

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-Eighth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1957

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, May 16, 1957

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

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

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that H. P. 310, L. D. 427, Bill "An Act to Increase Salaries of Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court and Superior Court" be recalled to the Senate from the legislative files (S. P. 581)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read and, on motion of Mr. Bean of Winterport, passed in concurrence.

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to study, in addition to the study authorized by Joint Order H. P. 1090, the operations of banking institutions insofar as such operations relate to "Small Loans"; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Committee report the results of its study to the 99th Legislature (S. P. 584)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

**Senate Reports of Committees
Leave to Withdraw**

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act to Create the Maine Industrial Building Authority" (S. P. 239) (L. D. 640) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

**Divided Report
Indefinitely Postponed**

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Equipment of Rail Track Motorcars Used by Railroad Transport Employees" (S. P. 283) (L. D. 742) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 531) (L. D. 1498) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CURTIS of Cumberland
ST. PIERRE of Androscoggin
— of the Senate

Messrs. SMITH of Portland
KARKOS of Lisbon
WINCHENPAW of Friendship
EMMONS of Kennebunk
LETOURNEAU of Sanford
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. HILLMAN of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Messrs. ROSS of Bath
HANSCOMB of South Portland
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: The bill in discussion now is the bill that would put tops on all railroad hand cars. This is a perennial bill. I was against it last session, and I am against it now. Not that I am against men having tops on these hand cars. I certainly do feel sorry for those men, but I have felt that it is a matter that we should not legislate, and I do not feel that this legislature should require the railroads to put tops on hand cars any more than we should insist that tops be put on all farm tractors. I maintain it's a matter of negotiation between labor and management. The new draft 1498 says that they should do this within four years. Since this

new draft was prepared, labor and management have met. They have negotiated, and I have in my possession now a contract signed by labor and management. I have the authority of the Brotherhoods of the Railroads who sponsored this bill to now move indefinite postponement which I do at this time.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Equipment of Rail Track Motor Cars Used by Railroad Transport Employees" both reports be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos.

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, if there has been a contract signed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, there has been a contract signed. It has been signed by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, the Brotherhood of Maintenance and Ways and the Railroads. They all agree and they authorized me to do this. I would not have done it without their authority.

Mr. KARKOS: Thank you very much, Mr. Ross.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the indefinite postponement of both reports. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, both reports were indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Medical Services under Workmen's Compensation Act" (S. P. 448) (L. D. 1267) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CURTIS of Cumberland
ST. PIERRE

of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Messrs. HANSOMB
of South Portland
ROSS of Bath
EMMONS of Kennebunk
LETOURNEAU of Sanford
SMITH of Portland
KARKOS of Lisbon

— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. HILLMAN of Penobscot

— of the Senate.

Mr. WINCHENPAW

of Friendship
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Reports and Bill indefinitely postponed.

In the House: Reports were read.
On motion of Mr. Winchenpaw of Friendship, the House voted to concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of thirty-eight eighth grade pupils from the Kennebunkport Consolidated School, accompanied by their Principal, Mr. Dominic Gagnon. On behalf of the House the Chair extends to you ladies and gentlemen a very cordial welcome and we hope you will enjoy your visit in the State House today. (Applause)

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Powers of State Board of Education" (S. P. 479) (L. D. 1384)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. ROGERSON of Aroostook
PIKE of Oxford

— of the Senate.

Messrs. TOTMAN of Bangor
WADE of Auburn
BRAGDON of Perham
ROSS of Bath

WALSH of Brunswick
ELWELL of Brooks
CHILDS of Portland
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before we accept any motion, I would like, as briefly as possible, to express my sentiments on this bill. I feel justified in going along with the Minority Report "Ought to pass" since when the bill which formed the State Board of Education was passed, a few sessions ago, I voted against it at that time. I voted against it because it is contrary to my philosophy of government. I have no quarrel with the ladies and gentlemen who make up the Board. I think that they are devoted citizens. I think that they are honorable and able men and women. However, I feel very strongly that there should be a straight line of authority and responsibility from the Governor down to the heads of each department. I feel, and I think it was proven in the last upheaval that we had in the department, many people, at least twenty-five people came to me and said: "We have written to the Governor, we have talked with the Governor, we saw the Governor last week at a meeting and we talked with him, why isn't he doing something?" I had to reply to those people: "The Governor is powerless to act." We have here a small group, a board which has the authority to appoint the Commissioner of Education; which has the authority to run the department; which has the authority to run our state schools, our teachers' colleges, and so forth. In other words, they are completely insulated from any authority within the state, within the framework of our state government.

