

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

VOLUME II

1953

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL

AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, May 7, 1953

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Douglas Robbins of Augusta.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature, on Bill "An Act relating to Reclassification of State Aid Highways as Town Ways" (H. P. 1153) (L. D. 1301) reporting that they are unable to agree.
(Signed)

Messrs. LUDWIG of Hope
CAMPBELL of Guilford
TURNER of Auburn
—Committee on part of House
PARKER of Piscataquis
SINCLAIR of Somerset
LITTLEFIELD of York
—Committee on part of Senate
Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

**Papers from the Senate
New Resolve**

Resolve in favor of Florence Watson of Richmond (S. P. 608)

Came from the Senate received by unanimous consent and passed to be engrossed without reference to a Committee.

In the House: Resolve was read.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the receiving of this Resolve by unanimous consent without reference to any committee in concurrence?

The Chair hears objection.

Under the Cloture Rules this Resolve will stand referred to the next Legislature.

**Senate Reports of Committees
Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Report of the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act relating to Administration of the Highway Commission" (S. P. 463) (L. D. 1298) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 598) (L. D. 1544) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

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

In the House: Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Ludwig.

Mr. LUDWIG: Mr. Speaker, I move that the "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report of the Committee be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hope, Mr. Ludwig, moves that the "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report was accepted in concurrence and the Bill was given its two several readings.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "B" and the Chair will state that this Senate Amendment "B" appears in the nature of a substitute.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "B" was read by the Clerk as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 598, L. D. 1544, Bill "An Act Relating to Administration of the Highway Commission."

Amend said Bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Sec. 1. R. S., c. 20, §3, amended. Section 3 of chapter 20 of the revised statutes, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

'Sec. 3. Commission; appointment; tenure; choice of chairman; attorney-general attorney for commission; annual reports. The state highway commission, as heretofore established, shall consist of 3 members to be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the council. One member shall be a member of the political party which cast the 2nd highest number of votes in the last gubernatorial election. One member shall be appointed by the governor as chairman who shall devote each full working day to his duties and whose salary shall be fixed by the governor and council. The term of

office of the chairman shall be 7 years, subject only to removal for cause. The other members of the commission shall receive \$4,000 per year and shall be appointed for a term of 3 years and any vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired term. Each member of the commission except the chairman, shall receive his actual expenses incurred in the performance of his official duties while away from his home. The attorney-general shall be attorney for the commission and shall without additional compensation give the commission such advice and service as it may from time to time require. The commission shall be furnished with suitable offices at the seat of government. It shall make an annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, to the governor and council, of its doings and the expenditures of its office, with such statement relative to the construction and maintenance of public highways and such recommendations as to the general policy of the state relative thereto as it considers appropriate. The chairman shall be the chief administrative officer, having general charge of the office and records, but all policy decisions of the commission must be by a majority of its total membership.'

Sec. 2. Intent. It is the intent of the legislature that whoever may be chairman of the highway commission on the effective date of this act shall continue as chairman until the expiration of his current term; provided he is willing to assume the fulltime responsibilities provided by the provisions of this act.

It is also the intent of the legislature that this act shall in no way affect the present tenure of office of the other 2 members of the highway commission."

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B".

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to Senate Amendment "B" to S. P. 598, L. D. 1544, Bill "An Act Relating to Administration of the Highway Commission."

Amend said Amendment by striking out all of that part designated

"Sec. 2." and inserting in place thereof the following 2 sections:

'**Sec. 2. Effective date.** This act shall become effective at the expiration of the term of office of whomever may be chairman of the highway commission on the date of approval of this act.

Sec. 3. Intent. It is the intent of the legislature that this act shall in no way affect the present tenure of office of the present members of the highway commission.'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Ludwig.

Mr. LUDWIG: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" to Senate Paper 598, L. D. 1544, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Ludwig, moves to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B"?

Mr. LUDWIG: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hope, Mr. Ludwig, moves that Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hope, Mr. Ludwig, offers House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B". The Clerk will read House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B".

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to Senate Amendment "B" to S. P. 598, L. D. 1544, Bill "An Act Relating to Administration of the Highway Commission."

Amend said Amendment by striking out all of that part designated "Sec. 2" and inserting in place thereof the following 2 sections:

"**Sec. 2. Effective date.** This act shall become effective either at the expiration of the term of office of whomever may be chairman of the highway commission on the date of approval of this act or upon a vacancy occurring by resignation or otherwise in the office of chairman of the highway commission, whichever is sooner.'

'Sec. 3. Intent. It is the intent of the legislature that this act shall in no way affect the present tenure of office of the present members of the highway commission.'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like an opportunity to discuss a little bit, before we pass under the hammer, this new administration in the Highway Commission, and I request your indulgence for about five minutes, because I feel that this is one of the most important potential changes that could take place in a very heavy spending department.

I personally would like to see the entire bill and amendments indefinitely postponed. That is the way I would like to see it. I am not going to make that motion because until I see that there is further support from other members of the House I have no desire to hold up the legislation.

However, I don't like the bill and I wish to tell you briefly why. We all, sooner or later, have had occasion to go over to the State Highway Commission and try to get information regarding their plans, their policy and probably some pet piece of road, and if some of you have had the experience that I have had, it is about as easy to pin down the Highway Commission on what they plan to do in the immediate future — and I am speaking now of Maine networks and not just little off-the-way roads — as it is to talk to a shadow. It is just about as illusive.

Now before I go any further I want to make one point clear. I am not singling out personalities; I am singling out policy; and my chief objection to the manner in which the Highway Commission, and I want to repeat "Commission" and not "Department" because I have a great deal of admiration for the men who work in that department, my chief criticism of the Commission's policy is not because they don't cut the pieces of pie up in the right way to suit me. I have never gone over there and asked that they cut the pie in any particular way, but it is because

I distinctly feel that there is a tragic lack of safety consideration in planning our highways. Now some of you may be shocked to think that I would say that, since we have some nice signs up and down the highways and curve signs and et cetera, but believe me, without taking too much of your time, if it were not so late in the session — I have sat up quite a few nights since this Legislature met, attempting to write a consolidated talk that would give you some burning examples of the terrific lack of attention to old, age-old, dangerous spots, a terrific lack of attention to new roads that have been resurfaced, and by their resurfacing made even more dangerous than they ever were before; and lest you wonder what I am talking about when I say an age-old abuse of safety, I refer you to that prime example in my county of Stillwater Corner where they have got red "killed" signs on each end, and they have got anti-tank barriers in front of one gas station and they have got an anti-tank barrier in front of a man's house; and when you go over there and ask them why they don't straighten the curve out, there is a nice weak smile, and you are convinced that the rumor you have heard, that the thing is going to stay there until Dooms Day because some politician has a gas station in the corner, that is probably about the best answer you will ever get.

Now another burning example of lack of safety, and I don't think many of you realize it: I said to a few members of this House one night that the road from Newport to Bangor rates in the United States, not in the State of Maine, but rates in the United States the third highest in fatalities — from Newport to Bangor, and believe it or not, it is not even in the accelerated highway program, and I don't think that this House is too well aware of what is not being done from the safety angle for the highways.

You are all interested in your own counties; I appreciate that; you want to see this highway program followed. I put an order in here, asking them to explain in what manner they are going to fol-

low it because every time I went over there and asked them what was happening to the priorities they denounced the list of priorities. Then when I put them on the spot with a House Order, and told them to either fish or cut bait, they came back and said that the list of priorities was what they meant in the first place. O. K. That's fine. But now I call your attention to the fact that if that list of priorities means something, just turn to the Waldo County page in your accelerated highway program and look at Number 1. Number 1 happens to be U. S. Number 1. It runs from Belfast to Searsport, right up to Stockton. They haven't even surveyed it yet, and to me, if that isn't one of the most important pieces of our Maine highway network, I would like to know what is.

Now that is just an example I picked out.

I think you may have also noticed that recently they announced they were going to improve a section from Orono to Old Town and spend about three quarters of a million dollars, which to me was rather a confusing piece of construction, so I went over and asked them. I said "You, gentlemen, are going to build a through-truck boulevard road approximately four miles long of which two miles are going to be residential streets. How do you explain that. What are you going to do with the trucks that go through? Are you going to keep them down to twenty-five miles an hour?" And the answer was given: "Well, we thought that was the best we could do." I then raised the question: "What are you going to do, once you spend that three quarters of a million dollars, about the road from Bangor to Orono, which is obviously one of the third heaviest traveled roads in the State of Maine. Are you going to fix that up? Can that be widened without undue expense?" And the answer was: "Why, we have been toying with the idea of surveying a parallel road that runs off in the woods, called Stillwater Avenue. Now it may be that we will eventually adopt that road as a through road." In other words, they are going to spend three quarters of a million, and to me, from a safety factor, it is utterly ridiculous

to put a through truck road—half of the length of the road—through a residential area and admit, in the next breath, that maybe in a few years they will duplicate that road in an entirely different new location.

If you haven't noticed in the papers recently the number of deaths we have had in this State, let me call this fact to your attention: The death score as of about two weeks ago in the State of Maine was around thirty or thirty-four. This year it is up to around forty-two or forty-four, which is at least a twenty-five or thirty per cent increase.

I realize that most of you are concerned about this highway program because you want a smoother and better road to travel on, but I think that you, as legislators, in this House, those of you who will be back here next session, I hope someone in this House will have enough interest to dig into this highway program, the policy of the Highway Commission, and find out if safety is one of the primary factors in planning our roads, because from where I have examined it and studied it, it seems to me that maintenance is the Number 1 factor and safety is a poor second and third.

Now possibly this bill that is being proposed for having a full time administrator will produce safer highways, but I very frankly have yet to see any Highway Commission appointees who have been appointed to do much more than just try to pacify you and I when we go over to that office. That is their primary job. I don't see any Highway Commissioner with a burning desire to make our highways safer.

A young couple was killed over in Harrington this winter by going through one of these toothpick guard rails. A painter went through a bridge down here in Kennebunk the other day and was drowned. I don't see any concerted action on the part of the Highway Commission to rebuild these obviously weak guard rails at these dangerous spots with permanent steel-type guard rails. I don't see the action on the part of the State Highway Commission to improve "Deadmen's Curves" until people like Mr.

Brown, from Robbinston and his Senator go over there on bended knees and get down and beg and plead for them to do something. It would seem to me that if we had an aggressive, alert Highway Commission who was imbued with the idea of safety, that they wouldn't have to be begged, but rather that they on their own hooks would have suggested that they clean up these danger spots.

Are you aware that last session we passed, in this Legislature, the right for the Highway Commission to post the various roads for whatever speed they deemed was safe? To my knowledge there has been but one road since three years or two years that has been posted in that manner and that is the road from Lewiston to Winthrop, and I asked them why they didn't widen the shoulders of the narrow road from Newport to Bangor, which is a death trap, and probably the reasons that they want to take down the red signs, which you may have seen in the papers, is because they are ashamed to see the forest of red signs which are growing up on that road—and the answer was "Well, Mr. Totman, perhaps we ought to post that road for lower speed."

Now I ask you, are they just saying that they ought to post the road? They have had two years to post them. If a road is notoriously dangerous, why haven't they done it already? Why is the road from Augusta up to Waterville, obviously one of the best roads we had in the State, still held down to forty-five on the straight stretches? I think it is a lack of being imbued with the idea of safety that makes this Commission fail to protect the motoring public, in my estimation, and therefore any bill that is introduced in this House to say that the present Commission, that the present policy as represented by the present Commission, will be strengthened, will be put on a full-time basis by making the present chairman or a future chairman a full-time man, I cannot enthuse over. I did enthuse over the original bill, which Governor Cross recommended for a separate head administrator. I thought that was an excellent idea, but somewhere along the line, between pressures

and personal regrets, that got killed.

Therefore I personally cannot vote for this bill nor for the amendments. And rather than waste time with a vote on indefinite postponement, because I don't believe that there is that much sympathy for it, I will not make the motion but I will vote against the original motion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Ludwig, that House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" be adopted. As many as are in favor will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A vive voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "B" was adopted in non-concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House that Senate Amendment "B" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto be adopted? As many as are in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment "B" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and Senate Amendment "B" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was adopted in non-concurrence and the Bill as amended was assigned for third reading at 1.30 P.M. today.

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Specified Injuries under the Workmen's Compensation Law" (S. P. 62) (L. D. 131)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WARD of Penobscot
REID of Kennebec
—of the Senate
Messrs. COUTURE of Lewiston
SMALL of Mexico
WEST of Stockton Springs
CASWELL of New Sharon

LEGARD of Bath
GATES of Millinocket
—of the House

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. ST. PIERRE of Androscoggin
—of the Senate

Mr. LETOURNEAU of Sanford
—of the House

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report read and accepted.

In the House: The Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Providing for State Pension for Clyde Spaulding of Hartland (H. P. 128) on which the House accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on April 22.

Came from the Senate with the Resolve substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. CLEMENTS: Mr. Speaker, due to new information we have received on this resolve, I move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Clements, moves that the House recede from its former action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed; and on further motion of the same gentleman the House voted to concur with the Senate in substituting the Resolve for the Report.

Thereupon, the Resolve was given its first reading.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 128, Resolve, Providing for State Pension for Clyde Spaulding, of Hartland.

Amend said Resolve by striking out in the 1st line the figures "\$50"

and inserting in place thereof the figures '\$30'

Further amend said Resolve by striking out in the 4th line the figures "1951" and inserting in place thereof the figures '1953'

Further amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in place thereof of the following:

'; and be it further

Resolved: That there be, and hereby is, appropriated out of the appropriation for the department of health and welfare the sum of \$360 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954 and \$360 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 to carry out the purposes of this resolve.'

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Resolve was assigned for second reading at 1:30 P.M. this afternoon.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to the Issuance of Operators' Licenses from Date of Birth" (H. P. 878) (L. D. 870) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed, and asking for a Committee of Conference with the following conferees appointed on its part:

Messrs. CARTER of Oxford
SINCLAIR of Somerset
DENNETT of York

In the House: On motion of Mr. Finemore of Bridgewater, the House voted to insist and join in a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on House Paper 878, Legislative Document 873, Bill "An Act relating to the Issuance of Operators' Licenses from Date of Birth," the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. FINEMORE of Bridgewater
LOVELY of Westfield
DODGE of Strong

Non-Concurrent Matter

Joint Order (H. P. 1304) relative to the Committees on Appropriations and Financial Affairs and Taxation jointly to report what measures should be taken to satisfy needs and to provide revenues

therefor which was passed in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Chase of Whitefield, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the Joint Order.

Orders

Mr. Call of Cumberland presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that there be installed before the convening of the 97th Legislature a drinking fountain in the House end of the third floor corridor.

The **SPEAKER**: Is it the pleasure of the House that this Order receive passage? As many as are in favor of the passage of this Order will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote was taken.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair is in doubt. As many as are in favor of the passage of this Order will kindly rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, desire recognition?

Mr. **TOTMAN**: A matter of information, Mr. Speaker, to find out what the Order means.

The **SPEAKER**: Would the gentleman like the order re-read?

Mr. **TOTMAN**: Please, Mr. Speaker.

The Order was read again by the Clerk.

The **SPEAKER**: As many as are in favor of the passage of this Order will kindly rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

The question before the House is on the passage of this Order and the Chair is calling for a division because it was in doubt on the voice vote.

A division of the House was had.

The **SPEAKER**: Twelve having voted in the affirmative and fifty-one having voted in the negative, the Order does not receive passage.

Mr. Trafton of Auburn, presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that Bill "An Act relating to Duties of Official Court Reporter (S. P. 104) (L. D. 318) be recalled to the House from the Engrossing Department. (H. P. 1305)

The Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Resolve relating to Appropriation for Recess Committee to Study Maine State Retirement System and Titles of Social Security Act (S. P. 602) (L. D. 1547)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act Removing Violations by Liquor Law Licensees from Operation of the Criminal Law" (S. P. 221) (L. D. 587)

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

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

Mr. **STEWART**: Mr. Speaker, in bringing this bill to the attention of the House on third reading, I move the indefinite postponement of the bill, and in further support of that motion I would like to ask at least two questions of any member of the Judiciary Committee who will care to answer.

The provision of the bill in Section 2 seems to me to provide that licenses may not be revoked or suspended at the discretion of the Commission for the following cause, and it names sale of liquor to minors. Indirectly it says that that part is taken out of the law, that part is repealed which says that licenses may be revoked or suspended by the Commission, that is any suspension, five days or two days or ten days or complete revocation, they may be revoked or suspended at the discretion of the Commission for conviction of violation of the law relating to the sale of intoxicating liquor to minors.

Do I have a proper understanding of that section which seems to me to indicate that the Commission would not be able now to punish for violation of the law for sale of liquor to minors?

I direct the attention of any member of that committee, if they care to answer, to Section 2, and there is another section which does something similar to that.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, moves that the Bill be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. The same gentleman requests information through the Chair.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the question was whether the gentleman's impression was correct. I believe the answer is "No."

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

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, in rejoinder to that I would like to just re-read it and see whether or not the clarity of the English Language here does not appeal to you. "Licenses may be revoked or suspended at the discretion of the Commission for conviction of violation of any law relating to sale of intoxicating liquor to minors." That is repealed.

Now in regard to Section 3, the same section provides that licenses may be revoked or suspended for conviction of violation of any law in this State. That section is repealed by Section 3 of the act. Again I would like to ask any member of the Judiciary Committee whether or not I misunderstand the purport of the bill when it strikes me that that means that if a person violates any law of the State in regard to the sale of liquor he cannot have his liquor license revoked or suspended, the plain wording of the statute.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, requests information through the Chair of some member of the Judiciary Committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not certain that I quite understood the precise question posed by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, but I will state that the purpose of this law is to remove violations by liquor licensees from

the criminal law, so that those violations — that includes sales, as I understand it, sales to minors, Sunday sales, sales after hours; those violations will be punished by the Liquor Commission through revocation or suspension of license. It keeps in the criminal law any violations of the liquor laws by other than a licensee which, of course, would be a bootlegger of any type. The purpose of the law was to make it possible to enforce these laws practically because as it was the Commission found that it was, in some cases, almost impossible to get a conviction in court after they had suspended the license of the licensee. They also found that they could get more immediate action, more immediate results, by regulations and enforcement in the Commission than they could in the criminal law.

