly in sympathy with what she has said and with what the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, has said, but there are some phases in this matter of advertising which make this particular phase of it particularly objectionable. I may find it a pain, and a good many others who have similar points of view as myself, may find it somewhat of a pain, to have to see so many pages in newspapers and in magazines and whatnot, but I can turn over those pages. I may not find it interesting to listen to some things that are said on the radio, but I can turn off the radio, but in very many respects it is impossible for me to step aside from the offense, and more or less the discomfort, of the billboard signs that are covered by this bill, and I certainly am in favor of the motion of Mrs. Christie.

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

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I ask that when the vote is taken, it be by a division of the House.

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

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I stand to

go along with the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, in her motion. I have just re-read again this bill that we are now considering, and this bill prohibits signs and advertising on the outside of any premises. I was just thinking in my own mind the situation regarding our State stores. On our State stores you do not see any sign on the outside of the premises, at least not in my community. There is a sign on the inside of the premises, in the show window, which says that this premise is a State store.

Now it seems to me that that is adequate identification of that place of business. I realize, and you may say to me: "But, yes, the State has the monopoly; they don't have to worry about competition. No wonder they don't advertise or have neon signs." But I don't believe we have to advertise this product; unfortunately, I think the demand is there; I think it is simply a question of identification, and I believe that if a sign is on the inside of the premises on the window, it would be adequate identification.

You may wonder sometimes why I seem to be a little bit bewildered when I arrive here in the morning. Well, every morning, on my way to Brunswick from my home, I see five different billboards urging me to drink either this brand or that brand, and frankly, members, by the time I get in Brunswick, I don't know which brand to drink, or whether I had better go home or stay in Brunswick. (Laughter)

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

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is my opinion that the so-called State Stores don't need any signs on the outside of them because they are commonly known as the "Green-front"; they are all painted that way, and if you go into any community and if you want to find the State Store, it will be very easy to locate.

In defense of the committee report, which was nine to one in this case, I believe that if you should substitute the minority report for

the majority report on this bill, you should think of what may happen. You may have people, like the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, going down Water Street here in Augusta, where there is no sign to indicate what they are selling in there, and he will find himself embarrassed when he walks in there. You wouldn't want that any more than I do. (Laughter)

Members, I move that House Paper 275, Legislative Document 262, be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, moves that House Divided Report, majority "Ought not to pass" and minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Liquor Billboards and Signs," House Paper 275, Legislative Document 262, together with accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford.

Mr. SANFORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I was on earth the first time, we didn't have billboard advertising like that. We didn't have any of those signs advertising liquor but, as I remember it, that was some time ago, we could get liquor in a number of places. I do not believe that people today need these neon signs and these billboards to tell where to get liquor and I don't think that any town or any city has been made much prettier by having these signs stuck all over their towns and I want to go along with the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, and support the minority report on this bill.

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

Mr. OSBORNE: Mr. Speaker, I possibly am unique in this House in at least one sense. I lived in Pennsylvania both before and after they passed a similar act. After the act was passed, from time to time I conducted what you might say was a one-man census of opinion. I visited several of these places; I hasten to call your attention to the fact that they also sell sandwiches. I inquired from the

proprietors how they felt about the act after it was passed, when it was first passed and later on and much to my surprise, although it had been bitterly opposed by the proprietors of the shops who would be affected, I found that after a little time had passed that they were in favor of it. They said it helped them in the matter of competition; it cut down on the cost of advertising. Even the live distributors were in favor of it because they were competing at a very large expense in the matter of furnishing neon signs which ran into considerable money and other signs for the different distributors and it didn't seem to be any handicap at all to them. It doesn't prohibit any signs in the window inside; they can still put up the signs in accordance with the present law.

I am inclined to believe that we should go along with the gentleman from Presque Isle (Mrs. Christie) by accepting the minority report in this matter.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Gates.