Our other department heads are either appointed by the Governor or elected by the legislature, and here we have a group that is set aside, and has complete power as to the running of that department. I feel also that the Commissioner of Education should have the right and the authority to elect the subdivision heads in his department. I feel that the administration of the department should be in his hands and not in the hands of the Board of Education. I think that it is wrong for us to have a government within a government, and that is exactly what we have. Those of you who were here two years ago remember that we had the same situation in the Maine Development Commission and the cries of "politics" that we hear today, we heard two years ago. We relegated the Development Commission to an advisory capacity. We made up the new Department of Industry and Commerce. The head is appointed by the Governor, and we have had two heads of that department since the department was inaugurated two years ago. We had a Democratic governor, yet both heads that were chosen were Republicans, men of very high standing and men who have done a good job. There is close collaboration between the Governor and that department, and things are working smoothly.

We also hear the cries that the trend today in education throughout the nation is state boards. I would say perhaps that is true, but we certainly could run things as we wish in Maine. The trend in the nation is for one election, yet we in Maine have had two elections for many years. The cry also is: "Let's keep education out of politics." I say to you that politics is the science of government. It is as neat and as clean and as honorable as the people that we elect to carry out the elected offices within the sphere of politics. I would also remind you that the Commissioners of Education that were appointed under our old system were very fine people, and I would challenge anyone to point to any of those appointments and say: "That was a political appointment." I feel that those men, Payson Smith, Harland Ladd, Mr. Packard, and many

others have certainly given good, devoted service to the state under the former system, so that I don't think it is a question of politics. I know that I stand in the minority on this issue, but I feel very strongly that when a man is elected to the high office of Governor, it is because he has the confidence of the people, and I am sure that no man or woman who ever reaches that position in our state would ever play politics with education, and I am sure that the electorate of this state would never tolerate politics in education, and for those reasons, I favor the minority "Ought to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand the gentlewoman makes that a motion?

Miss CORMIER: I so move.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, that the House accept, the Minority "Ought to pass" Report in non-concurrence. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "no")

The SPEAKER: Will those who favor accepting the Minority "Ought to pass" Report in non-concurrence please say aye; those opposed, no.

The Minority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted in non-concurrence on a viva voce vote.

Thereupon, the Bill was read twice and tomorrow assigned.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Lights on Rear of Trucks" (S. P. 452) (L. D. 1270) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 546) (L. D. 1532) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. COLE of Waldo
ROGERSON of Aroostook
HALL of York
- of the Senate.

Messrs. BEYER of Cape Elizabeth
ALLEN of Chelsea
KELLY of Rumford
JACQUES of Lewiston

STILPHEN of Rockland
TOTMAN of Bangor

- of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. HERSEY of Fort Fairfield
- of the House.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, the House voted to accept the Majority Report in concurrence, and the Bill was read twice.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 546, L. D. 1532, Bill, "An Act Relating to Lights on Rear of Trucks."

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

'All lights, reflectors and signal lamps required by law to be displayed on the rear of all motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers of 7 feet or over in width shall be at least within 12 inches of the extreme extension of the rear of such vehicle.'

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Time Limitations for Filing Petitions under Workmen's Compensation Act (S. P. 259) (L. D. 697) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 9, and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on May 7.

Came from the Senate with Committee Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Imposing a Tax on Dry Beans (H. P. 486) (L. D. 730) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 8, and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A", Senate Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" on May 2.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A", House Amendment "A" and Senate Amendments "A" and "B" in non-concurrence.

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

**Non-Concurrent Matter
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act relating to Appointment of Deputy Commissioner of Institutional Service and Member of Parole Board (H. P. 1006) (L. D. 1432) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 14, and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on May 7.

Came from the Senate with Committee Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" 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: I just found out about this amendment and spoke with the sponsor, and for further discussion on it I would like to ask that this be tabled until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves that with respect to item ten, Bill "An Act relating to Appointment of Deputy Commissioner of Institutional Service and Member of Parole Board", this matter be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending further consideration. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Publication of Specimen Ballots, Constitutional Amendments and Referen-

dums in Foreign Language Newspapers" (H. P. 1015) (L. D. 1445) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 13.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto in non-concurrence.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Classifying Certain Surface Waters in Maine" (H. P. 1035) (L. D. 1562) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A" "B", "D" and "E" in the House on May 14.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A", House Amendment "B", House Amendment "D", and House Amendment "E" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto, and Senate Amendment "B" in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Morrill of Harrison, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Authorizing Towns to Control Shellfish Resources" (H. P. 670) (L. D. 951) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 14.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

On motion of Mr. Miller of Portland, the House voted to adhere.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Certificates Issued by Board of Commissioners of Pharmacy" (H. P. 788) (L. D. 1121) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 7.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

On motion of Mr. Emerson of Milinocket, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Planning Board for City of Lewiston"

(H. P. 84) (L. D. 110) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 10.