You will notice that the punishment that can be imposed by the Commission is certainly severe enough so that there is no need of it being in the criminal law. As I said yesterday, this was a recommendation of the Research Committee. It has the approval of the Liquor Commission. It was given a thorough hearing, and it seems to me that the only attempt today is to confuse the issue, and I don't care to answer any more questions.

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: One thing you have got to say for the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, no matter how often he gets licked, he simply won't quit trying.

Now this bill is a bill to remove certain liquor violations from the criminal law. Now the purpose of doing that is to enable the better enforcement of the liquor law. Now the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart isn't interested so much in the carrying out of the liquor law violations as he is to pin upon everybody who violates the liquor law that he is a criminal. That is what Mr. Stewart wants. He wants everybody who, in any way, violates the liquor law to be a criminal.

Now, the idea is that when a man violates the liquor law, he is brought before the Municipal Court and ordinarily found guilty, and he

appeals to the next term of the Superior Court. Now the Liquor Commission cannot remove his license to continue in the liquor business until the Superior Court has acted, so he goes right back carrying on his liquor business and continues to violate the law. He is not scared because he knows that when the thing comes up before the Superior Court he is going to be found guilty and lose his license then, but he has from that time until the Superior Court acts to continue to violate the law, and it is a fact that they continue to violate it openly, not once or twice, but fifteen or twenty times; and then when the thing comes up in the Superior Court they plead guilty, and are fined, and they simply withdraw their appeal, and that's the end of it and they are out of business.

Now the idea of removing it from the criminal law is that immediately upon his conviction of violating, that is, when the Liquor Commission decides that he has violated the liquor law, they will immediately take away his license and take him out of the liquor business.

Mr. Stewart isn't satisfied with that. He wants that man to have a criminal record.

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

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I submit, that the only thing it does, as the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Low) and the gentleman from Pittsfield (Mr. Cianchette) declared that this act does, the only thing that seems to do that is the title of the bill which says "An Act Removing Violations of the Liquor Law from the Criminal Law". I think this is a bit of razzle-dazzle from the Liquor Research Committee, which I don't think showed as much thought as it should have, or else the last section of the bill, which did away with the penalties for bootlegging, would not have been in the bill.

Now I would like to have your indulgence, and I hope I have, to go down through the bill section by section and briefly, because it is a brief bill, and see whether or not that does exactly that.

Section 1—please bear with me as this will not take long—Section 1 says that violations for sale of liquor on Sunday are punishable. This is already in the law. It is not necessary to have that section. Another attempt to put sugar coating on the bill to sell the bill, of course.

Section 2 provides in effect, and I do not misread it; I have read this carefully many times; it provides in effect that there shall be no suspension or revocation by the Commission. This does not deal with the problem of the courts at all, but it takes away a power of the Commission, that the Commission will not revoke or suspend for sale of liquor to minors.

Section 3, in effect, and I do not misread it, but I have awaited for enlightenment on this, says that there shall be no revocation or suspension for violation of the laws of the State of Maine. The Commission will not appoint for that.

Section 4, which first said that bootlegging was legal has been amended to provide that bootlegging is illegal. I submit, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this bill does not do what it proposes to do in title and that it does cut the guts out of some of the most important parts of our liquor laws. That does not represent to my mind the best thinking on the subject of control and regulation, and it is my feeling that this bill would be one which we would do well to indefinitely postpone. It seems to me that the Legislative Research Commission passed out about twenty bills and counsel prepared bills, and I do not feel that in some instances the counsel is as well acquainted with the liquor law as those people who represent the "Wets" and represent the "Drys" on the question of liquor laws. Those gentleman know the liquor laws like the back of their hands, and it seems to me that this law is an unwise law which you ought to indefinitely postpone and Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me that the question on the voice vote yesterday was fairly close although predominatingly "No", and for the purpose of being certain today I would like to ask for a division.

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Just one further word: I don't know what some other committee did but the Judiciary Committee, which is made up of ten lawyers, thoroughly considered this bill and they didn't hurry through it and they didn't take somebody else's word for it, and they didn't take Mr. Stewart's word for it either. We studied it and we passed it, I believe, unanimously.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, that Bill "An Act Removing Violations by Liquor Law Licensees from Operation of the Criminal Law," Senate Paper 221, Legislative Document 587, and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. The same gentleman requests a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, for indefinite postponement of this measure 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.

Two having voted in the affirmative and seventy-seven having voted in the negative, the motion for indefinite postponement did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Bill "An Act Imposing a Tax on Milk Producers for Promotional Purposes" (H. P. 1284) (L. D. 1530)

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

Passed to be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Certain Tax Exemptions for Amputee Veterans (S. P. 55) (L. D. 83)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and

strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 124 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: In the interests of orderly handling of the following enactors, the Chair at this time requests any member of the House who has a measure which might have an amendment or a motion attached to it to notify the Chair at this time.

Item 3 will be passed over and taken up out of order.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Requiring Children to Care for Parents According to Ability (S. P. 401) (L. D. 1118)

An Act Declaring All Court Papers, Books and Records Pertaining to Adoption Confidential and Providing for Release Thereof (S. P. 541) (L. D. 1454)

An Act to Provide a New Charter for the City of Saco (H. P. 430) (L. D. 477)

An Act relating to the State Personnel Board (H. P. 654) (L. D. 697)

An Act relating to Issuance of Harness Horse Racing Licenses (H. P. 931) (L. D. 996)

An Act relating to Organization of Police Department of City of Lewiston (H. P. 1052) (L. D. 1193)

An Act relating to Closing County Offices on Saturdays (H. P. 1145) (L. D. 1293)

An Act Exempting from Sales Tax Passenger Automobiles Not to be Registered in State (H. P. 1272) (L. D. 1468)

An Act relating to Binding of Logs, Lumber and Timber Carried by Motor Vehicles (H. P. 1288) (L. D. 1531)

Finally Passed

Resolve to Create a Special Committee to Study Safeguards in Construction Projects (S. P. 536) (L. D. 1441)

Resolve in favor of E. Stanley Kitchin of Rumford (H. P. 184) (L. D. 179)

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

Resolve Granting a Retirement Pension to Hugh A. Smith of Charleston (H. P. 342) (L. D. 359)

Resolve relating to Navigation on Part of Sebago Lake, Cumberland County (H. P. 1281) (L. D. 1517)

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

Item 3, under Enactors, An Act relating to Certain Policies of Insurance by Companies Organized under General Law, Senate Paper 433, Legislative Document 1210, was placed before the House.

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

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

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment and I move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it passed this Bill to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Albee) would care to explain his amendment and whether there are principal statutes on the books or regulations that affect accident policies that would otherwise not be in effect?

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, requests the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, to explain the amendment not yet offered, which he proposes to offer.

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If you will take bill, L. D. 1210, and take the third line from the bottom, it says: "or personal representative or persons who are killed as the result of an accident." Then you will look at the next section and it says: "and such provision shall not be deemed

to be an accident insurance policy," under the heading: "An Act Relating to Certain Policies of Insurance". This does not have anything to do with the casualty laws whatsoever. This is just clarifying the language in this bill, bringing it back to an accident policy, as stated so on the Floor by the proponents of this bill. I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

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

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill has caused considerable controversy and debate upon the Floor of the House and yesterday I took the time and the opportunity to visit the Insurance Department to make some inquiries as to whether or not there was anything wrong about the bill as it was written and as it has been passed to be engrossed by this House and the other branch of the Legislature. I was informed that it was similar to all other limited coverage items which are now in our policies and which we can buy or may not buy as we so see fit. I was told that when the affair came to the Insurance Department, they would interpret it as they interpret other items as to whether or not it was strictly accident or otherwise, but, in any event it was limited coverage.

I was also informed that the bill as it is written is adequate and is proper and that there is nothing wrong with it.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I ask you in the interest of good legislation to consider what I have said to you as coming from the Insurance Department, vote against the motion to reconsider and let's enact this law as it is written by men who know what they are doing.

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

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We just went to the phone and talked with the Insurance Commissioner and the Insurance Commissioner says it is impossible for him to interpret anything until he has it. This is an

enabling act. It is just a question of whether we are going to give them some permissive legislation. I don't know what it is and certainly I just say that it says it is an "accident" and they don't want to call it as such and I would just like to have it called what they are going to call it. If the proponents say it is an accident policy, I would like to have them call it an accident policy or strike it out.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think this is just another attempt to kill a bill by an amendment. If you adopt this amendment, it looks to me as though you are going to have to include all the provisions of a standard accident policy in a bodily injury liability policy. I hope that you will not vote to reconsider our action:

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, that the House reconsider its action.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House; My seat mate here is one of the two or three signers of the minority report. I can't help but be a little prejudiced to believe in his good faith and intentions. I have just asked him if this amendment would, as Mr. Davis has just suggested, kill the bill. If I understood him correctly, he said it would not and it seems to me in due faith in Mr. Albee that this is simply a clarifying amendment to guarantee that the bill will do what they say it will do. And furthermore, as far as calling the Insurance Commission and doing whatever they say, I have picked up a few flaws in the insurance business here myself so I don't say that they are above error.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Yarmouth, Mr. Henry.

Mr. HENRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have to concur with the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis, that this is just another attempt to sabotage this bill. The bill has been fully discussed on the Floor of this House.

All the arguments that could be thought of have been brought up against it. It seems to me that the time is rather late now to try to bring in amendments. I realize that it is perfectly legal and all that. I hope that the reason that this bill was brought in has been made clear. It is to give the people in the lower income brackets a chance to buy limited coverage, a policy that they can not afford to buy under the terms of the present insurance laws.

I believe that if this amendment is passed, if we reconsider this, that we will be harming the low-income people of the State. I hope that you will not vote for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washburn, Mr. Story.

Mr. STORY: Mr. Speaker, this simply removes, this amendment simply removes the objection that all the insurance companies had to this bill and that was being an accident policy, why should it be termed anything else? This provides for this company to make this package insurance and not come under the law as it applies to all other companies.

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just heard the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis, and the gentleman from North Yarmouth, Mr. Henry, say that this amendment is going to kill the bill. I may be a little stupid but I don't see how it is going to kill the bill. They haven't given any explanation of that. They just say that so that you members will accept it. Another thing they say is that the poor people cannot buy insurance but they don't tell you why they can't buy the insurance. I wonder why?

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

Mr. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think this is just another attempt to cut out a little competition on this type of insurance. This broadens out your medical payments as it is now written under your regular standard automobile policy. I have a policy here that was issued on April 18 with \$500 medical payments for each person, for which I pay \$4.00 a year.

I have been carrying this for quite some number of years and have never had occasion to collect on it but I know that in a good many cases where we have had automobile accidents, sometimes a lot of ill men riding in a car with young people, taken up to the hospital where this medical payment wouldn't be included in the policy. The results would be that there would be no money to pay for the accident and the doctors and hospitals would have to go without any compensation.

I will say again I think it is just a fad of some of the companies who are writing this type of insurance to beat off a little bit of competition. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, does not prevail for us to accept this amendment.

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

Mr. TONDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel obligated to re-state my previous stand on this matter as a member of the Business Legislation Committee. My view on this bill is that the measure will greatly benefit the general public. Now, the opponents of this measure have stated on some measures the Business Legislation Committee has been interested in safeguarding the public but that in regard to this bill that we are not so interested. I would like to state that that type of talk is not true. We are not here trying to write up an insurance policy, we are merely authorizing permissive legislation for type of insurance policy to be written and that policy would still be subject to the approval of the Insurance Commissioner, who is appointed, who is an appointee of the Governor in the State of Maine. Every statement, every paragraph, every word in that policy would have to be acceptable to the Insurance Commissioner. I think if we can't have enough faith in the Insurance Commissioner to allow him to pass over what type of policies can or cannot be written in the State in accordance with the provisions that this Legislature has set forth, I think then that we certainly don't

have much need for an Insurance Commissioner.

The reason that this insurance would greatly benefit the public is that when you purchase an automobile insurance policy, you would be able to purchase complete protection which would include for you or any member of your family, medical payments, hospitalization and other types of surgical benefits in order to defray any costs of any accidents. Now, the usual hospitalization insurance includes all types of coverage as far as hospitalization is concerned. It takes in all types of occupations and therefore, because it covers the whole life of an individual and not just the time which he spends in an automobile, the rates are much higher. The ordinary individual cannot afford such a policy. This would merely allow the ordinary citizen who wishes to carry that type of policy when he is in his automobile to be sufficiently covered. I think it is a good policy and I believe it still ought to receive passage.

As far as this amendment is concerned, it would merely require that the insurance comply with the standard provisions and as I stated before most of these standard provisions are provisions that have to do with the occupational hazards that the life insurance has to comply with. Now, there is no occupational distinction in this policy. This policy is meant to cover anyone when he is driving an automobile.

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The Insurance Commissioner is not under discussion here neither is the value of this bill under discussion here. The only thing that is under discussion right now is whether an accident insurance policy should be called an accident insurance policy or not. That is the only thing that you have under discussion at the present time. The bill has been discussed and the bill has been passed. We are just discussing this little amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Naples, Mr. Fickett.

Mr. FICKEIT: Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, would explain what he means by a limited policy. I don't seem to get that.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Naples, Mr. Fickett, requests information through the Chair of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, may answer the question only.

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker, a limited policy is a policy that has bold type. In other words, it is coverage that you don't have. Let me put it that way. In other words, you no doubt purchase policies through the mail or you get a lot of literature through the mail, for \$1.00 a month or \$1.00 a year or \$3.00 a year, they will cover you and your family and your neighbor but you must be on the crosswalk at 12:00 o'clock noon, four inches off the ground and get hit on the head with a hammer. Now, that is the type of limited insurance.

Now, I do want to answer another question he just raised here. It is a question of policies. We are not talking about policy and we are not going to issue a policy; we are going to issue riders. They don't issue policies. Their policies are in force now and they would just merely add a rider to it. This is permissive legislation to do that. It has nothing to do with the policy and I would like to answer that man on the committee on that. I have no objection to this bill at all, absolutely none. I certainly would favor the passage if they will call it an accident policy as it so states in the bill.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, that the House reconsider its action as of yesterday whereby it passed to be engrossed Bill "An Act relating to Certain Policies of Insurance by Companies Organized Under General Law", Senate Paper 433, Legislative Document 1210, as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Committee Amendment "B".

As many as are in favor of the motion for reconsideration will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted, a division of the House was had.

Fifty having voted in the affirmative and sixty-two having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

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

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, seek recognition?

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: I would like, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the request of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, for unanimous consent to address the House? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I understand that this is the birthday of our Democrat, Mr. Louis Jalbert.

The SPEAKER: May the Chair interrupt the gentleman and request the Sergeant-at-Arms to attempt to find the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that this is the birthday of Mr. Louis Jalbert of Lewiston. In my opinion, Mr. Jalbert has rendered this Legislature much valuable assistance by furnishing us with information that we needed from time to time.

At this time I have been requested by the Honorable Horace McClure, one of our members of the Governor's Council, to extend to Mr. Jalbert a small gift with this message: "May this tie be just another birthday greeting from that other guy. It may be too late and although I love you, I still feel glad about the election day" Signed, Uncle Horace. (Applause, members rising).

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair lays before the House the first item of Unfinished Business, Senate Report "Ought to pass" in new draft under title of Bill "An Act to Confer Additional

Powers upon Municipalities in the State of Maine in relation to Parking Facilities", Senate Paper 578, Legislative Document 1518 on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Exempt Revenue Bonds from the Limitations of Municipal Indebtedness, Senate Paper 84, Legislative Document 191, tabled on May 2 by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, pending acceptance; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with the Senate and accept the report of the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, moves that the "Ought to pass" in new draft report of the committee be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the "Ought to pass" in new draft Report was accepted in concurrence.

Thereupon, the new draft was given its first reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, it was definitely my understanding that when this bill came in on the other calendar, that the whole thing had been killed and I want to go along with the Senate and just let it die.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understood the gentleman to say to concur with the Senate. In the Senate the report was accepted and then the bill and accompanying papers were indefinitely postponed.

The Chair now understands that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, after the first reading of the bill, moves that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the Bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed in concurrence will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the second item of Unfinished Business, Resolve Providing for Construction of Highway to Sugar Loaf Mountain,

Franklin County, Senate Paper 296, Legislative Document 828, tabled on May 1 by the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey, pending further consideration.

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to thank the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey, for tabling this in my absence. Due to the budgetary affairs, with regret, I move that this resolve be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, moves that the resolve be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Resolve with accompanying papers was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the third item of Unfinished Business, House Joint Order relative to recommendation of the Legislature on State House Expansion, House Paper 1298, tabled on May 2 by the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Anderson, pending reproduction of the order and his motion for passage; and the Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think I have to clear the atmosphere at the outset about this order. This is not Paul Slocum's; it is Anderson's. I admit I did talk to Paul Slocum before I introduced the order but I drew my own conclusions from reading what the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, and the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, said after going home one evening and two or three days later reading in the Kennebec Journal the possibility that there would be some such structure constructed on Grove Street similar to this outfit over here that we call the Highway Building. I certainly do not think that the State ought to go to the extent of building such a place as that with no thought in mind for the future growth of the State.

With those few words, that is the sum and substance, the whole reason and the only reason for introducing such an order. I think it

certainly is a waste of money, of the State's money, and a waste of time to build something similar to what we have out back here that we are now having to remove some of the files from because of the fact that it is falling down. I think that is all that I have to say on the order.

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

Mr. **McGLAUFFIN**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think it would be very unwise to pass such a resolution. In the first place, it can have no weight, it is just simply an expression from this Legislature and if I were the Governor I would give it no attention whatsoever. If you employ a lawyer, if you are wise, you let your lawyer handle your case. When a client tries to handle a case, he is liable to lose it. If you employ a physician, you expect that physician to use his judgment as to how to cure you, not your's. If you employ an architect, you want somebody besides laymen to do the planning. Let the architect do it; don't let us in this Legislature be so foolish as to tell the gentleman who is authorized by the Governor and Council to carry out this provision for a new building. Don't let us who don't know anything about what we are talking about tell them what to do. I move the indefinite postponement of this order.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, moves that the joint order be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. **SENER**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise to support the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, for the indefinite postponement of this order. In my opinion, I think an addition to this State Capitol is unwise because it is uneconomical and will not promote efficiency. This order states that it is in the interests of economy and efficiency that the present State House be enlarged. I think that it would be wise for the State to build a separate building for the various departments of the State. Now,

why would an addition to this State Capitol be uneconomical?