Mr. GATES: Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this bill but I feel that what has influenced me, perhaps, the most is my desire to clean up the highways from being cluttered up with these billboards and signs. Their claim that people would not find liquor is surely ridiculous to me. We all recall that between 1918 and '33, everybody followed it, everybody knew where it was excepting the enforcement officers. (Laughter) I repeat again: I intend to go along with this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For many years, the State of Maine had a law making it illegal to manufacture or sell intoxicating liquors or beverages. Some 19 years ago, this law was repealed.

In the great controversy regarding this change in policy, the proponents of this change claimed that all they desired was that the people of this State might have the right to buy or not to buy these beverages; that they had no inten-

tion or desire to commercialize this privilege or by intensive advertising to entice others to purchase intoxicating beverages. This bill which we have here is simply asking that they keep faith with the people of Maine.

We have no quarrel with those who wish to purchase alcoholic beverages for their own use but we do feel that it is not fair to our young men and women, our boys and girls to, by intensive and misleading propaganda, try to influence them to purchase these intoxicating beverages.

Alcoholic beverages, as a manufactured product, hold a unique position. Some people can use them with no particular extensive harmful results to themselves while others get themselves into all degrees of difficulties by their use.

The legalization of the sale of these beverages with the prevalent feeling of a considerable number of our citizens seems to be a necessary evil which nothing but education on this subject will ever change.

Until this time comes, and by education this law is changed, we only ask that those who wish to purchase these beverages have the right to do so but those who have no desire so to do be not enticed and coerced to purchase them by advertising, mostly misleading and untrue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Small.

Mr. SMALL: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that all of these various speakers would cover the points I had in mind. I come from up in the Oxford Hills, we call them the beautiful Oxford Hills. I also do not happen to be one of these rabid Prohibitionists. The ladies in my "neck of the woods," to quote the cover of a book written up there, have for years had a campaign of their own to clean up our highways, and if this bill in any way would help do that I am for it and they are for it.

It happens that I am the President of a club of over thirteen hundred members that has both a hard liquor and malt beverage license. To show you that these people who like to take a drink now

and then have feelings about advertising, it is a rule of our club that no advertisement for liquor or beer or calendar displaying such advertisement may be posted upon the walls of our club.

I want to make you members understand that I represent an altogether different segment of our population perhaps than you do and that I am closer to them, and I want you to understand that among those people this matter of advertising means something and that they do not think it is necessary. I want to agree with the words of the gentleman from Millinocket (Mr. Gates), I want to tell you that I think that if all billboard advertising were discontinued and these bright lights that are close to our highways were discontinued that our highways would be safer to drive upon and ride upon.

As you remember, I introduced a bill some time ago about daylight saving, and although it was advertised as giving the hunters an extra hour to hunt rabbits, the real purpose of it was to have an extra hour of twilight time when traffic was heavy upon the road. So, with that thought in mind, it would also be for safety upon the highways and for more beautiful scenery as we ride along the highways, I want to register my opinion and I want to vote in support of the measure.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, that House Divided Report, majority "Ought not to pass", minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Liquor Billboards and Signs", House Paper 275, Legislative Document 262, together with accompanying papers, be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, has requested a division.

As many as are in favor of this matter being indefinitely postponed will rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Twenty-three having voted in the affirmative and eighty-seven in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report, and the Bill was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

On motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, the House voted to take from the table the sixth tabled and unassigned matter, Senate Report "Ought to pass" in New Draft (S. P. 343) (L. D. 843) under the same title of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Billboard Advertising of Liquor in Dry Municipalities" (S. P. 138) (L. D. 326) tabled on February 26 by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, pending acceptance in concurrence; and on further motion of the same gentleman, the "Ought to pass" in New Draft report was accepted in concurrence and the Bill was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

On motion of the gentleman from Medway, Mr. Potter, the House voted to take from the table the fifteenth tabled and unassigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Minority "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Welfare on Bill "An Act relating to the Town's Share in Aid to Dependent Children" (H. P. 80) (L. D. 75), tabled on March 12 by the same gentleman pending the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Clements, to accept the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Medway, Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER: Mr. Speaker, I now move the acceptance of the majority "Ought to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman must understand that there is a motion before the House at this time by the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Clements, to accept the majority "Ought to pass" report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton.