Came from the Senate with the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Rancourt of Lewiston, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to License and Regulate Operation of Trading Stamp Companies" (H. P. 395) (L. D. 1281) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto in the House on May 9.

Came from the Senate with the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Business Legislation accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. MORRILL: Mr. Speaker, I move we insist on our former action and ask for a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that his motion to recede and concur does take precedence over the motion of the gentleman to insist.

The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that the House recede and concur. Is this the pleasure of the House? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Morrill.

Mr. MORRILL: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on that.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: We've hashed this thing over considerable, and we've tried to do everything in our power

that was right. There were some in here in the House who objected to the word "privilege," and you so amended it to take out the word "privilege." We then went to the Taxation Committee, or to the Department and asked them for information on what they had. We found out the word privilege was perfectly okay. We found that the life insurance companies are operating under that word privilege and paying a 2 per cent tax on their gross receipts. That is all the money they receive as premiums, they are paying a privilege tax of 2 per cent into the general fund. We also found that the fire companies are doing the same, and added to that, we find that the fire companies of Maine are paying a ½ per cent in addition to the 2 per cent as dedicated revenue which goes into the Department to pay for the investigation of fires. Now, the only thing we're ever asked of these people was simply to do as others are doing. There was an amendment prepared for the other body which would just make this, instead of making it a stamp tax, it would make it a gross sales tax just the same as the other people are paying, and at the same rate of 2 per cent. Evidently they did not go along for that, and I don't know as there's any use to go any farther, but inasmuch as the other body is asking for a Committee of conference, I see no reason why we should not ask, and I wish to support my good friend, the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Morrill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that the other branch of the legislature has not requested a Committee of Conference.

Mr. CURTIS: I did not mean on this particular thing, I meant on other things.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that the House recede and concur. A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to recede and concur please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-five having voted in the affirmative and sixty-three having

voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

The motion prevailed.

From the Senate: The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

May 15, 1957

Honorable Harvey R. Pease
Clerk of the House of

Representatives
Ninety-eighth Legislature
Sir:

The Senate today voted to insist on its former action on:

Bill "An Act relating to Hours of Selling Liquor" (H. P. 429) (L. D. 605)

and to join a Committee of Conference. The President appointed the following Conferees on the part of the Senate:

Senators: CARPENTER

BOUCHER of Somerset
WILLEY of Androscoggin
of Hancock

The Senate also voted to insist on its former action on:

Bill "An Act relating to Injury to Monuments and Places of Burial." (H. P. 920) (L. D. 1310)

and to join a Committee of Conference. The President appointed the following Conferees on the part of the Senate:

Senators: SILSBY of Hancock
BUTLER of Franklin
WOODCOCK of Penobscot

Respectfully,
(Signed) WALDO H. CLARK
Assistant Secretary of the
Senate

In the House, the Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Orders

On motion of the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp, House Rule 25 was suspended for the re-

mainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

Mr. Crockett of Freeport presented the following Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the House have learned that yesterday there was a great event in the life of Mr. Emerson of Millinocket when he received word of the birth of a grandson,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDERED, that heartiest congratulations be extended to Mr. Emerson on this addition to his family.

The Order received passage.

(Off record remarks.)

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Tevanian from the Committee on Judiciary on Resolve Authorizing Board of Bar Examiners to Permit Albert N. Tardif of Portland, to take Bar Examination (H. P. 371) (L. D. 501) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Mr. Smith from the Committee on Labor reported same on Bill "An Act Establishing Minimum Wages for Employees" (H. P. 879) (L. D. 1247), as it is covered by other legislation.

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Repealing the Assessment of Towns for Aid to Dependent Children" (H. P. 259) (L. D. 357).

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Provide a Uniform Allowance for National Guard Officers" (H. P. 498) (L. D. 710)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Invest-

ments of Moneys in State Special Revenue Fund" (H. P. 739) (L. D. 1053)

Report was read.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, there is another bill covering this same matter that has not come out of committee yet, and if I may, I would like to table this until next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, with respect to item five, Committee Report on Bill "An Act relating to Investments of Moneys in State Special Revenue Fund", moves that this matter be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 21, pending acceptance of the Committee Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. Bragdon from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve to Provide Funds for Matching Federal Funds for Training in Fisheries Trades (H. P. 697) (L. D. 1004)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Vocational Educational Institute in Androscoggin County (H. P. 1013) (L. D. 1443)

Mr. Duquette from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to a Consultant to Aid Farmers' Cooperatives" (H. P. 1012) (L. D. 1442)

Mr. Stanley from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Educational Institute in Vocational School in Aroostook County (H. P. 698) (L. D. 1005)

Mr. Wood from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Forest Practices" (H. P. 966) (L. D. 1366)

Mr. Needham from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act Permitting Voluntary Admissions and Discharges at Pownal State School" (H. P. 1004) (L. D. 1441) as it is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Walker from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Creating Deputy Municipal Tax Collectors" (H. P. 73) (L. D. 100), as it is covered by other legislation.