My first reason is because the State has already paid \$150,000 for the plans for this building. The plans have been bought and paid for; \$150,000 for a separate State office building. And my impression is that this is not a factory type building nor does it in any way resemble the present State Highway Commission Building. Now, I am told that if these plans, already paid for and drawn up, were followed it would call for the expenditure of approximately \$4,000,000. Now we have already approved an expenditure of \$3,000,000. I have been informed that with some alterations, changes, minor changes to those plans, we could, at the present time, build a building for \$3,000,000 that would take care of all existing needs and that building could be built to be expanded in the future to take care of future needs. So, we have paid \$150,000 for plans for a separate building.

Secondly, we have paid \$25,000 to a firm known as Ernst & Ernst for a partial analysis of the needs, that is, the space requirements for the various departments of our State government, having in mind a separate building. \$25,000 spent already.

If we were to build an addition on this present building, it would cost 20 per cent more because of the fact that we would have to use granite to make the addition conform to the present building. I do not believe any of you would want an addition to detract from the beauty and dignity of this building.

Now, the plans for this separate building are to have the building built on land which the State already owns at the rear of the State House. That lot is of sufficient size to take care of the building and some parking area and it seems to me that it would be wise for the State in the future to buy additional property to increase the size of the parking lot.

I believe that it would be uneconomical and inefficient to build an addition on this Capitol for this reason: That the State Capitol is more or less like a museum, when the Legislature is in session and

when it is not in session. You have all seen school children and other interested citizens come through these corridors to see their State Capitol. I believe that if we were to carry out the business affairs of our State government in this State building that these citizens, school children and other people, there present, would tend to interfere with the efficiency of these departments. Any of you who run a business I think would agree that if you have clerical work to do, bookkeeping work to do, you usually have that done in an area of your store or establishment where there isn't a general traffic going through the building. I do not think it would be wise; I almost would rather have my leg cut off than to see the elm trees at the side of this building cut down to make room for an addition. For one thing, we don't have the land on this side of the present structure. If, in the future, we decide we need to build an additional addition, we might have a building which would resemble the State House of Boston where the traffic goes underneath an archway and on the other side of the archway is additional office space.

For these reasons, I am opposed to the order and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, for indefinite postponement will prevail.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am glad to have some discussion on the order. The bill has already passed both branches of this Legislature to build a new building or an addition thereto to this one and I am fully confident in the Governor and Council and the five members of the advisory committee to the Governor and Council to build such a building as will be an honor and a pleasure to this State. I believe that this discussion is wholly unnecessary because it is now in the hands of the Governor and Council and five members of the State of Maine, who they may appoint to advise with them for this project.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I haven't any long prepared speech on this item but down around Thomaston I have seen a lot of signs that say: "Granite lives forever" and I have been hoping all winter that any additions that we put on this place might be made of granite.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the Joint Order relative to recommendation of the Legislature on State House Expansion, House Paper 1298, presented by the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Anderson, be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of the motion for indefinite postponement will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Joint Order was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth item of Unfinished Business, Bill "An Act to Create the Waterville Parking District", Senate Paper 307, Legislative Document 925, tabled on May 2 by the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A"; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. LANE: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the bill be given its third reading.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, moves that Committee Amendment "A" be adopted or indefinitely postponed? The question before the House is on the adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

Mr. LANE: To be adopted, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, moves that Committee Amendment "A" be adopted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that this bill has had its two several readings and the House has

now adopted Committee Amendment "A" and the measure will be assigned for third reading as amended at 1:30 P. M., Eastern Standard Time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifth item of Unfinished Business, Bill "An Act relating to Police Officers in Uniform Stopping Motor Vehicles for Examination", House Paper 270, Legislative Document 298, tabled on May 4 by the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford, pending further consideration.

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

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I thank you for the courtesy of tabling this bill Monday at the request of my seat mate, the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford. You have killed many of my good bills this session and this is your last chance to vote for or against one of my bills. I can see you are all heaving a sigh of relief and so am I.

I will simply say that this bill was passed in the House on a unanimous "Ought to pass" report from the tough Judiciary Committee. I move that we insist on our former action.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman moves only to insist? No committee of conference?

The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, moves that the House insist on its former action. Is this the pleasure of the House?

As many as are in favor of the motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the sixth item of Unfinished Business, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Maine Soldiers and Sailors in the War with Spain", House Paper 398, Legislative Document 452, tabled on March 25 by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, pending acceptance of the report.

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that this matter be retabled.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Berry, moves on the sixth item of unfinished business that the report and accompanying papers be retabled. Is this the pleasure of the House?

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Berry, that the matter be retabled will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The reason I wanted to have this retabled, I understand that there is another bill out, a veterans bill, and my reason for retabling was to find out what the result of that was.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will request the gentleman to make a motion.

Mr. BERRY: I didn't understand you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair requests the gentleman to make a motion.

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now move that we substitute the bill for the report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Berry, moves that the bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

Does the gentleman wish to speak to his motion?

Is it the pleasure of the House that the bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee?

All those in favor will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Bill was substituted for the Report, given its two several readings and assigned for third reading at 1:30 P. M., E. S. T., today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the seventh item

of Unfinished Business, House Report "Ought not to pass" as covered by other legislation of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Bounty on Bears", House Paper 808, Legislative Document 892, tabled on May 5 by the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Gates, pending acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. GATES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to make a motion and then address the House following that. I make a motion that this be retabled and if I may, I would like to address the House just a second.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would suggest that the gentleman withdraw his motion. The motion to table is not debatable. The gentleman could then talk and afterward make a motion.

Mr. GATES: I can talk first, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Gates, withdraws his motion to table. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GATES: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking this to be tabled is the same reason that I had it tabled day before yesterday. If you will note in your calendar, it says that this is an "Ought not to pass" report from the committee as covered by other legislation. It is covered by other legislation and if this other legislation passes, I will be tickled to death, I will immediately take this from the table and accept the report of the committee. But the other legislation which is mentioned is bogged down in the other branch of the Legislature and until that moves I hate reluctantly to remove this bill or accept the report of the committee as covered by other legislation until the other legislation is passed.

I hope that my motion to table will be accepted in the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Gates, moves that the seventh item of unfinished business be retabled.

As many as are in favor of the motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Report

and accompanying papers were retabled pending acceptance of the report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eighth item of Unfinished Business, House Order relative to Copies of Mimeo-graphed Manual "Administrative Agencies, Structure and Functions" for distribution in secondary school classes, tabled on May 5 by the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree, pending reproduction and passage; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. CRABTREE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I tabled this order simply so you might refer to this portfolio to which it refers. It was available to all of us earlier in the season. I must admit that I didn't discover the value of it myself until the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Fuller, drew my attention to it and I have discussed this with the Department of Education. My order simply covers the matter, through the cooperation of the Clerk, to gather together what stencils are available and the Department of Education will then issue these very valuable portfolios to the teachers of social science and problems of democracy, the point being that many of these classes which come to visit us would certainly be much better informed if a week before they came they had a chance to study this very valuable document. There is nothing else like it that I know of. It is a small matter and I move its passage.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree, moves passage of the order.

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

Mr. POTTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to go along with Mr. Crabtree on this order. When those books first became available to the members of this House, several of the teachers asked me to procure one for them to use in their classes. I talked with the librarian and she told me there were absolutely none available except for the members here and there was no way we could get even one to use in our schools, and I certainly hope this order receives passage.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree, that the order receive passage.

As many as are in favor of the motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the order received passage.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair lays before the House the ninth item of Unfinished Business, House Order relative to Simplified Manual of Legislative Procedure to be prepared by the Department of Government of the University of Maine, tabled on May 5 by the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree, pending reproduction and passage; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. **CRABTREE**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There is no conflict or connection between the thing we have just done and this. I will simply yield to the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, or anybody else.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, in his own right.

Mr. **SENDER**: Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite matters, I will move that the order have passage.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, moves that the order receive passage.

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

Mr. **ALBERT**: Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of preparing an amendment and I will explain my amendment, I move that the order be retabled until this afternoon's session. I think that any manual prepared on legislative procedure should have the advice of our Clerk who has been in the business for some twenty odd years and that is what my amendment will be. I move that it be tabled until this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, moves that the ninth item of unfinished business, House Order, be retabled pending passage until this afternoon. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Order was retabled pending the mo-

tion of Mr. Senter of Brunswick that it receive passage and was specially assigned for this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair lays before the House the tenth item of unfinished business, House Divided Report, Majority Report "Ought to pass" and Minority Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Membership of State Harness Racing Commission", House Paper 663, Legislative Document 706, tabled on May 5 by the gentleman from New Limerick, Mr. Hand, pending the motion of the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, to accept the Majority Report.

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

Mr. **CHILDS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from New Limerick, Mr. Hand, tabled this item for me the other day as I asked him to for the purpose of leaving this on the table so we could then take up the eleventh unfinished business, which was a bill creating a running racing commission. If this bill passes, this running racing commission, there no longer will be a State harness racing commission and therefore to save time and debate I thought it would be a good idea to take care of that matter first. Therefore, I move that the tenth unfinished business lie upon the table until the eleventh is disposed of, which is the next matter.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, requests unanimous consent that the tenth item of unfinished business be taken up immediately after the eleventh item of unfinished business. Does the Chair hear objection? The Chair hears none.

Thereupon, unanimous consent was granted to pass over the tenth item of unfinished business to be taken up after disposition of the eleventh.

The **SPEAKER**: Does the gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor, wish to speak on a matter out of order?

Mr. **TAYLOR**: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on article 11.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eleventh item of Unfinished Business, House Divided Report, Majority Report "Ought to pass" and Minority Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating a Racing Commission", House Paper 1188, Legislative Document 1337, tabled on May 5 by the gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In view of the fact that I tabled the bill of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, I will yield to him if he wishes to speak on this Legislative Document number 1337.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First, I want to thank the gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor, very sincerely for retabling this matter the other day when I was unable to be here.

When I first put this bill in the hopper eight or ten weeks ago, I never anticipated at that time just how valuable this particular piece of legislation would be, and the need that there is going to be for it now. When I originally introduced the bill the purpose of it was to more or less be in accordance with the rest of the states. I could see no need of two commissions where one commission could do the same job. We all realize now that we definitely have a problem before us. I believe it was two sessions ago the 94th Legislature passed night harness racing. This Legislature has now passed night running racing. As you all know, I certainly opposed night running racing. I wanted Scarborough Downs to operate but I wanted them to operate days but this Legislature in their wisdom has thought otherwise. As you all know, yesterday, I conceded to the majority and went along with Scarborough going nights but now we have a problem.

If we had one commission, one commission would be in a position to allocate dates and supervise this

racing so all be able to run at some profit. There would at that time be some harmony. The whole problem in the last two or three sessions with regard to racing, I believe, has been because there have been two commissions. The two commissions have not been able to get together.

In 1950, the Running Racing Commission allocated the month of July, I believe it was, to Scarborough Downs and the Harness Racing Commission allocated the month of July to Gorham race track, only twelve miles apart and both commissions allocating dates when they would be running in direct competition with each other. The commissions refused to get together. If these commissions had gotten together they might have been able to make some arrangements, but it wasn't done and it doesn't look like it ever will be done. The way to remedy it is if we have one commission, they will be able to distribute fairness to all concerned. Now, two sessions ago, when we passed the night harness racing bill, I believe that we owed a duty to Gorham to see that they would operate successfully night. We discussed the Scarborough Downs bill last week; the whole matter was fairness, let them be able to operate nights, let them make a profit out there, they are running at a loss. Now, I say the same thing should apply to Gorham. As we all know, the Running Racing Commission has allocated dates from May 15th, I believe, to November 15 and they can run anytime they want to in that period. Naturally, they are going to run part of July and part of August and probably part of September. It is very obvious that Gorham can't compete with them at that time.

We discussed investment the other day at Scarborough Downs. We have the same investment at Gorham, over half a million dollar investment there. This is all Maine money there; Maine investment. I certainly didn't object to Scarborough Downs in which half of the track is owned by a Massachusetts man. I want to see Massachusetts money in here too but I certainly do not want to see Massachusetts money come in here to push out

our Maine money and our Maine people. That certainly doesn't make sense to me. I would like to see them both operate successfully.

Also, between these two factions which are night running racing at Scarborough and the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, said the other day if two organizations which want to do something, right in the middle of these organizations are hundreds of small harness operators and those men are also interested in making a living. Their investment may not be so large but to them it is just as large an investment as a larger place. Those horses cost probably one to two thousand dollars. Those horses stay here twelve months a year. They buy their sulkies here. They buy their harnesses here. They buy their feed here. I can't see any reason in the world why you should put them out of business.

I wrote, to the best of my opinion, to all of the States who have pari mutuel betting, twenty-eight of them, I believe it is. Out of the twenty-eight states, twenty-four of them have one commission. I wrote and asked them what their opinion was and which was the most valid and could be operated the most satisfactorily, one or two commissions. I would like to read you just a couple of the answers. First, I want to remind you again that twenty-four out of the twenty-eight have one commission.

This letter from Division of New Jersey Racing Commission. I will read just part of the letters; there is no sense in reading all of the letters. Legal Affairs Committee. "The Legislature of New Jersey, in its wisdom, has given unto one commission, designated as the New Jersey Racing Commission, the supervision of all racing conducted within the state; this includes flat racing and harness racing. For the past ten years racing has been administered on a very high level in the State of New Jersey, without complaints from any branch of the State Government.

"It is my opinion from my own experience as a member of the New Jersey Racing Commission, and from historical opinion which I have obtained from prior commissioners, racing is best served when

it is administered by one official body." Signed Hugh L. Mehorter, Chairman of the New Jersey Racing Commission.

Washington Racing Commission: "It seems proper to have racing under one Commission or Board in order to secure the maximum in coordination. It is our opinion that under the supervision of one Board, racing is much better controlled in the several areas of the State, and better for racing itself. In other words it is not a good thing for racing to have too much time in one area and too little in another. Nor is it good to have harness and running races in the same locality at the same time. Serious conflicts of racing dates can much better be avoided by having all racing under the supervision of one Board or Commission." Signed by the Chairman of the Washington Horse Racing Commission.

The State of Michigan with a pari mutuel handling of \$107,000,000 a year. "Since Michigan legalized pari mutuel wagering both harness racing and runners have been governed by one commission. It has been our belief that the one commission form of control reduces costs considerably as well as increasing efficiency in regulating racing.

"In 1952 Michigan tracks had a mutuel handle of \$107,000,000 at two running and three harness meets," which was all under the supervision of one commission.

State of Colorado: "Please be advised that the State of Colorado does not have sulky racing. However, the Commission now has under its control both greyhound and horse racing; and if sulky racing were introduced in this State, it would undoubtedly fall under the supervision of our Racing Commission."

Also, in the one racing commission, if the bill is passed, there is an amendment, which, of course, was necessary because of certain changes in our racing laws. One was the night racing and also changing the commission to 15 1-2 per cent. Also, in the amendment, you will notice I have changed the breakage from 5 to 10 cents. My purpose for doing that was because the runners operate on that

breakage of from 5 to 10 cents. I have taken half the breakage to go back to the licensees; the other half would go to the State. So in the next two years, if the one racing commission bill passes with this amendment, the State would receive an additional approximately \$65,000, which I think we can certainly use. Also, with Gorham operating, and if Gorham will operate, probably they will do out there around \$2,000,000. And if they operate, of course the State would receive the 5 per cent from that.

Under this present setup, if the one racing commission didn't go into effect until August, the additional revenue from the commission at Gorham and from the commission on breakage would be approximately \$113,000 additional revenue in the next two years. And the biennium following that, if the racing wagers stay approximately the same, they will go about \$170,000 additional revenue.

In closing, I just want to say, I believe and I hope the House will be consistent in its sense of fairness. We are now in a position to legislate a remedy to this long-disputed problem of racing. I believe one commission is certainly sound and practical legislation. It will give both forms of racing the right to exist. This legislation would mean, as I said, an additional \$113,000 the next two years and following that an additional around \$175,000. It would also mean additional revenue to both the town of Gorham and the town of Scarborough. I certainly believe the Legislature owes the same sense of duty to both towns and certainly a duty to all our Maine people. I hope the majority report will be accepted and I make that move.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, moves that the majority report "Ought to pass" be accepted.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Warren, Mr. McCluskey.

Mr. McCLUSKEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: The Agricultural Fairs of Maine are dead against this bill. Now this bill calls for one race commission instead of the existing two, that is, one for harness racing and one for the runners.

As I have said before, I am a trustee in one of these Agricultural Fairs and naturally have the Fairs' best interests in mind when I speak on this bill.

Now earlier in the session the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, made a remark that impressed me very much. He said one of these days a bill or some bills would come along and the sponsors would try to get them through here like greased lightning. Bills that he intimated should be looked over very carefully for hidden intents, and these intents are best known to their sponsors.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe this is one of those bills and that it is also loaded with a little dynamite to help it on its way. There is something in the woodpile here.

As you have already been told, the Agricultural Fairs are interested in the promotion of Agricultural and Homemaking programs, and I would like to add that the great majority of them are non-profit organizations. I would also like to add at this time that the Agricultural Fairs do not care to be involved in the quarrels between the commercial race tracks. We want to hold on to what we have left.

Now in 1949 the Legislature passed a law making it legal to construct and operate running race tracks in this State. At that time the Agricultural fairs which had harness racing were very much concerned and apprehensive that these running races would seriously harm their organizations, and they protested and fought against this legislation, but to no avail.

The fairs realize now that the so-called runners are here to stay, and you, Ladies and Gentlemen, as I said yesterday, by your voting you agreed with that; therefore the Fairs must be ever alert to look out for their own welfare. I also think you will agree that the administration of these two types of races should be kept separate.

It has been said "Why two commissions? A horse race is a horse race. They are all the same," Ladies and Gentlemen, that is not so. It is not any more true than calling all boat races the same. I am sure we realize there is a world of difference between a sailboat race and

a speedboat race, different tactics, different training, different technique, different ability, different handling.