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wonder if any measure more unfair or more politically artful has been dropped in the hopper this session than House

Paper 80, L. D. 75. Just what is the department up to? You have got to watch this one closely for the hand is quicker than the eye.

A little review of the history of this aid program might be useful. It started back in 1917. Then it was called Mothers Aid. At that time the towns were directed to give aid to mothers who had children who did not have the necessities and the State would reimburse the towns fifty per cent of the expenditure of the town for people who had settlement there. As time went on, more and more of the administration of the program was taken over by the State. When the Federal Social Security Act was passed, the name of the program was changed; it came as "Aid to Dependent Children". The federal provisions and federal funds were accepted. At that time, what was the amount that the towns paid? Fifty per cent, just as it was back in 1917, of the amount that was expended for relief of children with settlements in their towns.

In 1949, this contribution was changed; it was reduced to eighteen per cent and the measure to change it provided that if Federal funds were increased the share the towns paid would be similarly reduced. Always, the towns have paid their share whether it was fifty per cent or eighteen per cent on the basis of the amount of aid granted to the persons who had a settlement in the town. This method of determination requires that settlement be decided in each case. Originally, that determination was made by the municipalities and the State or the towns might object. Later, that determination was made by the State Department and the towns could object if they wanted to. Although a fair method of assessing the share of each municipality, it has been a nuisance for the department and to a much lesser extent to the municipal officers to pass on this question of settlement.

As to background, I would like to call your attention to a statement made by Commissioner Stevens last October before Governor Cross and the Legislative Advisory Budget Committee: He said: "There should be mentioned the present provisions

in the law for municipalities in the state to share in the total cost of the Aid to Dependent Children Program to the extent of eighteen per cent where there is a settlement in a town." Here, again, there are two levels in State Government in the same cases. This is objected to on the part of the towns because it is not possible to bring the towns into the administrative function in connection with this program. The remedy, of course, would be for the State to absorb the eighteen per cent which is now being paid by the municipalities.

It is a good subject for debate whether a town should or should not pay any part of the cost of this program. There is clearly a duplication of effort. On the other hand, there is a close check on what the department does. Is there any doubt in your minds from his statement what the Commissioner would like? There is one obstacle to it though. There is a bill still in the office of the Director of Legislative Research which would do just that. It hasn't been brought out yet. It is being held in back.

Economics is a reason why the Commissioner sometimes gets what he wants. The municipalities in 1952 had to pay somewhat over \$502,000. What would happen to the budget if this contribution of the towns were taken away from the State? They are clever, though, they devise a way without costing the State too much money or any at all to obtain the same objective of getting the towns under the program for all administrative purposes. This could be done if the town's share were assessed on the basis of population. No order would be necessary to determine settlement. Incidentally, perhaps, a municipality would no longer bother whether its application was granted or not. They wouldn't care. But there is an obstacle there: politics. Such a system of assessing the towns is not fair. I beg to differ with some of the preceding speakers. There is no logical basis whatsoever for allocating the expense of this program on the basis of population. At the present time, many towns have no cases and pay nothing. There is

one town that is paying each year at the rate of \$12.40 per person in the town. Franklin County paid 27 cents per person in 1952, while Aroostook paid \$1.15 per person. Between towns, there is no equal load. It is fair to say that a person should bear his own load. It would be equally fair to say that the State should take over the whole burden; shift the burden to a larger governmental unit.

I would like to call attention to one Representative's district. In Benedicta, nothing is paid for 225 persons. In the town of Crystal, they are paying \$1.31 per person; in the town of Hersey 116 people are not paying anything at the present time. Then you come to Island Falls, they are paying 88 cents per person; the town of Sherman, \$1.48 per person. Why is it fair to ask the town of Benedicta to share the burden of the town of Island Falls? If there is any principle involved that will logically justify this shift to a population basis, I challenge the proponents of the bill to explain it. I would like to remind them that per capita income varies considerably between municipalities and the ability of a municipality to pay is not proportional with its population. Also, in some areas private charity supports children's homes. The load is thus taken off the municipal tax burden because they do not benefit by this A. D. C. program.

Here is another political obstacle to shifting: More municipalities would be adversely affected, yes, more would be hurt by the change than would be helped. If the contributions the towns paid, \$501,000 odd in 1952, were divided among them on a population basis, it would average 55 cents per person for the number of people in the town. What were the counties paying in 1952? Androscoggin paid 30 cents; Aroostook paid \$1.15 per person, a good deal more than 55; Cumberland County paid 42; Franklin, they really have this problem licked, they paid 27 cents; Hancock paid 58; Kennebec paid 51; Knox, 59; Lincoln, 54; Oxford, 42; Penobscot, 65; Piscataquis, 47; Sagadahoc, 59; Somerset, 52; Waldo paid 88 cents per person; York

paid 30 cents per person. Nine counties, if you figure it on a population basis, were paying less than 55 cents per person; seven counties were paying more. You can see why the bill would be licked. Besides being unfair in asking one community to share another community's load, the shift to the population assessment would not pass this House because more people would be hurt than helped. So what did they do? It was clever. They made a package. They said: "We will shift to the population basis and we will throw \$100,000 into this package, reducing the amount that the towns, over all, shall pay. Instead of 55 cents per person, under this package bill you would pay on a population basis but you would only pay 44 cents per person." That shift alone means that some were being hurt by the population theory, more helped.

It is interesting to see the towns that appear on this list as being helped by the bill, who are, in fact, hurt by the population theory. Now, if you want to test it on your town, here is the way you do it: Simply take one-quarter of the total appearing in column 4, add it to that figure and see if it is more or less than the figure in column 2, what they actually paid. Durham, this looks like the bill helps them, the population theory hurts them. The same way with Leeds; the same way with Mars Hill, Presque Isle in Aroostook County, the population theory hurts them. Now, some of the big towns, too: Brunswick, it looks like the bill helps them, the population theory, in fact, hurts them. The same with Freeport, the same with Portland, Yarmouth, Bar Harbor, Augusta, they are in the same situation, being shifted over just enough to make the Augusta people think they are being helped. The same with Gardiner, Hallowell, Pittston, Camden, Friendship, Boothbay Harbor, Wiscasset, Paris, Bangor, Brewer, Veazie. It is so even with the town of the proponent of the bill, the gentleman from Belfast (Mr. Clements); it looks like it helps Belfast. Actually it does not.

Thus they came by this package method of political sex appeal to the notion of changing over the

method of assessment. I would like to know: Where is the \$100,000 coming from? Or, if you look at the estimated expense for '53-'54, where is the \$150,000 coming from? Is it from the federal government? Why shouldn't the towns get the benefit, cut down the eighteen per cent? Is it from the State? Then why shouldn't this bill be referred to the Appropriations Committee? Heaven forbid that it should come from the recipients of this aid.

If it is for economy, I should like to know how many employees can be saved and whether their salaries would amount to \$100,000. The proponents said that this bill would relieve the towns from the administrative burden. I would like to know just how much time the municipal officers do spend each year on these A.D.C. cases. Is it very much?

It has been said that this bill would let the town know just how much it would need to budget for A.D.C. support. Well, that is true. Wouldn't it also be nice if we could legislate how much snow would fall and be able to tell exactly how much we needed to spend to plow our roads in winter?

In the light of much greater uncertainties, I do not believe that that small uncertainty should justify the change. The argument is rather pindling. I am glad my friend, the gentleman from Island Falls (Mr. Crabtree), initiated this debate last week with the suggestion that it be decided upon principle. On principle, too, I suggest that it is unfair, that it is a pick-pocket measure, and that it should be killed deader than a porcupine.

If your thinking is based on the political expediency of your own town, look it over. I have computed for every town in the State the figure that it would be on a population basis if the total of \$501,000, as in 1952, remained the amount the towns should pay. If you wish, I would be glad to show it to you and you would find that more than a majority of you are hurt by this change to the population theory. If the Budget Committee thinks it can be done, I believe that one thing and one thing only should be saved from this bill and that is the provision that

the towns should benefit and have their load reduced \$100,000.