The same is true in citing the difference between the types of horse racing. The length and construction of the tracks are different, the jockeys, the drivers are different, the training is different. What is more, the horses in harness racing move from one track to another about every week. The runners stay at one track. Technique tactics are different. Even the horses are different, and what is most important, the management of the tracks is different. In the case of the runners the tracks are operated by groups solely for commercial purposes and that includes the harness racing at Gorham, whereas the fair officials are entrusted with the operating of fairs for the betterment of agriculture.

Now this bill is a five-page affair. It tears apart the existing law on the statutes with various types of phraseology, it repeals this, replaces that, amends this, adds something here and there. It adds a little icing to the cake. What it really means to do is to put all racing under one commission.

At present there are three members on each commission. The bill takes the salary of these three members, and I notice by an amendment which just came in that it now calls for five members, and just adds it onto the other Race Commission. There isn't any economy in this.

Here is some of the sugar in the icing: Under the title "Assistants" the bill proposes "That it shall be unlawful to appoint to any position any state, county or town official, or employee who receives from the town, county or state more than \$1,000 annually." Members, why is this added? I do not know unless the sponsors have something or someone in mind.

The sponsors have added that any meet running over eight days shall pay the town \$25.00 for each day. This sweetens it up, makes it look good for the towns. Half of the towns work for the Fairs anyway, and the other half rent rooms.

The sponsors have added that "eighty per cent of all the persons employed at the tracks shall have

resided in the State for a period of not less than one year." Now that looks good; that is a little sugar. Everybody is going to get a job and they are going to come from the State, and as I said before, now this amendment comes through calling for five members on this one commission, one of the members shall be connected with the agricultural fairs. That is a little more icing. The fairs don't want it. They don't bite; they are not interested.

Now summing up, I believe that under the bill one commission might be, and could be, so stacked against the fairs that great harm could be done them. The fairs want no part of this and I am sure you don't want it either.

Now just in conclusion I would like to quote from the present law relative to the duties of the present Harness Racing Commission, which commission was created to protect the fairs: "The commission is directed"—now this is emphasized—"directed to assign such dates for holding harness horse races or meets for public exhibition, with pari mutuel pools, as will best serve the interests of the agricultural associations of Maine and may accordingly refuse to issue a permit if the issuance of the permit would, in the opinion of the racing commission, be detrimental to the interests of said agricultural associations or any of them."

I believe that one commission administering the affairs of both runners and harness racing could not and would not best serve the interests of these associations in Maine.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Childs) does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Gowell.

Mr. GOWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill, as you well know, was heard by the Committee on Legal Affairs and was heard several weeks ago.

At the hearing several gentlemen representing the County Fairs appeared in opposition. Several gentlemen interested in running races appeared in opposition, and among the number several gentlemen well known in this House, two of whom

I remember distinctly appeared before the committee; one was the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center who is interested in the county fairs, and the other gentleman who comes from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor, who is interested in the harness racing. They both appeared and registered against it.

It appeared that some states have adopted the one racing system as proposed by Mr. Childs. The State of New Hampshire has very little harness racing; it is mostly running racing and a part-time commission. They have the one racing commission.

In Massachusetts the commission is a full-time commission and salary. They have the running races, the harness races and the dog races. They receive a very large salary, and as it appeared by the figures submitted before the committee, that the proposition of Mr. Childs would not save the State much money, if any, in regard to its operation.

But the principal objection seems to be that both sides, the night racing and the harness racing, would not be happy and so expressed themselves, under one racing commission. Perhaps that is not to be taken too seriously, but I think, if you had heard the objections made by those gentlemen who appeared before our committee, you would take some credence in what they said. They are people that we know, and we know that their statements could be depended on. That is why I presume the other members, signed the minority report and I believed then, as I believe today, that it is not the proper time to pass a bill creating one commission for the State of Maine.

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

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as one of the signers of the "Ought to pass" report, I merely want to be on record as being in favor of this measure. When I first read the bill it made sense to me and it still makes sense, and I personally am fed up with this horse racing business; I am tired of talking about it; and I am sick of being talked to. It

seems to me that it is more of an administrative problem than a legislative one.

This amendment that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, has offered, or will offer, provides for a five-man commission each of whom is to be appointed by the Governor, and that is good enough for me.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center.

Mr. CENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First of all I would like to say that I personally have, you might say, no interest in horse racing of either type. I have seen three running races in the State of Maine in my life, and I have seen three horse races in the last three years, that is trotting races, and I have kept entirely out of the discussion of the merits of running nights or running days, and so forth. I am, however, as I said the other day, vitally interested in the fairs of the State of Maine, and therefore on this bill I cannot refrain from expressing my views.

This bill, as has been pointed out, would set up a commission of three, or with the amendment I see on the desk, five men to administer all of the racing in Maine whether it be harness racing or running racing.

I want to say that all of the fairs in the State, with one exception, are opposed to this bill.

The problems of the two commissions, as I see it, have nothing in common except that people bet on both types of racing. The runners require more supervision than do the harness racers, equipment must be checked before and after each race, jockeys have to be weighted in, urine tests are compulsory after each race, the officiating is conducted under rules entirely different from harness horse racing. Those who are qualified to perform one are not necessarily qualified to perform the other. As pointed out by Mr. McCluskey, harness racing moves from track to track every week or so; running racing is conducted all at one track. Harness racing is intimately associated with the agricultural fairs, and running racing has very little to do with the fairs. Harness racing is a time-honored sport in the State of Maine, and many, many

people, breeders, owners, trainers, drivers and so forth, have complete knowledge of the rules and regulations of the sport and are qualified to serve on the Commission. Running racing is relatively new to Maine and few people know or understand its problems. It would be very difficult to find any individual who is interested in and has knowledge of both.

But the worst feature of all, I think, in this bill, is that it would establish a very powerful Commission of only three or five men which could be extremely dangerous from its political complications. While such a commission would be appointed by the Governor with the approval of the counsel, it might definitely favor one type of racing or the other, and by so doing unconsciously cause ruination of either harness horse racing or running horse racing. One commission cannot and should not perform the work of two. The present running commission has had three years of experience and has done a good job, likewise the harness commission.

In my opinion this bill would accomplish nothing constructive and would not even save money. It would permit discrimination, it would lead to confusion, inefficiency and chaos. In fact, in my opinion it is one of the most asinine and dangerous pieces of legislation that has been introduced into this House during the entire session.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, will not prevail, and when the vote is taken I would ask for a division.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Woodcock.

Mr. **WOODCOCK**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to go on record as favoring the majority opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee. Although I was in favor of the running night races I do not see, in my ignorance perhaps, that they are mutually inconsistent.

I note that the previous speaker expostulated on a fear which he apparently has about the men who would be appointed on this commission if there ever is one; but I for one do not think that it is up

to me to speculate upon whom the Executive might put on this Commission. I think his choices in appointments so far have been excellent and I have no reason to think that he would fall down in his choices on this one commission if such there sometime is. Therefore I hope that the majority opinion of the committee prevails.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. **TAYLOR**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not know how I could add anything more to what Mr. Center has said. He has certainly stated my opinion. I feel that the fairs of the State of Maine are something that we want to go along with and the fairs, almost invariably, want this thing in two commissions. This seems to me the thing to do. I have raced horses on every track in the State of Maine. I have talked to the fair officials since this thing came up, I have talked with the drivers and owners, and they all feel that they will get much better service if they can have two commissions.

I move that this bill and the amendment be indefinitely postponed, and when the vote is taken I request a division.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor, moves that the two reports and bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pownal, Mr. Tuttle.

Mr. **TUTTLE**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can see much merit in the policy of one commission under ordinary circumstances, but it seems to me these are not the ordinary conditions. It is not a question in my mind of whether pari mutuels for harness racing is sound or not. A former Legislature has spoken on that. It is not a question of whether running racing is sound or not. A former Legislature had spoken on that. It is not a question to me of whether the policy of combining the two is reasonable or not. We have been informed that this State is not big enough to support both harness and running races, but this Legislature has spoken on that. With the situa-

tion as it is, as I look at it—and I am not interested from the standpoint of the fairs especially or the running races especially or the harness races, but with the present state of the feeling at this time it seems to me that the only chance for us to get along amicably is to let the two continue, not hand in hand but side by side.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. **CAMPBELL**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am in much the same position as Mr. Center, who spoke a few minutes ago. I am not personally interested in this matter in any way except through the agricultural fairs. It is very evident that the agricultural fairs are opposed to this, as I have had the fairs in my county contact me in regard to it and they have asked me to vote against it.

It is also very evident that things are not altogether harmonious between the runners and the harness racing factions, and I do not see how under one commission it would create any greater amount of harmony. I therefore want to go on record as being opposed to this measure.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Alden.

Mr. **ALDEN**: Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House: Down in my town there is the Gorham Raceway. It is not an agricultural fair. It used to be years ago and it ran very successfully. When it was taken over by the present owner he raced through July and up into August. He has never interfered with the agricultural fairs since he has been racing there. He raced very successfully until he was frozen out two years ago by Scarborough Downs with their running races. I really feel, in regard to this Racing Commission, that most anyone that has a business of a similar nature will run it under one head, and I believe that these two types of racing could be run under one commission and run successfully and there would be less conflict in dates and more satisfaction all around after a short time, after it had been tried out. I certainly

am in favor of the single commission.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Northeast Harbor, Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. **REYNOLDS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At the present time we have two commissions, the harness and the running. Apparently from all reports each one of these commissions is doing an excellent job, and due to the different types of questions that would come up during the meets and so forth, it does not seem very wise to make the change at this time, therefore I am in favor of the continuation of the two commissions.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Archer.

Mr. **ARCHER**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not a member of the Legal Affairs Committee and neither am I particularly interested in horse racing, either the agricultural fairs or the runners or the harness racers; but the other day — yesterday or the day before, I believe it was — we decided that we were going to be fair. We took all of the discrimination out of racing. We allowed runners to race at night. Now that was right; I agreed with that. Now it seems to me that to bring harmony into all the racing and save us from going through this from one Legislature to another, we should bring this all into one commission, thereby solving all the problems at once, rather than having two commissions vieing one against the other. It seems to me that as long as we have the two commissions they are going to be fighting over race dates and you are not going to get any equity anywhere. Therefore I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey.

Mr. **BAILEY**: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As the gentleman who has just been speaking seems to show, one commission would settle and work harmony between two different branches which have been operating in the State.

For the past two sessions, I know that we have had the harness racing and the runners, but I think that the legislation which we have passed so far will go a long way towards clarifying their difficulties. But if under this one bill we should happen to make a mistake and drop what has already been done it certainly would not give us the results which we have been looking for. The fairs have had their commission, they have been operating, and to quite an extent in recent years they have been in cooperation with the runners, and I feel confident that if it is continued for a period of at least two years that harmony will be worked out so that perhaps at a later time it might be policy to work under a one-man commission, but at the present time I should hate very much to do anything in this Legislature that is going to upset all that we have worked out. Therefore, I wish to favor the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First I would like to thank Judge McGlaulin and the House membership for your birthday wishes. I am sure you feel great that you have finally arrived at the voting age.

There have been at this session thirteen bills presented concerning horse racing. I got from the Clerk of the House, from their splendid records, what has happened to these bills insofar as presentation, acceptance of reports, tabling and engrossing. I find that these three pages show that we have handled racing bills 67 times at this session. Bear in mind that the printing of a bill — I am not trying to bore you with figures — the printing of a bill is approximately \$15 a page and engrossment of a bill is approximately \$9.05 a page and the tabling of a bill is \$1.35 each day that it is on the table. So you can well imagine what the price tag is there.

Now I recall two years ago, as a member of the Budget Committee, submitting to both commissions the thought of one commission. The objection came from the run-

ners; no objection from the trotters.

I think you will all agree that there has not been one session where the gavel has pounded for adjournment when at the same time the proponents or opponents of a piece of racing legislation have not been sitting outside the Governor's office, wondering whether or not this or that bill would be vetoed.

My major interest is unity. It has worked out apparently in other states. I find myself in the position of coming from a county that has a fair, we think it is a good fair, and the people involved in that are for this bill. I am also mindful of the fact that at one time the owner of the fair was, and I say that in fairness, a part-owner of Scarborough Downs. I find myself also in the position of being friendly with both groups. Again I repeat, that I have been lobbied pro and con. Again I repeat, I welcome lobbyists. They are helpful. They have a right to lobby us, as we have a right and I have a right also sometimes to lobby you. I am thoroughly convinced that this could be the solution to the problem, where it would have members of the majority and the minority parties and a member from the agricultural fairs. I feel as I did two years ago, after talking to owners of race tracks from other states, that it has proven to be a solution in those states. For that reason, I am for the bill and the amendment.

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

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have been hearing the last half hour a good deal about harmony. Let us suppose a case, if this bill should pass and the amendment should pass. Presumably, the five appointees might be divided like this: two members of those who favor harness racing, two members who favor running races and one member, a small majority, representing the county fairs. I cannot believe that that would result in any greater harmony.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Warren, Mr. McCluskey.

Mr. McCLUSKEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I believe the fair that Mr. Jalbert is talking about is the Lewiston Fair which I think, and I can be corrected, is a privately owned fair, by either one man or a corporation; it is not strictly an agricultural fair. And also that what is good in other states isn't necessarily good in this State, but Mr. Childs forgot to remind you that in New York, Kentucky and Illinois, where they have a lot of racing, they have two commissions.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I dislike rising again but I certainly have to rebut some of these arguments which have been presented by the fair associations. Mr. McCluskey stood up and the first thing he said was "Let's look over the bill; it is full of dynamite." Yet he could find nothing in it that that was wrong and he certainly didn't mention it. He said the fair associations do not want to be involved between two tracks. Well, just what have they been doing all along? Who supported the night racing—the fair associations? I certainly think they are involved there.

He also said that it was a different type of racing. We got up the other day and we argued the question of whether Scarborough Downs should operate nights or not. The very opponents of this bill said "Well, it is all the same, so why shouldn't we both be able to go nights?"

And then he quoted and said there are about eighty per cent to be employed from Maine. And he mentioned about officers of towns who couldn't be employed at race tracks, and I put that in the bill. The only reason why I put that in the bill is it is in the law now.

Also he said it is possible for the commission to be stacked against the fairs. The only thing I can say to that is that I believe he has no confidence in the Governor and the Council. I am quite sure that the Governor and Council can appoint capable men and competent men who will not be biased one way or another. I can look around me here and see probably a hun-

dred and fifty members who could be on this one commission and certainly be fair about it.

A big majority of the commission should know all the details of racing; a commission is to enforce rules and regulations and allocate dates; they appoint men who are called stewards to go along with the mechanics of racing.

Representative Gowell says the running racers at Scarborough Downs are opposed to it. Of course they are opposed to it. Why shouldn't they be opposed to it? Now they have the opportunity to have the monopoly. It would be fine to have the monopoly in the State of Maine, especially the running racing monopoly. I say that we should let them both run, have harmony, so that they can all go. There is still an investment at Gorham Race Track of over half a million dollars. Should that go down the drain? I believe it shouldn't.

Representative Center said if we had two commissions it would lead to chaos. What do you think is going to happen in the next few years, if we have one commission and it leads to chaos, what is going to happen in the next few years if we have two commissions? There will not only be chaos; there will be chaos and turmoil; they will be fighting each other like dogs, and in the end one of them will win out and there will be a monopoly.

Representative Campbell said this wasn't any ordinary condition and I certainly agree with him; it isn't an ordinary condition. That is exactly why we need one commission, to see that there is supervision.

Representative Reynolds says that both commissions are doing an excellent job. What excellent job are they doing? In 1950 the commissions refused to get together and to both allocate a date; they run in conflict with each other only ten miles apart. I certainly don't think they are doing a good job to allow that to happen.

Representative Bailey said that if we went along, eventually harmony would be worked out. Possibly it would be worked out but we have the chance to work it out right now by appointing one commission to see that they both make a living.

I certainly hope that the motion for indefinite postponement does not prevail.

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

Mr. HUSSEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I merely want to state that most all the Fairs are opposed to this one racing commission and I believe most of the small harness horse owners are also opposed. I am in favor of indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief. I have not spoken in regard to any of these other racing bills. I hesitate to speak regarding this bill because of the points brought out or the interests involved.

I do not wish to concern myself with the interests, any of the interests, involved, but I certainly feel that this measure has a great deal of merit. I am sorry that it has been lobbied to such an extent by both the proponents and the opponents. I wish that we could have faced this bill strictly on the merits, and I hope that the members of this House will consider this bill on the merits.

I think this measure goes to the root of the racing problem that exists at this time, and that this one commission plan will eliminate most of the problems that have existed and the new problems that have been created by the night racing bill.

As the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, pointed out the other day, when he was discussing his bill on the issuance of racing licenses, these tracks cannot operate efficiently as long as there are conflicting schedules. We passed Mr. Center's bill as a step toward avoiding these conflicting schedules, but actually the only means of avoiding all conflicting schedules is by this one racing commission.

I sincerely believe that the argument that one commission might favor either harness racing or running racing is totally without merit. We have now, under the harness racing commission, fairs and these

long harness meets. I have never heard either the fair people or the people who operate these harness meets complain that each side has not been treated fairly regarding their dates. I think it is absurd to have one commission to supervise one running race track. I think it is absurd to argue that there might be this favoritism. I think it would be just as logical to argue that we should have one commission to supervise the operations of each liquor company or one Banking Commission for Trust Companies and one Banking Commission for Savings Banks or one Public Utilities Commission for Water companies, one for Sewer companies, one for Telephone companies and one for Power companies. It is the same principle involved.

I regretted that the fairs have taken the attitude they have upon this thing because, as I have listened to the arguments, I have not heard one concrete argument for their opposition. It was pointed out that there was something in the woodpile but there wasn't even an attempt to point out what might be in the woodpile.

It was pointed out by the gentleman from Warren, Mr. McCluskey, that this bill had a great deal of merit, and I don't understand his reason for claiming that each point that had merit was simply sugarcoated. I think this bill has a lot of sugarcoating; I think it is all sugarcoating in that it is all for the benefit, not only for the fairs, the runners or the other tracks, but for the people of Maine.