For that purpose and with that in view, Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, offers House Amendment "A" and moves its adoption.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Tondreau.

Mr. TONDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mr. Trafton, my good friend, the gentleman from Auburn, has taken care of this side of the issue very well and I would really like to concur with him in his opinion that this is not an economy measure. It is my belief that this change in the A.D.C. law would really entail a greater amount of mismanagement and lack of frugality on the part of the towns and that what might appear at present to be a temporary gain for some of the towns according to this chart would soon be nullified by the growth of the A.D.C. rolls by mismanagement in the future.

Now, the temporary gain from the settlements of the D.C.'s in this measure would certainly be nullified in a very few years. Therefore, I would like to go on record as opposing this measure.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree.

Mr. CRABTREE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I thought I read in the papers a few days ago where Stalin had died but I guess he must still be over in the Department of Health and Welfare according to my very good friend, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton. Brother Trafton must have spent a very busy weekend. I can not help but have great admiration for his presentation, which I am sure must be his convictions. It is a fact that any given set of figures or statistics can prove almost anything you want to prove by them by certain manipulations and viewpoints. I am not an accountant nor a statistician. I think that right now for the only time in my life I wish that I did not reside in Aroostook County because it would seem from Mr. Trafton's remarks that I am swayed by the

fact that towns in my district would benefit. Let me say, right now, to you, that I knew not how the towns in my classes were affected or by how much until you told me, Mr. Trafton. Thank you.

Now, I did look over how the counties were affected on a dollar basis without any manipulation of figures. I do not think that that is the way to decide this measure anyway. I think truly that we have to keep to principles aside from the immediate consideration of how our own towns are affected. That if the principle is good and I thoroughly believe it is good; if the population basis is fair according to our Constitution as it is to allocate Representatives to this House — and in a few days we will insist that population is just the thing as a basis, just the thing — I can hear the oratory now, running from corner to corner, when it comes to Representatives from Androscoggin and all those populous counties, that will be the thing but today it seems out of order for some reason or other. Well, if we must consider our own teacups, if we must consider just what we will receive ourselves in our own little communities, which I do not believe is a good basis for intelligent and fair legislation, here on the outside of this folder, dollar-wise, is how the counties are affected: Androscoggin pays more, Franklin pays more, York pays more. All of the other counties, Aroostook, Cumberland, Hancock, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Sagadahoc, Somerset, Waldo and Washington pay less but I say, so what, that is on the basis of the present city and local loads of A. D. C. In a matter of months or years, the individual loads in a town could change. They would have a greater or lesser load. That is why it seems eminently fair to me from every possible standpoint that this should be allocated on a basis of population. You know, just as we get to a place where we think we can make ends meet somebody wants to move the ends. (Laughter) That is one of the reasons why this amendment is one of the most ridiculous things. Some one said that this was a ridiculous bill but this amendment is

more ridiculous because it defeats the very purpose of the bill. It is impossible to administer that amendment. The amendment presupposes that all determinations in regard to settlement are to be made at a certain time but that just can not be done. It is impossible to bill a town for its share of A. D. C. It is impossible to bill a town for its share of the A. D. C. program on a current basis. All settlements would have to be determined for the year before computations could be made leading to the billing. All that is left is the \$400,000 and no saving, and still we are up against this costly matter of determining settlements. It is costly. Not only is it costly in time and money in the department but it is costly in strained relations between towns as you very well know if you have had anything to do with town affairs. So, there is no assurance whatever that \$400,000 on this basis would be enough to go around anyway. It would add to their problem, not detract from it, in the matter of accounting and in the matter of settlements.

As far as the change in the attitude towards eligibility for A. D. C. that matter is definitely set up. There would be no increase or decrease in that regardless, because either a case is eligible for A. D. C. or it is not. It is very definite. I found that out myself two or three times this last year when I thought there were cases in Aroostook that were eligible for A. D. C. and I was told very distinctly and very emphatically by Commissioner Stevens that they were not and I had to accept it, and I am perfectly willing to accept it. It is better not to have any bill at all than to have this amendment tagged onto it. It further complicates the issue. I certainly hope that the motion to adopt the amendment will be defeated.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote.

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In order to keep this debate on a fair basis, I would like to go on record as throwing my weight behind the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Clements.

Mr. CLEMENTS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is natural for us to assume that where there is a larger population there are going to be more babies and where there are more babies there are going to be more A.D.C. people. I was very glad that my good friend, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, told me about Belfast losing money on it because according to this schedule we are already saving a little, and the city manager notified us Saturday that he had just received a bill for \$600 from one of these counties which claim they are being penalized. So I feel that the counties that are carrying the load of the A.D.C. cases that are living in these other counties and are spending their money for rent, buying food, and so forth -- I understand that my good friend, Mr. Turner, has become wealthy by selling cows and farm machinery indirectly to these people receiving A.D.C. (Laughter) So I feel that this is a perfectly fair bill and I hope that the amendment will not be adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford.

Mr. SANFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have put some time in on this bill too but I notice that the city of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, is getting hit a little bit and perhaps people might think that is why he is talking the way he is. Our town gets helped quite a bit but, in all fairness to everyone here, I think that we should go along with the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell.

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I see by the clock the time is running out and I don't know as you will be as patient with me as you have been with the previous speakers but there are one or two things that I want to bring out in regard to this bill. In the first place, it seems to me, I will pass up any argument on whether it is a political scheme or not or whether my town or my county is

being hurt or helped by it, and I will stick—and I can do that—sometimes I have to change my mind but in this case I haven't got to—I will stick to my argument of last Thursday: that I think this is not an economy measure. In the long run, it will not prove to be so. We have, however, a rather unusual case where both elements, both the town that is being aided by the provisions of this bill and the town that is being hurt, are both impelled in the same direction. Notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Island Falls (Mr. Crabtree) that there is no question as to whether anybody is eligible or not to receive this aid, there are many cases in this State, eligible cases, which have not for one reason or another ever applied, and with both elements, as I say, in this case, both the towns helped and the towns hurt, being impelled in the same direction, there are bound to be additional cases and the over all load will be increased. Whether or not the towns will be billed any more or not makes no difference because the money has got to come from somewhere.

There is another point that hasn't been brought out that I want to mention here just briefly. Provided this bill, unchanged or with the amendment, should receive passage, as a proof that this method of determining one form of charitable aid should be based on the population basis, why not dump all the paupers, all over the State, into the Health and Welfare plan? Now that is a point wherein we profess, we people in the back towns, profess to be very chary of. We don't care to yield too much of our jurisdiction to the State administration but with this bill passed, there you have your precedent. Why not dump the whole business, paupers within the town with a settlement in the town, paupers with a settlement in other towns, as well as state paupers, let the State take care of all of them. It would lead to, well, the department could send out checks just the same as they do for A.D.C. every month, to all the paupers in the town. It would take an awful headache away from the overseers of the poor and the health departments in the various towns and cities but it will also cause a need for quite a

large flock of conservators being appointed because paupers as a usual thing are not qualified to handle money in a lump. That is why they are paupers. As I say, it would take a lot away from the municipal officers and I think that the enactment of this measure is just a step in that direction. Now, that is a possibility that I think it would pay us to ponder on before we take final action on this measure.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hanover, Mr. Ferguson.

Mr. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to say a word in regard to this bill. As I see it we will have to make comparisons, because that is about the only way we can arrive at whether anything is fair or unfair. Evidently the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, did not have many dealings with the welfare business in the smaller or the larger towns. I do not believe it makes a great deal of difference whether you are dealing with it in a large city or a small community, but in the small community you are getting down closer to the people who are in need.