I think this problem goes beyond the interests of the fairs or beyond the interests of the runners or any other harness meet. This is a problem that directly affects the entire State of Maine, and certainly if we are ever going to solve this problem it is going to be by this one commission. All of these other states have found, twenty-four out of twenty-eight, from experience, that the way to handle this matter is through one commission. They have found that is the only way they can avoid these conflicting schedules, the only way they can properly regulate all racing, the only way they can insure that each track is treated fairly and avoid

these conflicting schedules. It seems to me that we could profit by that experience and it seems to me that this is the only way that we can have each track treated fairly and the only way they can operate efficiently and thereby insure greater revenue to the State of Maine, and I think perhaps one of the most important elements of all is that it will insure that in the next Legislature we will not have the hopper full of these racing bills.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Kennebunkport, Mrs. Downing.

Mrs. **DOWNING**: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as favoring the two commissions.

I move the previous question and ask that when the vote is taken it be by division.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentlewoman from North Kennebunkport, Mrs. Downing, moves the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question it requires the consent of one-third of the members present.

All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will rise and stand in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The **SPEAKER**: Obviously more than one-third of the members present having arisen, the motion for the previous question is entertained.

The question before the House now is: Shall the main question be put now? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor, that both reports and Bill "An Act Creating a Racing Commission", H. P. 1188, L. D. 1337, be indefinitely postponed. The same gentleman requests a division.

As many as are in favor of the indefinite postponement of both reports and bill on the motion of the gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor, 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.

The **SPEAKER**: Eighty-one having voted in the affirmative - - -

For what purpose does the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, seek recognition?

Mr. **CHILDS**: Mr. Speaker, I rise to request a vote by the yeas and nays.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, is in order. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, requests a roll call by the yeas and nays. All those who desire that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays will stand and remain in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count. The consent of one-fifth of those present is necessary.

An insufficient number arose.

The **SPEAKER**: Less than one-fifth of the members present having arisen, the yeas and nays are not ordered.

The Chair is about to announce the vote on a division on the motion of the gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor, to indefinitely postpone both reports and bill.

Eighty-one having voted in the affirmative and forty-four having voted in the negative, the two reports with accompanying papers were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair now lays before the House the tenth item of Unfinished Business, House Divided Report, Majority Report "Ought to pass" and Minority Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Membership of State Harness Racing Commission" (H. P. 663) (L. D. 706) tabled on May 5 by the gentleman from New Limerick, Mr. Hand, pending the motion of the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, to accept the majority report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center.

Mr. **CENTER**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Just to prove that all along the line I am most sincere about the agricultural fairs of the State of Maine, I intro-

duced this measure into this Legislature so that the agricultural fairs might have a little fuller representation on the Harness Commission. This is simply one of those bills designed to protect and help the agricultural fairs.

As I pointed out the other day, the chief reason why pari mutuel betting was authorized in Maine was to assist the fairs and it has done so materially. The problems of fairs, however, are many and varied, and harness racing is only one of the many attractions. The educational value of the fairs is to be found in other departments, cattle, sheep, 4-H activities, Grange exhibits, and everything pertaining to rural and agricultural life.

Now this bill will not tie down the Governor's hands or embarrass him in any way, but will serve only as a guide. It will insure that at least one member of the Commission knows, understands and appreciates the problems of the agricultural fairs, and will serve to tie in the harness racing activities with the other activities of the fairs. It is broad enough so that the commission will be picked from a list of over 2500 eligible people, and yet would be a safeguard to protect the agricultural interests of the fairs.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, on the one racing commission I proposed to put one man from the fair association on it. At that time there would be five members on the commission and the one from the fair association could not have too much influence. Now they are proposing one member of the fair association to be on the Harness Commission when only three members are there. Here they are attempting to put a particular member on the Commission from one fair association who has a direct and pecuniary interest in what is going on. He is a man who cannot help but be prejudiced, so it would be to the detriment of harness racing, there is no question about that. This makes about as much sense to me as putting one of the executives from the telephone company upon the Public Utilities

Commission or putting Herman Sahagian on the Liquor Commission.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, that the majority "Ought to pass" report be accepted.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can see no harm in this bill and I want to go on record as in favor of it and I ask that when the vote is taken it be taken by division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norridgewock, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very much in favor of this bill. I hope that Mr. Center's bill will receive passage.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center that the Majority "Ought to pass" report of the Committee on Legal Affairs be accepted. The gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Edwards, has requested a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" report 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.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-eight having voted in the affirmative and fifteen in the negative the motion to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report prevails.

Thereupon the Bill was given its two several readings and was assigned for third reading at 1:30 p.m., E.S.T. today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the twelfth item of Unfinished Business, Senate Report "Ought to pass" in new draft, Senate Paper 583, Legislative Document 1523, under title of Bill "An Act relating to Officers and Employees of the Legislature," on Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of Officers of the Legislature," Senate Paper 160, Legislative Document 433, tabled on May 5 by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, pending acceptance of the

report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Jacobs of Auburn, the "Ought to Pass" in new draft report was accepted in concurrence and the new draft was given its two several readings.

The same gentleman then offered House Amendment "A" and moved it's adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 583, L. D. 1523, Bill "An Act Relating to Officers and Employees of the Legislature."

Amend said Bill by striking out of the title the words "and Employees"

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of section 3 and inserting in place thereof the following 3 sections:

"Sec. 3. R. S., c. 9, §7, amended. The last sentence of the 1st paragraph of section 7 of chapter 9 of the revised statutes, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

'He shall receive a salary of \$3,000 \$4,500 in full for all official services by him performed during the regular session of the legislature and for such additional services provided for in this section.'

Sec. 4. R. S., c. 9, §7, amended. The 2nd paragraph of section 7 of chapter 9 of the revised statutes, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"The assistant clerk of the house shall receive a salary of \$1,500 \$2,400; his work shall be performed under the direction of the clerk.'

Sec. 5. R. S., c. 9, §7-A, additional. Chapter 9 of the revised statutes, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding thereto a new section, to be numbered 7-A, to read as follows:

'Sec. 7-A. Non-legislative year salaries. Any officer of the legislature whose salary is fixed by sections 4 and 7 who shall become eligible for retirement under the provisions of the Maine State Retirement System shall receive, during the year that the legislature is not in regular session, a salary equivalent to the amount he would receive were he to retire.'

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, seek recognition?

Mr. McGLAUFFIN: This is on the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, that House Amendment "A" be adopted.

Mr. McGLAUFFIN: I can simply say, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that I have been informed by a man who knows very much more about it than I do that this should definitely be defeated.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, that House Amendment "A" be adopted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Thereupon House Amendment "A" was adopted in non-concurrence, and the Bill was assigned for third reading at 1.30 P. M., E. S. T. today.

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Legislative Document 318 is in possession of the House?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the matter has been recalled and is in possession of the House.

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider our action whereby we passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "B", L. D. 318, and that we then reconsider adoption of Senate Amendment "B" and then indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "B" and then I will offer House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, may I speak to that barrel of motions?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will attempt to clear the motions and then the gentleman may speak.

The Chair understands the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it passed to be engrossed Bill "An Act relating to Duties of Court Stenographers", Senate Paper 104, Legislative Document 318, as amended by Senate

Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "B"; and that the gentleman moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendment "B", and further moves to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "B" and then reconsider adoption of Senate Amendment "A" and the gentleman will then offer House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A".

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, all this problem is caused by an error in the amendment of the bill. Changing the word "shall" to the word "may" was made with respect to the original bill rather than to the amendment and this is to correct that error. Mr. Speaker, this is Bill "An Act relating to Duties of Court Stenographers."

The SPEAKER: The House has heard the motions stated once. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "B"; and to reconsider its action whereby Senate Amendment "B" was adopted and Senate Amendment "B" was then indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence; and further to reconsider its action whereby Senate Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to Senate Amendment "A" to S. P. 104, L. D. 318, Bill "An Act Relating to Duties of Court Stenographers."

Amend said Amendment by striking out the underlined word "shall" in the 1st sentence of the last paragraph thereof and inserting in place thereof the underlined word "may"

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Trafton of Auburn, House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in non-concurrence. Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was adopted.

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

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, desire recognition?

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that unless previous notice is given to the Clerk of the House of intention to move reconsideration the Clerk be authorized to send to the Engrossing Department forthwith after action by the House all matters passed to be engrossed during today's session and to send to the Senate all matters acted upon during today's session that require Senate consent one hour after the completion of the House action, and after such matters have been sent forward by the Clerk no motion to reconsider shall be in order.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the unanimous consent request by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller?

The Chair hears no objection and it is so ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the tabled and unassigned matter printed on page 6 of today's calendar, House Joint Order (H. P. 1300) recalling from the office of the Governor "An Act relating to Application of Plumbing Laws", House Paper 1276, Legislative Document 1512, tabled on May 6 by the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey, pending further consideration; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish to thank you at this time for the permission you gave me yesterday to table this bill. There was some misunderstanding here in the House in regard to that matter, on which, as you will remember, the order was given to recall this bill from the Governor's desk. In the Senate it was indefinitely postponed. We have found since that the Governor has signed this bill as reported to us. Therefore, it is beyond our reach.

I now move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite

postponement of the order. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

On motion of Mr. Fuller of South Portland, the House recessed until 1:30 P.M., E.S.T.

After Recess—1:30 P.M., E.S.T.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The hour of 1:30 Eastern Standard Time having arrived, the Chair lays before the House the matters assigned for third reading this afternoon from this morning's session.

The Chair wishes to announce that the matters assigned for third reading have not yet been reviewed by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading. The House will take those up in short order.

The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, moves that the rules be suspended at this time so that papers from the Senate may be taken up. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules.

**Papers from the Senate
Senate Report of Committee
Ought to Pass**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs under authority of Joint Order (S. P. 599) reporting a Resolve (S. P. 609) (L. D. 1553) under title of Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Reconditioning Buildings at the Maine Vocational-Technical Institute and that it "Ought to pass"

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

In the House: Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Resolve was read once and assigned for second reading at 4:00 P.M. this afternoon Eastern Standard Time.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Creating a State Crime Commission" (S. P. 521) (L. D. 1422) which was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A", and asking for a Committee of Conference with the following conferees appointed on its part:

Messrs. CHAPMAN of Cumberland
REID of Kennebec
CARTER of Oxford

In the House:

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Martin, moves that the House recede and concur. As many as are in favor —

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland. Mr. McGlaufflin.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have forgotten whether this comes first, Mr. Speaker, but I move that we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, moves that the House adhere.

The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Martin, that the House recede and concur.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Martin, that the House recede and concur will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, that the House adhere.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, that the House adhere, will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the House voted to adhere.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Bookmobile Service (H. P. 2) (L. D. 2) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord.

Mrs. LORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its former action and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord, moves that the House insist on its former action and ask for a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: During the noon hour I heard a great deal of comment concerning the action of the other branch. I think that every member of this body wants to be fair, and have been fair. It is true there are a great many projects that are very worthy that are being indefinitely postponed. We did not have what we have had in the past, a special calendar, but even though we had had a special calendar, it must be remembered that the other branch is the last word and from there it goes to the Governor's office, and then if we feel, and it is easily understandable that we would feel that way if one of our own measures would be indefinitely postponed according to the schedule, we must also be fair and remember that many, many times we have said "Let's pass it here" and they will kill it over on the other side anyway.

I was one of the movers myself—I think I can honestly state this and I think the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord, would certainly agree with me, that I was the one who suggested to her that she go to the leaders, so-called, and ask that the Bookmobile measure be recommended. It had come out of committee "Ought not to pass." This time it came out of committee "Ought to pass" with a nine to one vote. I feel as strongly for the measure as Mrs. Lord does; I know it is a project that is very close and dear to her, but funds are not available. It is very obvious there will not be extra revenue to make it possible for these measures to be

passed, and if there were some measure for extra revenue I would be the first one to get up and vote for it.

I feel very definitely that a Committee will only serve one purpose and that is to kill some valuable time, and regretfully I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low.

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very strongly in favor of a Committee of Conference, if for only one reason: To show that we believe in the Bookmobile and many other things which are being decided in the other branch. I would like it on the record that this House believes in those things and that we are very sorry that we have abdicated all the power we had to decide which ones go through. That has been taken over largely by one man in the other branch and we seem to be powerless to do anything about it, but I would like this House to be on record, and I hope the newspapers take some note of it, in favor of some of the good things that are arbitrarily being turned down without our having anything whatever to say about it.

I hope that the motion to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference carries. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center.

Mr. CENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to concur with the remarks that have just been made by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low. Yesterday afternoon I think we spent about an hour of our time very seriously considering and debating a Joint Order whereby we hoped to have, through two committees in this Joint Order, discuss this whole problem of necessary finances and the bills, special L. D.'s that we felt really should have passage and those that might be postponed.

The other branch saw fit not to go along with that Order, but instead simply to make up their mind

that all the L. D.'s, or practically all of them, would go by the board.

I thoroughly concur in what the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, has said, and in the fact that this body should have something to say about these special L. D.'s at this stage of the game, and I hope that this body will send back these matters in non-concurrence and thereby go on record as having been in favor of these special L. D.'s that we really believe in, and if the other branch is going to turn them down, let the other branch take the responsibility before the public.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House recede and concur. As many as are in favor of that motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord, that the House insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference. As many as are in favor of that motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on House Paper 2, Legislative Document 2, Bill "An Act relating to Bookmobile Service", the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: The gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Roundy, and the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is informed that the next matter on Supplementary Calendar No. 1 is to be passed over as it has been recalled.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Bosworth Memorial Association (H. P. 23) (L. D. 18) which was finally passed in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. BERRY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we insist and request a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Berry, moves that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Based purely on principle, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur.

The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in indefinite postponement. As many as are in favor of that motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Berry, that the House insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Education in Unorganized Territory (S. P. 448) (L. D. 1262) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There are children in this State of Maine where we are supposed to have equalized opportunity for education who have to travel eighty miles a day in order to go to school. That costs those children \$3.50 a week which they have to pay for themselves, and a lot of them cannot do it and they don't get education. That is equalized educational opportunities.

We are expected to concur in this matter when we ought to be able to decide on the priority of the following items which could pay for it: One is "An Act Exempting Ships Stores from Maine Sales Tax" for \$6,000; "An Act to Provide a Credit against the Sales Tax when the Price is not Paid", \$5,000; "An Act Relating to Stamp Discounts on Cigar and Tobacco Products," \$24,000; "An Act Exempting Certain Educational Institutions from the Sales Tax" — that is just three colleges; "An Act to Amend the Sales Tax Relative to Packaging and Shipping Materials," \$5,000; the colleges were \$20,000.

We had no opportunity, ladies and gentlemen, to decide whether it is more important to educate children in unorganized territory or to leave the tax exemption on as they have been taxed.

I don't think it is right. I move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, moves that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, pertaining to this measure, this would encourage towns going into the unorganized field. They would say "If we are unorganized, they will carry our children to school and they will build our schools and they will subsidize one hundred per cent."

If that argument is not good enough, based again on principle, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of Senate Paper 448, Legislative Document 1262, Bill "An Act relating to Education in Unorganized Territory." As many as are in favor of that motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, that the House in-

sist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House? The motion prevailed.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature, on Bill "An Act relating to Evidence of Intoxication" (H. P. 422) (L. D. 469) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

Messrs. TRAFTON of Auburn
STEWART of Portland
FULLER of Bangor
—Committee on part of House
WARD of Penobscot
BROGGI of York
HARDING of Knox
—Committee on part of Senate
Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Senate Papers (Cont'd) Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Joseph A. DiDonato (H. P. 641) (L. D. 1331) which was finally passed in the House on March 25.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist on our former action and appoint a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, moves that the House insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the resolve. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, to recede and concur with the Senate will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that the House insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of the Town of Liberty (H. P. 637) (L. D. 1356) which was finally passed in the House on April 8.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. COLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I realize this is taking time, but I am entirely in agreement with the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, and also the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center.

I realize that it is the prerogative of the other branch to do as they see fit, but some of these measures, like the Nursing Attendant bill and the Bookmobile and a great many others—the Elderly Teachers' which have been cut down—I believe this House has gone on record as favoring increased taxation to cover some of these most urgent resolves.

It certainly gripes me to see several members of the Senate, and some special committees, run this Legislature. I am certainly not in accord with their methods that they are using, therefore I move that we insist on our former action and that a Committee of Conference be appointed. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole, moves that the House insist and request a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House; On this one, if my memory serves me correctly, the gentleman who just spoke went along with the unanimous "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. The action of the other branch is certainly justified

by a Joint Rule. You are certainly justified in calling for Committees of Conference. And certainly I know of no other member of the Appropriations Committee that I have enjoyed serving with any more than I have the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole. And we have tossed around compliments and bouquets about this one and that one being a fine fellow, but I will say about "Bill Cole" he is a fine fellow.

Based on principle, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair requests the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, to approach the rostrum.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The bill came from the Claims Committee. Mr. Cole has bailed out on principle, and based on principle, I still move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It certainly looks to me as though this was open season on the other end of the corridor. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, and with the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, that I don't like to be pushed around any more than anyone else, but I think, in our enthusiasm to show our independence, we are being just a little bit childish. If you feel as though you want to slap the wrists of the gentlemen at the other end of the corridor, you can still do it and save your face and save the time of the people who have to sit here until ten o'clock at night, making up those calendars, reporting the Committees of Conference, etcetera.

If I am mistaken, I stand to be corrected, but if we should vote to adhere, we are indicating to the other body that we do not approve of their action, that we, in effect, not literally but figuratively, insist that we are right, but you will certainly avoid all of this Tomfoolery of asking for a Committee of Con-

ference when you know perfectly well that you are simply going to antagonize those people and you won't get what you are after; you will still get turned down.

Now you can say "That is what we want to do. We want to slap them down." But just let me leave this thought in your mind: Somewhere the next day or two there may be a bill that you seriously and honestly want to compromise on, and if you spend the rest of your time antagonizing them automatically on every bill, Lord help you when you come to that bill on which you seriously want a Committee of Conference, to try and reach a compromise.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sure, in my voting, that I am not voting any Tomfoolery. I voted in every instance for a Committee of Conference, and I am deadly serious.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in indefinite postponement of Resolve in favor of the Town of Liberty, House Paper 637, Legislative Document 1356. As many as are in favor of that motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole, that the House insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, may I approach the rostrum?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may.

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

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have reason for making this motion, I now move that we reconsider our

action to adhere on Bill "An Act Creating a State Crime Commission" and move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it voted to adhere to its former action in regard to Bill "An Act Creating a State Crime Commission" Senate Paper 521, Legislative Document 1422. Is this the pleasure of the House? As many as are in favor will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

On further motion of the same gentleman the House voted to insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Senate Paper 521, Legislative Document 1422, Bill "An Act Creating a State Crime Commission," the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, and the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Eastern Maine General Hospital of Bangor (H. P. 634) (L. D. 656) which was finally passed in the House on April 8.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. POTTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This resolve was referred to the Claims Committee. The Claims Committee spent a great deal of time and effort studying it. It came out, after a considerable amount of study, and some travel expense to the State, not too much, as "Ought to pass" and I ask that the House insist on its former action and that a Committee of Conference be appointed.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I will try another wrinkle and we can keep on tottering. This resolve is in favor of the Eastern Maine General Hospital. I wonder if you would try this for size. Certainly, the Eastern Maine General Hospital can take care of this small item when they are going to get part of the million dollars that we are giving to the Hospital Aid program. I move we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of Resolve in Favor of Eastern Maine General Hospital of Bangor, House Paper 634, Legislative Document 656. As many as are in favor of that motion will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Medway, Mr. Potter, that the House insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve to Reimburse the City of South Portland for Support of Margaret Dawson (S. P. 243) (L. D. 669) which was finally passed in the House on March 25.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I think this is one bill that we can recede and concur on. I would like to be corrected if I am wrong. Possibly some member of the Claims Committee can put us straight on this.

As I understand it, this is an old lady who had a dowry and she had a helper and the helper stole all her money and she was taken off from Old Age Assistance, but some member of the other branch told me that everything had all been fixed up now and she was going back on Old Age Assistance.

I would like to ask through the Chair of some member of the Claims

Committee if that is not correct, and if it is, I would like to move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, requests information through the Chair from any member of the Committee on Claims.

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

Mr. POTTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Mr. Fuller was entirely correct in his statement, and inasmuch as this was a Senate bill, I think we should concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, moves that the House recede and concur. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole, desire recognition?

Mr. COLE: I would like permission to approach the rostrum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may.

From the Senate: The following Communications:

STATE OF MAINE SENATE CHAMBER

May 7, 1953

Hon. Harvey R. Pease
Clerk of the House of Representatives
96th Legislature
Sir:

The President of the Senate has today appointed the following conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on the following matters:

Resolve in favor of the Several Academies, Institutes and Seminaries (H. P. 1244) (L. D. 1446)
Senators:

HASKELL of Penobscot
COLLINS of Aroostook
WARD of Penobscot

Resolve in favor of the Town of Garland (H. P. 1038) (L. D. 1182)
Senators:

COLLINS of Aroostook

HASKELL of Penobscot
SINCLAIR of Somerset

Respectfully

(Signed) Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate

STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER

May 7, 1953

Hon. Harvey R. Pease
Clerk of the House of Representa-
tives
96th Legislature
Sir:

The President of the Senate has today appointed the following conferees on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on the following:

Resolve, Authorizing Alfred How-
ard, Sr. and Ethel M. Howard of
Bingham to Sue the State of Maine
(H. P. 1171) (L. D. 1326)

Senators:

WARD of Penobscot
ROBBINS of Aroostook
GREELEY of Waldo

Respectfully,

(Signed) Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate

The Communications were read
and ordered placed on file.

The SPEAKER: These matters
having been assigned at 2:30 P. M.
Daylight Saving Time, the Chair
now brings before the House Bills
and Resolves reported by the Com-
mittee on Bills in the Third Read-
ing and on their passage to be en-
grossed.

Passed to Be Engrossed
Amended Bill

Bill "An Act to Create the Water-
ville Parking District" (S. P. 307)
(L. D. 925)

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

Tabled

Bill "An Act relating to Maine
Soldiers and Sailors in the War with
Spain" (H. P. 398) (L. D. 452)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-
nizes the gentleman from Auburn,
Mr. Trafton.

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker and
Members of the House: This bill
was incorporated as an amend-
ment on the Bonus Bill, the fate
of which has not been decided.
So that it might have an independ-
ent hearing if the Bonus Bill should
fail I move it be tabled at this time.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman
from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, moves
that this bill lie on the table pend-
ing third reading. Is this the
pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the Bill
was so tabled.

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Adminis-
tration of the Highway Com-
mission" (S. P. 598) (L. D. 1544)

Was reported by the Committee
on Bills in the Third Reading, read
the third time, passed to be en-
grossed as amended by Senate
Amendment "B" as amended by
House Amendment "A" thereto in
non-concurrence and sent up for
concurrence.

Resolve Providing for State
Pension for Clyde Spaulding of
Hartland (H. P. 128)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Mem-
bership of State Harness Racing
Commission" (H. P. 663) (L. D. 706)

Was reported by the Committee
on Bills in the Third Reading, read
the third time, passed to be en-
grossed and sent to the Senate.

Amended Bill

Bill "An Act relating to Officers
of the Legislature" (S. P. 583) (L.
D. 1523)

Was reported by the Committee
on Bills in the Third Reading, read
the third time, passed to be en-
grossed as amended by House
Amendment "A" in non-concur-
rence and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-
nizes the gentleman from Strong,
Mr. Dodge.

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have consideration at this time to recall a matter which appears at the end of today's calendar, being House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act to Change the Deer Hunting Season," House Paper 915, Legislative Document 1016, which was recalled to the House by Joint Order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dodge, moves that the recalled matter printed on Page 6 be taken up at this time. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, I move you that under suspension of the rules we reconsider our action whereby the "Ought not to pass" report was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dodge, moves that under suspension of the rules the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Moose River Plantation, Mr. Watson.

Mr. WATSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I, with reluctance, must go against my good friend, the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dodge, and I hope that his motion does not carry. On account of the lateness of the session—we are almost in the closing hours of the session—and I know what his purpose is; it is to offer an amendment to change the hunting season on deer in Franklin County.

Now the original bill, which has been recalled to the House, asked to have the season changed in five counties.

We held a public hearing on that and we could find no support, or I might say a very scattered support, to have it changed in any county in the northern part of the State. We therefore passed the bill out "Ought not to pass."

That was several months ago, I think, or several weeks ago. Of course the opponents of this change knew that we had passed it out "Ought not to pass" and that the

House and the other branch had accepted that report, and I feel at this late date it would not be fair to the opponents of this change in the season to bring it up now and have just one county put in. I don't think that would be fair to the people and I don't think it would be fair to the State, and I hope that the motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Dodge, that the rules be suspended and that the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

For purposes of clarification the Chair will state that this requires a two-thirds vote. As many as are in favor of reconsideration of the action whereby the House accepted the "Ought not to pass" report will kindly rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

The SPEAKER: Obviously less than two-thirds —

The Chair will again state: As many as are in favor of the reconsideration of the action whereby the House accepted the "Ought not to pass" report 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.

Two having voted in the affirmative and fifty-three having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, out of order and under suspension of the rules, I ask unanimous consent to address the House briefly.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the request of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, for unanimous consent to address the House? The Chair hears no objection and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House: This morning there was presented from the upper branch a resolve in favor of Florence Watson of Richmond. Because of conditions beyond

my control, I was not here at that moment and I think if I had been and had explained it to you as I will now, that you would have thought differently about it.

I have known Miss Watson for years and the Watson family. Miss Watson taught school for seventeen years in the State of Maine. She lacked about three or four months of being eligible for a pension when she was stricken with arthritis. Since 1932, she has been bedridden. This family of Watsons, Seth Watson was her father, was a very substantial family in the town of Richmond. I would like to say that Seth Watson was a man who was much interested in government and governmental affairs and when he died about a year ago, he had the distinction of having been the oldest member and had the most consecutive attendances at the Republican State Convention in Maine, I think it was something like forty conventions he had attended consecutively. He did this because he was a good, substantial citizen and, if politics had been the other way, he would have been just as good and substantial and would have been just as good in regard to that party.

Now, they did, of course, spend the most of their fortune in trying to find relief for this bedridden girl. They took her all over the country to the different hospitals and had specialists until they were reduced to very severe circumstances. Yet, they never did call on anyone for aid. Now that Seth has gone and she and her mother are the only ones who are left in the home and her mother must be near eighty years old, as I call there three or four times a year to see her because of her condition as a great many other people do in surrounding towns.

Now, if this is cleared by the Education Department, if this receives favorable treatment here, there is no price tag on it. It only says that she would be eligible for pension under the existing laws of our State which makes eighteen years, of which she lacked a few months of having. It has been cleared with the Judiciary Committee, everyone seems to be in favor of it. So I ask at this time

unanimous consent to present this resolve.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, presents a resolve under the unanimous consent rule. The Clerk will read the title.

The CLERK: Resolve in favor of Florence Watson of Richmond.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the receiving of this resolve under the unanimous consent rule without reference to a committee and without being printed.

The Chair hears objection and the resolve is not received.

The gentleman from Wales, Mr. Scott, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In Androscoggin County, there is a pond which is approximately three and a half miles long and about a mile wide called Sabattus Pond. It is bounded by the towns of Greene, Webster and Wales. On the shore of the pond are roughly about 350 to 400 cottages. On the north and northwestern shore of this pond there are miles of trees and bushes extending into the pond. On account of high water and wind about two weeks ago today a section broke off creating a so-called floating island, which island drifted near and grounded in the cottage section. The so-called island is about $\frac{1}{4}$ of an acre and obstructs the view of the cottage residents and it not only obstructs the view but I understand that there are a lot of snakes on that island also and there are a lot of women and children, of course, there in the summer; they come clear from New York.

As this island is grounded on a rock ledge in the pond, and if another strong wind should move it it is liable to go down the pond and hit the dam in the town of Webster. This dam controls the water flow in Sabattus River, which water is used for production in the Webster Rubber Company, the Dana Woolen Mills, of course that is closed now because it is under receivership but it is expected to be reopened, in the town of Webster, the Farnsworth Woolen Mills in Lisbon Cen-

ter and the Bonafide Mills in Lisbon. These mills have got to have this water for production. The island, on this resolve there is a money tag of \$200 to be expended by the Forestry Department, and they can loosen that underneath with either a couple of sticks of dynamite or something and float it back on the water and take it back up to the northwestern section of the pond and anchor it and the Forestry Department would handle it. I have talked with them.

I have this resolve here which I would like to present for your consideration with the price tag, as I said, of \$200 to be expended by the Forestry Commission to remove that island.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to have unanimous consent to introduce this resolve.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inquire of the gentleman whether the matter is a resolve or a bill.

Mr. SCOTT: A bill, Mr. Speaker. I beg your pardon.

The SPEAKER: The Chair thanks the gentleman. Under the unanimous consent rule the gentleman from Wales, Mr. Scott, presents a bill. The Clerk will read the title.

The CLERK: Bill "An Act to Remove Floating Island in Sabattus Pond in Androscoggin County."

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the receiving of this bill under the unanimous consent rule without reference to a committee and without being printed? The Chair hears objection and the bill is not received.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time lays before the House the ninth item of Unfinished Business, which is on page 5 of this morning's journal, which was retabled until later in today's session by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, House Order relative to Simplified Manual of Legislative Procedure to be prepared by the Department of Government of the University of Maine, tabled on May 5 by the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree, pending reproduction and passage.

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

Mr. ALBERT: Mr Speaker and Members of the House. I have talked this matter over with the sponsor of the order and after discussing it with him and several other members of the House, we have prepared another order that is very similar only that the booklet will be prepared by the Clerk of the House, which, I think, is the way it should be, so I move that the order now on the table be indefinitely postponed for the purpose of introducing this other order that I have prepared.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, moves that the House Order presented by the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, did talk this matter over with me but I object to and oppose the indefinite postponement of my order.

Let me make it very clear that the only reason I presented this order to this Legislature was to accomplish my objective. That objective was to have prepared a simplified manual to assist and help the newly elected members of the next Legislature. As Mr. Albert has said, he proposes the introduction of a new order, the only change to be that the Clerk of the House shall be directed to prepare the manual instead of the Department of Government of the University of Maine as my order now before you calls for.

I regret very much the unnecessary debate on this matter and I will not become involved in a clash of personalities. I think you all know what has caused this trouble. I knew it before I sat down the other day. I want to ask you what you would have done if you were in my place and wanted to accomplish this objective. Now this is what I have done.

In the last session of the Legislature I introduced this order and it was approved by that body, unanimously, and this is the order I introduced at the last session: "ORDERED, that the Clerk of the House be requested to prepare a

simplified manual of legislative procedure adapted to the use of newly-elected members and investigate the advisability of inaugurating a series of instructional meetings at the opening of the next regular session." That order was accepted and approved.

Yet, the objective was not obtained; the manual was not prepared for the reasons that I think I made clear the other day and I want to be perfectly fair and state again that inasmuch as the Clerk is not employed by the State after the session adjourns that he could not be expected on his own time to do this. He cannot work for nothing but it was my understanding, because he wrote this order, that it would be charged to legislative expense. Therefore, I tried to do it that way. The objective was not accomplished so this session I looked elsewhere and I called the President of the University of Maine and I asked him if the State University would be willing to serve the State Legislature by preparing this manual. He took it up with the Department of Government and I had a telephone conversation with the head of the Department of Government of the State University. I told him that the State Library had prepared and had gathered together certain information on this subject and that the officials of the State Library would cooperate. I regret to say that the Clerk of the House was not willing to cooperate with the Department of Government of the University of Maine because he could have been of tremendous help.

Now, that is what I did. I turned to some other place because I did not accomplish my objective two years ago. I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone this order will not prevail.

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

Mr McGLAUFLIN: I dislike, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in any way to interfere with the plans of my friend, the gentleman from Brunswick (Mr. Senter), a man whom I greatly admire. I think he has made a wonderful

representative but I do want to express my opinion on this matter.

This year, our Speaker of his own accord made arrangements to have meetings in this Hall where we could discuss these matters that would be of assistance to the new members. I think that was exceedingly successful. I think that it was a far better method of getting the new members acquainted with their duties than would any booklet published by anybody. At those meetings, we had the Clerk present as an expert, and his valuable assistant, and we had opportunities, everybody had an opportunity, to ask questions. If they didn't understand the statements they were given a chance to have them clarified. If you get out a booklet such as is suggested, a great many of the members will never even read it. They come here, get instructions, take part in the debate and they learn a great deal.

I am not particularly opposed to the resolution of Mr. Senter. I merely want to state that I think it is unnecessary and I think that the method of our Speaker is far better.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not know what this disagreement is between some of the members here but what I am worried about is this: If the people at the U. of M. want to write something for our young folks, an enlightening study about government, I wonder if they are the same people who wrote that book which we received when we first came here which I think was a mile and a half away from anything. I think the man's name was Dow. There was so much of it that I couldn't see any sense or reason to it and I didn't get more than three-quarters of the way through it, because I got so disgusted. I am just wondering if some more of that wordage would be sent out to our school children to lead them along that line which I do not think represents our American form of government.

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

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just arise to correct the impression of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis. The manual which we are now discussing is not intended for the use of school children. The manual we are discussing is for the use of the newly-elected representatives to the 97th session of the Legislature.

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

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before I introduced this order, as the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, has told you, I discussed it with him. He couldn't agree with me on it and I admire him for telling me so. He did, very frankly. He told me he couldn't agree with me and he and I both agreed that we would settle it on its merits. He would present his case and I would present my case as I saw it and then the members of the House would vote whichever way they felt was the best way to handle it.

I have no axes to grind whatsoever with the University of Maine. I think it is a fine institution and I think it should remain as such. If a booklet is going to be prepared for members of the Legislature as to legislative procedure, there isn't a man in the State of Maine who can come up to the qualifications of our Clerk, I don't care who says what, there just isn't that man around. There are so many things going on here and so many things that happen that have never been written and never will be written unless the Clerk of the House is directed to do so. I will go along with the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, that he did present an order two years ago and, as he says, it was not carried out.

I will point out to the members of this House that there was no method of paying for that at the time of passing the order. I say that in all fairness and in defense of the Clerk. I am not in any way any better than Mr. Senter but I did make provisions to compensate whoever did the printing of it. The Clerk's office has assured me that the material would be furnished to the printers and assembled free of

charge to the State while they will be working over here after we go home to get the legislative record out and during that period he will have ample time to get that material together and submit it to the printer. The only thing that will be charged to legislative expense will be the actual cost of the printing of these booklets.

The order also stipulates that 30 days before the convening of the 97th Legislature, which should be in December or possibly November of 1954, those booklets will be mailed to each member coming into this House and to each member coming to the other branch. There will be 200 copies made and there will be ample for every member of the House, every member of the other body and also the Governor's Council.

There is nothing, absolutely nothing, personal in this. It is just a question as to whether you want the University to make a report or whether you want the Clerk of the House who has been here for twenty years to make the report.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, would be kind enough to read his order without attempting to introduce it so that I may see the difference between the two.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, requests the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, to read his order even though it has not yet been offered.

Mr. ALBERT: "ORDERED, that there be prepared a manual designed to assist new members in undertaking their Legislative duty and that the same be reproduced and the cost of reproduction be charged to Legislative expense.

"AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, said manual be sent to representatives-elect of the 97th Legislature at least 30 days before the Legislature convenes."

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, that the House Order presented by the gentleman from

Brunswick, Mr. Senter, be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone the order will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Order was indefinitely postponed.

Order Out of Order

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

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I present an order and move its passage.

The SPEAKER: Out of order and under suspension of the rules, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, presents an order and moves its passage. The Clerk will read the order.

The CLERK:

ORDERED, that there be prepared a manual designed to assist new members in undertaking their Legislative duty and that the same be reproduced and the cost of reproduction be charged to Legislative expense.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, said manual be sent to representatives elect of the 97th Legislature at least 30 days before the Legislature convenes.

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

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to state that I hope the Legislature will vote for the passage of this order to obtain the objective. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that this order receive passage?

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Albert of Augusta, the Order received passage.

Order Out of Order

Out of order and under suspension of the rules, Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham presented the following Order and moved its passage.