Now I represent ten towns. My own little town has a population of 211. We are going to have an increase of ninety-two percent. At the present time, we do not have to pay anything to A.D.C. but we never know when we are going to have that tremendous load which would put us in a very embarrassing position. It is so with all of the communities. The wise people are grouped together to buy group insurance, to spread the load so that no one person will be driven into bankruptcy by a long siege of illness and doctors' bills. I should think it would be, in the over all picture, a saving to the Welfare Department which spends weeks, sometimes months, trying to establish the residence of a certain family and then after spending hundreds and thousands of dollars they are no better off. They have got themselves back to the State and the State has got to take care of them anyway.

I should be in favor of this measure and I want to go along with it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am going to approach this problem this morning basing it on my argument of last Thursday so far as assessing on population. I have returned from the other branch and I will say that this phase of the appropriations bill, the way we stand now, was not explained.

For the purpose of being practical, and knowing that you members are and will be and want to be practical, I would like to tell you just where we stand. I know the bill will be explained by the House Chairman thoroughly, but these figures were not explained. I have dealt with them, I have had them for some ten days.

As we stand now, with this bill 1316 which you members received, we find ourselves with an operating gain of \$580,988 for the first year and \$284,185 for the second year. That is operating gain against revenue presently and re-estimated on an upgrade basis. If you allow for a legislative document that is on its way now, and if you pass the Teachers program which costs \$144,800 each year, you will find yourselves then with \$436,188 and \$148,695 for the second year of the biennium. If, also, this bill is well in the making to become law, and you allow L. D. 12, Aid to the Disabled, to pass, that costs \$133,500 for the first year and \$254,500 for the second year, which brings your total to \$302,688 for the first year and \$114,805 in the red for the second year. If you allow this instead of the \$160,000 it would bring your figure of \$202,688 for the first year in operating gain, but \$214,805 in the red for the second year. That is besides all the legislative documents that are flying around in the various committees and besides the many legislative documents that are in the Appropriations Committee, and that is also besides what the other branch might do in amending the Appropriations Bill on the upgrade so far as spending money is concerned, let alone what we might do here. I know that there is now also an amendment being discussed in the other branch

where we will be spending a great deal more money, some eighty or ninety thousand dollars.

I merely bring that argument before you because I believe in being practical. I visited Bath yesterday and somebody told me that in order to be a good Appropriations Committee member you have to be a first-class heel, but I guess I will have to agree with him. I am just giving you facts now. And for the benefit of the members that were here two years ago I wish to say that even after the sales tax bill was passed I remember talking long and loud, saying, "Either cut down or step up your revenue." We finally adjourned on Saturday night or Sunday morning, Saturday night at 11:55 in absolute confusion and finally came back, because we did not want to cut down on expenditures and just hiked the revenue some few hundred thousand dollars, on Monday afternoon, shook hands all around again and went home.

So you are faced with this problem now and I am again going to serve a little notice—and I am certainly not talking politics—I like to work on figures, I like to work in the Appropriations room, and I do not think at least from my actions of two years ago anyone can accuse me of having talked partisan politics as far as appropriations are concerned.

So, with all of these projects that I have brought forward to you, you are also faced with many tax exemptions, some of which, or at least one of which, I am pledged to go along with so unless you start being a little practical right now, get ready to hike the tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think we have all debated this thing long enough and we have all made up our minds as to how we are going, but there are one or two things that I think should be mentioned.

First, I think that Mr. Trafton has built up quite a lot of support for my bill which is coming in later; and, second, the main pur-

pose of this bill is to get away from settlement.

As you know now, last fall the Supreme Court handed down a decision in the case of State vs. Swans Island setting up the Health and Welfare Department more or less as judge and jury as to the settlement of children, that means deserted children and so forth. Now what happens when we cannot agree? The State says that the settlement belongs to a certain town. What recourse has that town got under the new decision that has been handed down?

This bill does away more or less with the settlement which requires the full time of several employees of the Department plus the full time of an Assistant Attorney General.

Now with this bill it would mean better supervision, as I said last Thursday. It means that a great many cases that are receiving now would be taken from the list and in a great many cases also the grants will be decreased through better supervision, because these employees that are now working on settlement will be working on case loads to see whether these children should be receiving or their parents should be receiving as much as they do receive. This is what I like about the bill, and I certainly hope that the motion for the adoption of the amendment does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Gates.