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be and hereby is directed to study the laws exempting property of corporations organized under Chapter 50 of the Revised Statutes

from taxation together with the practical application and effect of the application of such laws to the assessments of taxes in the municipalities of the State. (H. P. 1306)

The Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Winchenpaw of Friendship was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I regret that I did not do this a few days ago but maybe if I had a book of instructions I might have known better what to do. I would like to make a few remarks just to get on the record.

The other day a bill went by, an emergency bill, and the monitor in my section came along and said: "What was the matter with you. Why didn't you vote for that bill?" Well, I was studying that bill to see how it affected my area. On April 27 the Governor signed a bill as an emergency; on April 28 the worm diggers landed up here and several orders were introduced and what disturbed me was the fact that some of the members sort of took it as a joke when those orders were introduced but to me a \$2,000,000 worm business isn't any joke.

Now, last night I took my little girl up to the airport to watch the planes come in and a man came hurrying up with these boxes. I was up there a couple of weeks ago and a man came hurrying up with boxes and I thought he was shipping out cut flowers he was in such a hurry. He had long narrow boxes; I didn't question him. But last night I recognized a fellow, having seen him before, and when I spoke to him he remembered me. He was one of the worm buyers. He was shipping out 6,000 worms. Now, where were those worms going? They were going to Richmond, Virginia, by plane. Those worms were worth \$120. There should have been \$240 worth of worms; he had an order for 12,000 worms but he couldn't get the 12,000 worms. Now why couldn't he get 12,000 worms? Well, I will tell you why he couldn't get the 12,000 worms. The bill that we passed the other day was L.D. 1405 to close Waldoboro, Bremen,

Bristol, South Bristol and Damariscotta. And now, as of this morning, May 7, 1953, I checked with the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department and in Waldoboro there are no licensed worm diggers; in Bremen there are no licensed worm diggers; in Bristol there are no licensed worm diggers as of this morning; South Bristol, there were no licensed worm diggers; Damariscotta, there were two licensed worm diggers; Nobleboro, there were two licensed worm diggers but Nobleboro hasn't any clam flats, no worm flats; in Newagen there was one licensed worm digger; I believe Newagen is a part of Boothbay.

Now, I don't know. This is a serious situation to me. You can go down and buy a dragger's license for \$6.00 or something but you have to be careful where you drag. You can go down there, every man in this House can go down there and get a clam digger's license but where can you go to dig clams? You can go and get a worm digger's license but where can you go to dig worms?

Now, I have injected a little joke here and I hope nobody takes offense at it. Now you take our good Speaker, the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Bates. Suppose he buys a deer hunting license. I am assuming that Orono hasn't much deer hunting territory. So he goes over to Argyle or Alton to hunt deer. They say: "Dr. Bates, you don't live here; you can't hunt here." Well, of course, he might hunt on the campus at the University of Maine. (Laughter)

Now that is the situation. Some of those worm diggers were up here with a license they had just bought the day before. Because they don't live in Waldoboro, they can't dig in Waldoboro. Waldoboro has a tremendous amount of clam flats which the worms live in too and I believe that the worm diggers help the clams because they keep the top of the flats roughed up and the clams seed in. The clams can't seed themselves in on a perfectly smooth clam flat. Some areas where the people are more interested in the propagation of clams, they even cut brush, alders, gray birch and white birch and drag it down on the flats. All of that stuff

will sink and lay there all summer and that catches the clam seed.

Now, I suggest, this may be just a suggestion or recommendation, I know sometime the Legislature is going to do something about this situation. And what I would recommend is that the State go out of the licensing business, the State not sell any clam licenses, the State not sell any worm licenses. Let the towns do it. If these towns want to be closed, let them sell non-resident worm licenses. That fellow last night had \$120 worth of worms that they had dug yesterday. Those worm diggers would probably pay \$20 or \$25 for a non-resident license. The State sells non-resident deer hunting licenses. Why not let those towns sell non-resident worm licenses? Most of us don't care much about those worms. That is a big industry to those fellows; the fishermen down there in Richmond, Virginia, need them.

Now, Mr. Abraham Wanser of Wiscasset, one of the worm buyers, wants me to thank the House for the consideration finally shown the worm industry by the House. Thank you.

Mr. McGlaulin of Portland was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. McGLAULIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I addressed the House by unanimous consent at the early part of the Legislature. I wish to address you again briefly at the closing hours of this Legislature. I want to express my thanks and appreciation to our Speaker and to our Clerk for the great help they have given to me this session. I practically never read a speech but I have written a few words for this occasion which I wish to read.

Mr. Speaker and Members of this House:

We are now nearing the end of a strenuous session of this legislature. This is my seventh term in this House and I have never served with men and women who surpassed this House in character, in sincerity, in fair play, and in an honest desire to pass good legislation. I have made friendships that I shall cherish as long as I live. There is not a single member of this House whom I do not like and

I greatly appreciate the friendship and affection that has been extended to me.

I have no slightest animosity toward those who have opposed me, for I give each and every one of you credit for being as honest and sincere in your convictions as I have been in mine.

I have greatly enjoyed scrapping with such men as Dickey, Jalbert, Senter of Brunswick, Small, Crabtree, Fuller of Bangor, Trafton, Davis, Fitanides, Foss, Potter, Tuttle, Albert, Low of Rockland, Hussey, Hand and Finemore. I love them all. When we separate I shall miss the smile of our Speaker, Dr. Bates; the clarion voice of Dickey; the dignity of Jacobs; the comical remarks of Sanford and Turner, the eloquence of Miss Cormier; the lofty speeches of Travis and Trafton; the friendly rivalry with Small and Crabtree; the arguments of Burgess, Albee, Doc Center, Whitney, Senter of Brunswick, Bearce and Osborne; the logic of Totman; the staunch support of Roundy and Doc Caverly; the defense on reports put up by Potter, Tuttle, Clements, Campbell, Call and Watson; the hospitality of Curtis, Kelly, Carter, Pullen, and Mrs. Christie; the members of the Judicial Committee, Fitanides, Trafton, Fuller, Cianchette, Low and Martin, whose judgment has so often differed from my own. And I must not forget those "63" players, Debeck, Berry, Brockway, Buckley, Campbell, Cates, Clements, Dicker, Ferguson, Gardner, Archer, Kimball, Legard, Roberts, Pullen and Moulton. Nor would I forget my bodyguards, Ford, Pullen, Bibber, Childs, Davis and Reynolds.

I shall miss the ladies, Miss Cormier, Mrs. Christie, Mrs. Lord, Miss Steeves, Mrs. Downing and Miss Lawry, Bailey, Brown of Robbinston, Baldic, Caswell, Chase, Cole, Cote, Cyr, Dodge, Edwards, Fickett, Fuller of So. Portland, Gates, Gilman, Gowell, Hanson, Harnden, Higgins, Ludwig, Macomber, Rich, Scott, Stewart of So. Paris, Stewart of Portland and Story have all contributed their talent this session. Then there is Tardif whom I always take to be a Republican until he votes.

I would like to mention you all, for he also serves who only stands and votes.

I shall miss our Clerk and his able assistant, the reporters, the clerks, the pages, the sergeant-at-arms and his assistant, and the doorkeeper.

When this session closes, we will never all meet here again. Death, business circumstances and leaving the State will prevent the return of many of us. In closing I wish to say God bless the State of Maine and God bless you, each and every one. (Applause, Members rising)

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Supplement Number 2 of the House Advance Journal and the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, moves that out of order and under suspension of the rules papers from the Senate be now taken up. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Papers from the Senate Order Out of Order

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be authorized to study the problem of state aid to education, including the matter of equalization through state subsidy to municipalities under the formula now used as a basis for distribution of state aid, and such other related matters as may be involved in a comprehensive study of state educational finance; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report to the next legislature the result of its study with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate (S. P. 611))

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read and passed in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Control Vesicular Diseases (S. P. 465) (L. D. 1296) which was passed to be enacted in the House on April 21, and passed to be engrossed in concurrence on March 18.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Sen-

ate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center.

Mr. CENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There has been some little time since we have heard about vesicular exanthema. By this amendment that has appeared on our desks the total appropriation is being cut from \$25,000 down to \$5,000. It is somewhat doubtful in my mind how much of a job in controlling vesicular exanthema can be done with that amount of money. However, I am very anxious that this law should be on our statute books for another reason. I think it was mentioned in the earlier debate, and that is that the title of the bill is "An Act to Control Vesicular Diseases," and vesicular disease also controls hoof and mouth disease which fortunately you have not had in Maine but of course you could have before the next session of the Legislature.

Therefore, I think it is very important that we have something on our statutes whereby the department would have some authority to cope with that condition. I therefore plan to move that the House recede and concur with the Senate. To accomplish that purpose, I move that we reconsider our action whereby we passed this bill to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, moves that the House recede and concur. The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "A".

The CLERK:

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 465, L. D. 1296, Bill "An Act to Control Vesicular Diseases."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of section 3, and inserting in place thereof the following section:

Sec. 3. Appropriation. There is hereby appropriated from the unappropriated surplus of the general fund the sum of \$5,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, to carry out the provisions of this act. This appropriation shall not lapse but shall remain a continuing carrying account.

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of section 4.

Thereupon, on motion of the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be enacted on April 21; and further voted to recede from its former action whereby it passed the Bill to be engrossed on March 18. Senate Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Appropriating Money for the Purchase of "The Length and Breadth of Maine" (H. P. 313) (L. D. 385) which was finally passed in the House on April 23, and passed to be engrossed on April 9.

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

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 313, L. D. 385, Resolve Appropriating Money for the Purchase of "The Length and Breadth of Maine."

Amend said Resolve by inserting before the word "general" in the last line thereof the words 'unappropriated surplus of the'

Thereupon, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the Resolve was finally passed on April 23; and further voted to recede from its action whereby the Resolve was passed to be engrossed without amendment on April 9. Senate Amendment "A" was then adopted and the Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Police Officers in Uniform Stopping Motor Vehicles for Examination" (H. P. 270) (L. D. 298) on which the House insisted on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed on March 4.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence, and asking for a Com-

mittee of Conference with the following Conferees appointed on its part:

Messrs. SILSBY of Hancock
 BUTLER of Franklin
 WEEKS of Cumberland

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, kindly approach the rostrum?

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

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Since today committees of conference seem to be the spring style, I move that we join in a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, moves that the House join in a committee of conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature, on House Paper 270, Legislative Document 298, Bill "An Act relating to Police Officers in Uniform Stopping Motor Vehicles for Examination", the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis; the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaulin; the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton.

The SPEAKER: The House may be at ease until the sound of the gong.

House at Ease

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The hour of 4:00 P. M. having arrived, the Chair lays before the House a bill reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and on its passage to be engrossed.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Reconditioning Buildings at the Maine Vocational-Technical Institute (S. P. 609) (L. D. 1553)

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

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, moves that out of order and under

suspension of the rules we proceed with Supplement No. 3. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Papers from the Senate Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Robert W. Johnson of Rumford (H. P. 30) (L. D. 24) which was finally passed in the House on May 2, and passed to be engrossed on April 30.

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

In the House:

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 30, L. D. 24, Resolve in Favor of Robert W. Johnson, of Rumford.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in its place the following punctuation and words:

' , and be it further
Resolved: That there be, and hereby is, appropriated from the general fund for the purposes of this resolve the sum of \$800 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954 and the sum of \$800 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.'

Thereupon the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the resolve was finally passed on May 2nd and to recede from its action whereby the resolve was passed to be engrossed on April 30th without amendment, and to adopt Senate Amendment "A" and to pass the resolve to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Granting a Pension to Ida M. Fuller of Mount Vernon (H. P. 425) (L. D. 472) which was finally passed in the House on May 2, and passed to be engrossed on April 30.

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

In the House:

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 425, L. D. 472, Resolve, Grant-

ing a Pension to Ida M. Fuller of Mount Vernon.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in place thereof the following punctuation and words: ‘; and be it further

Resolved: That there be, and hereby is, appropriated from the general fund for the purposes of this resolve the sum of \$600 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954 and the sum of \$600 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.’

Thereupon the House voted to recede from its former action whereby it finally passed the resolve on May 2nd, and to recede from its action whereby it passed the resolve to be engrossed on April 30th, and to adopt Senate Amendment “A” and to pass the resolve to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment “A” in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Sadie M. D. Jewell of Orono (H. P. 927) (L. D. 1024) which was finally passed in the House on May 2, and passed to be engrossed on April 30.

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

In the House:

Senate Amendment “A” was read by the Clerk as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT “A” to H. P. 927, L. D. 1024, Resolve, in Favor of Sadie M. D. Jewell of Orono.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

‘; and be it further

Resolved: That there be, and hereby is, appropriated from the general fund to carry out the purposes of this resolve, the sum of \$600 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954 and \$600 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.’

Thereupon the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the resolve was finally passed on May 2nd, and to recede from its former action whereby it passed the resolve to be engrossed on April 30th, and to adopt Senate Amendment “A” and to pass the resolve to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment “A” in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Naomi G. Davis of Palermo (H. P. 1018) (L. D. 1144) which was finally passed in the House on May 2, and passed to be engrossed on April 30.

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

In the House:

Senate Amendment “A” was read by the Clerk as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT “A” to H. P. 1018, L. D. 1144, Resolve, in Favor of Naomi G. Davis of Palermo.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

‘; and be it further

Resolved: That there be and hereby is, appropriated from the general fund to carry out the purposes of this resolve, the sum of \$600 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954 and \$600 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.’

Thereupon the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the resolve was finally passed on May 2nd, and to recede from its former action whereby the resolve was passed to be engrossed without amendment on April 30th, and to adopt Senate Amendment “A” and pass the resolve to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment “A” in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Court Records and Official Court Reporters (S. P. 219) (L. D. 585) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 2, and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment “A” and Senate Amendment “A” in concurrence on April 29.

Came from the Senate with Senate Amendment “A” indefinitely postponed and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment “A” and Senate Amendment “B” in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Senate Amendment “B” was read by the Clerk as follows:

SENATE AMENDMENT “B” to S. P. 219, L. D. 585, Bill “An Act Relating to Court Records and Official Court Reporters.”

Amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figures "\$6,500" in the 1st sentence of that part of section 2 designated "Sec. 185" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures "\$5,000"

Thereupon the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be enacted on May 2nd and voted to recede from its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" on April 29th, and to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A", and to adopt Senate Amendment "B" and pass the bill to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "B" in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled

An Act relating to Salary of Members of the Legislature (H. P. 250) (L. D. 280) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 2.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This has a price tag of \$13,800 which would benefit our possible successors. It is included here because of the fact that we are appropriating money for the next biennium, and we would be in January of 1955, which would be part of that biennium.

With complete humility and bowed head, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to be thoroughly understood in the remarks that I am about to make, and I ask that no one consider the remarks as a criticism of any individual or of the House. I would like to preface these remarks by saying that this is my fifth term

and this is honestly the finest House that it has been my pleasure to serve with.

We have made a mistake, particularly in the last two weeks, by not keeping control of our House money bills and using the axe on them ourselves. It may be too late to correct that situation, but I leave the fact with you that as the session progresses to its final adjournment if money bills do appear that originated in the House I would suggest that in order to exonerate our own position as far as it is possible that from here on we follow that type of procedure.

With respect to the item that is now before you, not because I introduced the measure — as you know, this particular item was part of the Governor's program, and you also know that the small salary you are receiving is not adequate. I am thoroughly convinced that there will be a little bit of juggling before final adjournment, and I am going to ask this House to allow me to table this matter at this time in an honest effort to try to work something out for you.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to table L.D. 280, with the promise to do what I can and with the firm belief that some juggling may be able to be done.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, moves that H. P. 250, L. D. 280, An Act relating to Salary of Members of the Legislature, lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the Bill. Is this the pleasure of the House?

As many as are in favor of the motion to table will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled

An Act Providing for a Deputy Commissioner of Institutional Service (H. P. 897) (L. D. 883) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 2.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Macomber.

Mr. MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we insist and ask for a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Jay, Mr. Macomber, moves that the House insist on its former action and request a committee of conference.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was told myself by Mr. Greenlaw that he did not care for this. In fairness, I was told by another member a few minutes before we reconvened that the Governor felt he would like to have this. However, if we are to take, and I am taking the Governors word that he wants a balanced budget, I am sure that he was fully aware that we are now operating into a small deficit. There is no real enthusiasm for this anyway, we have no money, and I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Macomber.

Mr. MACOMBER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if it would be possible to table this until tomorrow?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that a motion to table is in order.

Mr. MACOMBER: I so move, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Jay, Mr. Macomber, moves that H. P. 897, L. D. 83, "An Act Providing for a Deputy Commissioner of Institutional Service" lie on the table, pending the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, to recede and concur and the motion of the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Macomber, to insist and request a committee of conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

As many as are in favor of the motion to table will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature, on Bill "An Act relating to the Issuance of Operators' Licenses from Date of Birth" (H. P. 878) (L. D. 870) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

Messrs. CARTER of Oxford

SINCLAIR of Somerset

DENNETT of York

—Committee on
part of Senate

FINEMORE of Bridgewater

DODGE of Strong

LOVELY of Westfield

—Committee on
part of House

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Authorizing Towns to Issue Revenue Bonds for Public Improvement" (S. P. 85) (L. D. 192) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 6.

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

In the House:

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 85, L. D. 192, Bill "An Act Authorizing Towns to Issue Revenue Bonds for Public Improvement."

Amend said Bill by striking out the amending clause immediately following the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following

"R. S., c. 80, §§126-A — 126-J additional. Chapter 80 of the revised statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto 10 new sections, to be numbered 126-A to 126-J, inclusive, to read as follows:"

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

'Sec. 126-J Referendum. No bonds shall be issued and sold in any city under the provisions of sections 126-A to 126-I, inclusive, until a majority of the legal voters present and voting at any regular or special election so vote, or in any town until an article in such town warrant so providing shall have been adopted at an annual or special town meeting; provided that the total number of votes cast for and against the issuance of such bonds at such meeting equals or exceeds 20% of the total vote for all candidates for governor in said city or town at the next previous gubernatorial election.'

On motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed and concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment "A", and pass the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Bill Substituted for Report

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Evidence of Offenses Before Grand Jury" (S. P. 407) (L. D. 1112) which was recommitted.

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

In the House: Report was read.

On motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate in substituting the Bill for the Report.

Thereupon the Bill was given its two several readings.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 407, L. D. 1112, Bill, "An Act Relating to Evidence of Offenses Before Grand Jury."

Amend said bill by striking out all after the words "the assistant county attorney" appearing in the 6th line of said bill, inserting a comma and adding the following:

'and at the discretion of the presiding justice, by such other persons as said presiding justice may permit'.

On motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill was assigned for third reading at 7:30 P. M.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Repeal the Tax on Cigars and Tobacco Products (H. P. 1144) (L. D. 1292) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 6, and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" on May 5.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto.

In the House:

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1144, L. D. 1292, Bill "An Act to Repeal the Tax on Cigars and Tobacco Products."

Amend said Amendment by striking out the word "July" in the last line and inserting in place thereof the word "September."

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker, the object of this amendment is to make it possible to re-enact this bill, if the next Legislature so desires without having an emergency clause.

I move we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, moves that the House recede and concur. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be enacted on May 6, and recede from its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A"; also its action whereby House Amendment "A" was adopted. The House then adopted Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A"; House Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto

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

The SPEAKER: The House may be at ease.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on H. P. 641, L. D. 1331, Resolve in favor of Joseph A. DiDonato, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center.

On the disagreeing action of the Legislature on H. P. 634, L. D. 656, Resolve in Favor of Eastern Maine General Hospital, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: The gentleman from Medway, Mr. Potter, the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Fuller.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on H. P. 637, L. D. 1356, Resolve in favor of the Town of Liberty, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: The gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole, the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, and the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on S. P. 448, L. D. 1262, "An Act relating to Education in Unorganized Territory" the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Traf-
ton.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on H. P. 23, L. D. 18, Resolve in favor of Bosworth Memorial Association, the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Berry, the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Larrabee, the gentleman from Warren, Mr. Mc-
Cluskey.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, has an announcement to make.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, I sent a notice to the Clerk that the Appropriations Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 8:30, Daylight Saving Time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, before I make the motion to recess I would like to make just a few remarks. The gentlemen from the other body would be very pleased to use the time from 6:30 to 7:00 Standard Time, or 7:30 to 8:00 Daylight Time for committees of conference and that would be a good time to get the things out of the way. They would be very pleased to join us in committees of conference at that time. Some of you probably do not care for an evening session. I was hoping to go home myself tonight but I am very glad if there is something to do to stay right here and do it so that we can get out of here.

I move that the House recess until 7:00 P.M. Standard Time.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, moves that the House recess until 7:00 P.M. Standard or 8:00 P.M. Daylight Time. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House so recessed.

After Recess, 7:00 P.M., E.S.T.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature, on Resolve Authorizing Alfred Howard, Sr. and Ethel M. Howard of Bingham to Sue the State of Maine (H. P. 1171) (L. D. 1326) reporting that the House recede from its former action whereby the Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A", that the House adopt Conference Amendment "A" and pass the Resolve to be engrossed as

amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Conference Amendment "A"; that the Senate recede from its former action whereby it accepted the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report, concur in accepting the Majority Report "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A", and pass the Resolve to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Conference Amendment "A".

(signed)

Messrs. WATSON

of Moose River Pl.
 TRAFTON of Auburn
 McGLAUFILIN of Portland
 —Committee on part
 of House

WARD of Penobscot
 ROBBINS of Aroostook
 —Committee on part
 of Senate

Report was read and accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Conference Amendment "A".

CONFERENCE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1171, L. D. 1326, Resolve Authorizing Alfred Howard, Sr. and Ethel M. Howard of Bangham to Sue the State of Maine.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end and inserting in place thereof the following:

' ; and be it further

Resolved: That it is the sole intent of the legislature to authorize the bringing of suit and that the passage of this resolve shall not in any way be construed as a finding in respect to facts or liability, and such matters as well as the matter of damages, if any, shall be determined by the tribunal above described.'

Thereupon, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby the Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Conference Amendment "A" was then adopted and the Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and by Conference Amendment "A" and sent up for concurrence.

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules.

Senate Report of Committee Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Long Meets in Harness Racing" (S. P. 273) (L. D. 762)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, was read and accepted in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Elderly Teachers' Pensions (S. P. 49) (L. D. 77) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 4, and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence on May 3.

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

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "B".

SENATE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 49, L. D. 77, Bill "An Act Relating to Elderly Teachers' Pensions."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning of the 1st line thereof the abbreviation and figure 'Sec. 1.'

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

'Sec. 2. **Appropriation.** There is hereby appropriated from the general fund to carry out the purposes of this act, the sum of \$72,400 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and \$72,400 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.'

Thereupon, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby it passed this Bill to be enacted on May 4; and further voted to recede from its former action whereby it passed the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "A" on May 3.

Senate Amendment "B" was then adopted, and the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Senate Amendments "A" and "B" in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Edward Alvin Hodsdon of Presque Isle (S. P. 548) (L. D. 1463) which was finally passed in the House on May 4, and passed to be engrossed in concurrence on May 1.

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

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "A".

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 548, L. D. 1463, Resolve, in favor of Edward Alvin Hodsdon, of Presque Isle.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

' ; and be it further

Resolved: That the provisions of this resolve as they relate to the monthly payments shall cease to be effective if the said Edward Alvin Hodsdon shall be convicted of any felony.'

Thereupon, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby it finally passed this Resolve on May 4; and further voted to recede from its former action whereby it passed the Resolve to be engrossed in concurrence on May 1.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Althea C. Ward of Augusta (S. P. 473) (L. D. 1295) which was finally passed in the House on May 4, and passed to be engrossed in concurrence on May 1.

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

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "A".

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 473, L. D. 1295, Resolve, in Favor of Althea C. Ward, of Augusta.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the period at the end thereof

and inserting in place of the period the following:

' ; and be it further

Resolved: That there be, and hereby is, appropriated from the general fund to carry out the purposes of this resolve the sum of \$1,655.22 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954 and the sum of \$1,655.22 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.'

Thereupon, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby it finally passed this Resolve on May 4; and further voted to recede from its former action whereby it passed the Resolve to be engrossed in concurrence on May 1.

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

**Non-Concurrent Matter
Tabled**

Resolve Providing Funds for Nursing Attendant Education (H. P. 480) (L. D. 499) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 6.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, this worthy project came out of committee with a majority "Ought not to pass" report and a minority "Ought to pass" report. I arose yesterday, and it went along; also the other members of the Appropriations Committee, who had signed the "Ought not to pass" report, to keep the thing alive because it stood high in priority providing we have the funds.

At the time that we reconvened this evening, here is the financial picture now. Surplus which does not involve this as it is a recurring affair, \$98,760.07. Current revenue, in the red, \$6,948.39 for the first year; in the red, \$4,161.46 for the second year. This is a worthy project. I think we ought to appreciate that even those of us who are on the majority "Ought not to pass" report. I see no other

recourse but to move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolve lie on the table.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, moves that the resolve and accompanying papers lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House recede and concur in the indefinite postponement of the Resolve. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the matter was so tabled.

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Officers of the Legislature" (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1523) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 7.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be laid on the table until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, moves that the bill and accompanying papers be laid on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill and accompanying papers were tabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for tomorrow.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Powers of Attorney General" (S. P. 172) (L. D. 438) which was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence in the House on May 4.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed, and asking for a Committee of Conference with the following conferees appointed on its part:

Messrs. REID of Kennebec
HARDING of Knox
WARD of Penobscot

In the House:

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

Mr. SMALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its previous action and concur with the Senate in a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Small, moves that the House insist on its former action and join in a committee of conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The House has assigned the only third reader on Supplement number 5 for the hour of 7:30 P.M., Eastern Standard Time. This gives the Chair an opportunity to explain to the members of the House that the only papers now in possession of the House are the four unassigned matters on Supplement number 1, House Calendar for Thursday evening, the two matters that have just been tabled and the third reader that will be acted upon in approximately three minutes.

The Chair understands that the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, requests unanimous consent to address the House on the record. Does the Chair here objection to the request of the gentleman? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A few days ago, the House passed an order whereby we could get copies of the statutes from the library that were excess. I have the names of several members here and I will read them off, those that I will read have not picked up their books or have not made arrangements with the librarian. The following Representatives: Bearce, Bailey, Burgess, Cote, Crabtree, Dorsey, Downing, Gilman, Larrabee, Lovely, Madore, Murray, Potter, Ready, Rich, Steeves, Tardif, Taylor, Totman, Watson, Whiting and Williams. If any of the Representatives whose names have been called off do not desire to pick up those books, please so inform the librarian.

The SPEAKER: The House may be at ease for one minute and forty seconds.

House at Ease

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Senate Paper 172, Legislative Document 438, Bill "An Act relating to Powers of Attorney General," the Chair appoints the following conferees on the part of the House: The gentleman from Mexico, Mr. Small; the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Fogg; the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Anderson.

The hour of 7:30 Eastern Standard Time having arrived, a bill reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and on its passage to be engrossed.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Evidence of Offenses Before Grand Jury" (S. P. 407) (L. D. 1112)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, out of order and under suspension of the rules I would like to ask for reconsideration on the motion this morning about the water fountain and I would like to address the House briefly.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it failed to pass this morning an order in relation to the installation of a drinking fountain at the House end of the third floor corridor. Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider our action?

As many as are in favor of reconsidering our action will please say aye; those opposed, no.

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, I think this morning when the Clerk read that, it was very brief and a brief explanation right now I think would iron out matters. As you all know, the wall fountain is obsolete. I even suggested that if they didn't pass this I would bring a six foot rubber hose up here and attach it so us farmers would be right at home. All I am asking is that we have an electric cooler the same as that outside of the Senate, that would be placed right in the same position as the water fountain is now situated on the wall for the next session. I hope you will go along with that because I do not think it will cost too much, will it Mr. Clerk? (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the Clerk is not in a position to answer.

The House, having voted to reconsider its former action, the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, moves that this order receive passage.

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

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no confusion, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Vaughan.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we move this drinking fountain just a few feet down this way so we can have the benefit of it and not have the other body have so much use of it.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment?

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

Mr. FOGG: Mr. Speaker, I hope that we don't pass this order just for the sake of witnessing the interesting sight of seeing Mr. Call dragging a hose up here to drink from.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Whitefield, Mr. Chase.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Whitefield, Mr. Chase, moves the previous question. In order for

the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it requires the consent of one-third of the members present.

All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will rise and stand in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third of the members present having arisen, the motion for the previous question is entertained.

The question before the House now is: Shall the main question be put now? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, that the order receive passage. The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, has requested a division.

As many as are in favor of the passage of this order 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 sixteen having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the order received passage.

The SPEAKER: For some time, the Chair has been planning to present the plaques to the Speakers pro tem although all those members who have served as Speaker pro tem are not here tonight. The Chair thinks that this would be an excellent opportunity, while the House is awaiting papers from the Senate, for the presentation of those plaques. The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Albert, and the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Fitanides, the Chair believes, have theirs. When the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, presided, the House recessed or adjourned, the Chair forgets which at this moment, be-

fore the Chair had a chance to present the plaque at that moment so the Chair is very happy at this time to request the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Pages to hand these plaques to the individual members as the Chair presents them: the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Archer; the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess; the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette; the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis; the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton; the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low; the gentleman from Moose River Plantation, Mr. Watson; the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Fuller; the gentleman from New Limerick, Mr. Hand; the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter; the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Fogg; the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman; the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord; the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Martin; the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Ludwig; and the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Woodcock. (Applause)

The Chair is deeply grateful to each member who has served as Speaker pro tem and is very happy to be able to have these little mementos presented to them at this time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low.

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you very much for the plaque which you have given me and I know when I tell you how much we appreciate the way you have conducted the sessions of this Legislature, the fairness you have shown, the helpfulness that you have shown, that I am voicing the opinion of every member of this House. We are deeply grateful for all the work you have done and we wish you well in the future. (Applause, members rising)

The SPEAKER: The Chair thanks the gentleman very much.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Moose River Plantation, Mr. Watson, on the record?

Mr. WATSON: On the record, Mr. Speaker. I thank you very much and I will have many happy hours looking at my plaque. It has been a privilege and an honor to have you as our Speaker, I assure you. (Applause)

House at Ease

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

From the Senate: The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER

May 7, 1953

Hon. Harvey R. Pease
Clerk of the House of Representatives
96th Legislature
Sir:

The President of the Senate today appointed the following conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on:

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

Senators:

HANSON of Washington
COLLINS of Aroostook
SINCLAIR of Somerset

Respectfully,

(Signed) Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, desire recognition?

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise to ask for unanimous consent to introduce a resolve. If I may be permitted, I would like to say that I realize the hour is late and we are anxious to adjourn but, in my opinion, this may be one of the most important matters that we have yet considered, particularly to the residents here, the Representatives from Aroostook County, Sagadahoc County, will be particularly interested. Now, this problem of drifting islands is serious and I hope that you will give me the courtesy of at least letting the Clerk read it.

The SPEAKER: Under the unanimous consent rule, the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, presents a resolve. The Clerk will read the title.

The CLERK: Resolve Appropriating Money for the Purpose of Anchoring the Three Hundred and Sixty-five Islands in Casco Bay to Prevent Their Drifting Away and Landing Near Portland Thereby Increasing the Population of Cumberland County on which Reapportionment in the Opinion of Some Should Be Based.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the receiving of this resolve by unanimous consent? The Chair hears objection and the resolve is not received.

**Senate Report of Committee
Ought Not to Pass**

Report of the Committee on Welfare reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing for State Pension for Eva A. Scammon of Franklin (S. P. 103)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, was read and accepted in concurrence.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on Resolve in favor of Arthur Payson of Brooks (H. P. 1098) (L. D. 1232) reporting that the Senate recede and concur with the House in passing the Resolve to be engrossed which was accepted in the House on May 4.

Came from the Senate with the Conference Report rejected.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very sorry to read that the Senate would not even consider a conference report which was unanimously signed by three members of the other branch. I realize perhaps at the most this old gentleman may have had \$2.00 a month added to his pension after giving twenty-five years of service to the State of Maine and I am very sorry that this gentleman should lose, as I say, that \$2.00 a month, perhaps, in his pension simply because I was endeavoring to save the State \$20,000. I do not know as there can be anything done about this con-

ference report other than to move that the House adhere.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, moves that the House adhere. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Senate Report of Committee Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Limitation of Slander and Libel Suits" (S. P. 486) (L. D. 1364)

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

In the House: Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair awaits a motion. Without a motion, the Chair will lay before the House the acceptance of the report of the committee.

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, I do not care to make a motion but I think it might be explained that the bill is to increase the period in which you can bring a suit for slander or libel from a two-year period to a four-year period. It gives that much longer to sue someone that you think has libelled you or slandered you.

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

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the matter be indefinitely postponed. Two years is long enough to bring a suit for slander.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, moves that the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee be accepted.

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

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, moves that the House recede. The Chair will state to the gentleman that where no action has as yet been taken by the House, the motion to recede is not in order.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, moves that the Bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee in concurrence. Is that correct?

The motion pending, however, is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, that the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee be accepted.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, that the "Ought not to pass" report be accepted will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled

Bill "An Act relating to Bounty on Bears" (H. P. 1043) (L. D. 1185) which was passed to be engrossed in the House as amended by House Amendment "A" and House Amendment "B" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto.

Came from the Senate with House Amendment "A" and House Amendment "B" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto indefinitely postponed, and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1043, L. D. 1185, Bill "An Act Relating to Bounty on Bears."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning of the 1st line thereof, the following abbreviation and figure: "Sec. 1."

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

"Sec. 2. R. S., c. 33, §59, amended. The 2nd sentence of section 59 of chapter 33 of the revised statutes, as revised, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The fee for a non-resident or alien for a trapping license shall be \$200, except that the fee for a non-

resident or alien for a license to trap bear only shall be \$10.' "

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Moose River Plantation, Mr. Watson.

Mr. **WATSON**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think we have had about all the fun we need to have with the bears, so I will very briefly move that the amendment to L. D. 1185 be indefinitely postponed and that we go along with Mr. Crabtree's bill, 1185, which leaves the bear situation exactly as it is now for the next two years. And, in the next two years some of us members on the Fish and Game Committee will possibly not be here but we are coming down to lobby this bear bill. The game biologists are going to do quite a lot of work in the next two years on that and, as I said before, we will be down to lobby it so I think we had better leave it as it is for the next two years and let the bills go along, indefinitely postpone this amendment and let the bill go along.

The **SPEAKER**: Will the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Gates, defer for just a moment.

Will the gentleman from Moose River Plantation, Mr. Watson, approach the rostrum?

The Chair understands that the gentleman from Moose River Plantation, Mr. Watson, moves that the House recede from its former action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and as amended by House Amendment "B" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto and that the House pass this bill to be engrossed without any amendment.

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

Mr. **GATES**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You may think it is funny but I don't. The bear in our county, in this particular part of the county, are thicker than blazes and I will go along with this gentleman to indefinitely postpone that amendment but I can't go along any further than that. Can't we take the amendment first and then debate his other motion or must they go along together?

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair understands that the gentleman from

Millinocket, Mr. Gates, moves that this matter lie on the table pending further consideration. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill and accompanying papers were so tabled.

Order Out of Order

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. **DICKEY**: Mr. Speaker, out of order and under suspension of the rules, I present an order and move its passage.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, out of order and under suspension of the rules, presents an order and moves its passage. The Clerk will read the order.

ORDERED, that in recognition of their long term of service, the following members be presented with the Chairs which they have used during the present Session:

Mr. **JACOBS** of Auburn

Mr. **McGLAUFLIN** of Portland

Mr. **GOWELL** of Berwick

Mr. **HANSON** of Machiasport

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the Clerk of the House be directed to have them delivered to their residence, at the end of the present session.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that if these members return for another session, they bring the chairs with them.

Thereupon, the Order received passage, the members applauding.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, for ten seconds.

Mr. **McGLAUFLIN**: Mr. Speaker, in behalf of one of those members I want to sincerely thank the members of the House. (Applause)

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, for nine seconds.

Mr. **JACOBS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to thank you very much for the chair. I have used it quite often for the last twenty years. (Applause)

On motion of Mr. Fuller of South Portland,

Adjourned until 8:30 A. M., E. S. T., tomorrow.