Mr. GATES: Mr. Speaker, the only yardstick that I know of for figuring whether this is a good or a bad bill is how it affects my town and the other towns in the State of Maine. In my opinion it is a good bill. It does benefit the towns. You will pay less money and you will have less trouble in figuring what you are going to owe.

They have said, of course, that it may help some towns now and tomorrow it may not. It has been my experience that your case load is increasing year by year and you know that what you are paying next year will be the same as you are paying at least until 1960. So you can go into your town meeting and you can figure your actual bud-

get to a cent. It is very simple because the formula is there. You can divide \$400,000 by the population of the State of Maine and multiply it by the population of your town and you will know to a cent what you are going to pay and that is what you will be assessed so you can ask for that amount in your annual town meeting.

I am particularly interested in getting away from this settlement. I have had my experience with this settlement thing, and in the face of the unreasonable and unjust and the unprecedented action of this Legislature you have closed the doors to any city or town where they have a settlement and where they find out afterwards that they have been assessed wrongly and never recover it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature: Someone has said that "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance." Therefore I am opposed to this measure, first, because it is another step in taking from the tax-paying people of this State their fundamental right to participate in government at the municipal as well as the State levels.

It would create another "super-duper" department beyond the control of the people of our State. Secondly, I am opposed to it because it penalizes rather than applauds the integrity, responsibility and forbearance of our people.

Where do these dependent children come from? Let us look at the record. Probably it would be safe to say that eighty per cent of them come from broken homes. And how come broken homes? Possibly ten per cent are caused by misfortune in the home caused by conditions beyond the control of the fathers and mothers of these children. It is probably true that seventy-five per cent of these broken homes are caused by wrangling, liquor and divorce. Now it holds that if a municipality, by the ability to bear and forbear of her citizens, has no broken homes, has no dependent children, why in all fairness should they have to pay taxes to care for the children of the morally delinquent parents of my town. And,

third, I am opposed to it because, as far as I have been able to determine by investigation, the picture as set up by this report is not true.

As just in witness of that I will say that I was down to Bowdoinham and went to the town office and I got the actual report of their experience. You look under Bowdoinham and you will find that it is costing us \$804 and under this new set-up we are getting off for \$460. Therefore quite naturally I would be for it, but when you look at the figures — these are copied from the town report — we are just paying \$324 now and if we are only \$480 off the estimate so far as Bowdoinham is concerned how far over the estimate are all the rest of them?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: So far as this Aid to Dependent Children is concerned I cannot see where it is anything else than Assistance to the Young. You now have Old Age Assistance and I cannot see why the Young Age Assistance isn't coming right along. There is only about fifty years' difference between them anyway and we are all candidates for this Old Age Assistance. Having been elected a member of this Legislature, I feel it my duty and the duty of every one of us to pass laws that will benefit this State as a whole rather than benefit a few. I call this a good cut-throat deal. I do not like it at all, and I am going to move for the indefinite postponement of the whole bill, papers and all. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, moves that House Divided Report, majority "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and minority "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Welfare on Bill "An Act relating to the Town's Share in Aid to Dependent Children" House Paper 80, Legislative Document 75, together with accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Windsor, Mr. Hussey.

Mr. HUSSEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: One thing I would like to call to your atten-

tion is this formula that has been laid on our desks this morning. I cannot see, on this county basis, why there are so many counties saving money here when the total under this new plan adds up to \$400,000 and where the estimated amount paid under the current plan will be \$560,000. It looks to me as if this comparison of figures is not really the true figures.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that House Divided Report, majority "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and minority "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Welfare on Bill "An Act relating to the Town's Share in Aid to Dependent Children" (H. P. 80) (L. D. 75) and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that this matter be indefinitely postponed will kindly rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Sixty-eight having voted in the affirmative and fifty-one in the negative, the motion prevailed and the two Reports with accompanying papers were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: If there is no further business to come before the House at this time, the Clerk will read the notices.

On motion of Mr. Kelly of Rumford,

Adjourned until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.