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass In New Draft

Mr. Browne from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Cutting of Christmas Trees" (H. P. 921) (L. D. 1321) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1091) (L. D. 1585) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mrs. Hendricks from the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act relating to Age of Applicants to Pownal State School" (H. P. 94) (L. D. 125) which was recommitted, reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1692) (L. D. 1586) under title of "An Act relating to Voluntary Admissions and Discharges at Pineland Hospital and Training Center" and that it "Ought to pass".

Reports were read and accepted, the New Drafts read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Directing Revision of Sea and Shore Fisheries Laws" (H. P. 830) (L. D. 1186) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 830, L. D. 1186, Bill "An Act Directing Revision of Sea and Shore Fisheries Laws."

Amend said Bill by inserting after the word "assistance" in the 11th line, the words 'and hold such public hearings'

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of "Sec. 2" and "Sec. 3" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 2. Appropriation. There is hereby appropriated from the unappropriated surplus of the general fund of the State the sum of \$7,500

to carry out the purposes of this Act. Said sum shall not lapse but shall remain a continuing carrying account until June 30, 1959."

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

Mr. Duquette from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Reactivate a State Committee on Aging" (H. P. 767) (L. D. 1100) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 767, L. D. 1100, Bill "An Act to Reactivate a State Committee on Aging."

Amend said Bill by striking out the last sentence of "Sec. 4."

Further amend said Bill by striking out the figure "\$9,000" in the 2nd line of "Sec. 5" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$2,500'

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

Mr. Edwards from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Calhooed Vaccination" (H. P. 579) (L. D. 828) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 579, L. D. 828, Bill "An Act Relating to Calhooed Vaccination."

Amend said Bill by inserting in the 1st line, before the headnote, 'Sec. 1.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the last 2 underlined lines and inserting in place thereof the underlined words 'against brucellosis.'

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof, the following section:

'Sec. 2. Appropriation. There is hereby appropriated from the general fund of the State the sum of

\$35,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and the sum of \$35,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 to carry out the purposes of this Act.'

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

Mr. Edwards from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve in favor of Maple Grove Cemetery Association of Randolph (H. P. 635) (L. D. 902) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve read once.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 635, L. D. 902, Resolve, in Favor of Maple Grove Cemetery Association of Randolph.

Amend said Resolve by inserting after the words "from the" in the 2nd line the words 'unappropriated surplus of the'

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

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Appointment of Institutional Heads in Department of Institutional Services" (S. P. 186) (L. D. 465)

Bill "An Act Authorizing the Annexation of Harbor Island to the Town of Brooksville" (S. P. 241) (L. D. 642)

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

Third Reader Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959" (S. P. 533) (L. D. 1503)

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

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It was our

intention to proceed in the usual manner with this item three, item four, item seven and item eight. However, earlier this week I made a personal promise to some of the opponents of this measure that I would allow them to count on having these items for debate this afternoon. And with their knowledge and with their approval, I would move that this item, and item four, seven and eight, lie on the table until this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would request the gentleman to make the motions separately with reference to each item.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, the Bill was tabled until later in today's session, pending third reading.

**Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned
Until Later in Today's Session**

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959" (S. P. 541) (L. D. 1520)

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

(On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, tabled pending third reading until later in today's session.)

Bill "An Act relating to Speed Regulations for Motor Vehicles" (S. P. 573) (L. D. 1576)

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

Amended Bill

Bill "An Act relating to Local Option for Sale of Liquor by Certain Part-time Hotels" (H. P. 665) (L. D. 946)

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

Mr. Hancock of York offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 665, L. D. 946, Bill, "An Act Relating to Local Option for Sale of Liquor by Certain Part-time Hotels."

Amend said Bill by striking out the underlined words "**and malt liquors**" in the 7th line.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "50" in the 9th line and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '30'.

House Amendment "A" was adopted, the Bill read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

**Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned
Until Later in Today's Session**

Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose of Building State Highways" (H. P. 1056) (L. D. 1504)

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

(On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, tabled pending third reading until later in today's session.)

**Tabled Until
Later in Today's Session**

Bill "An Act Increasing Registration Fees for Motor Vehicles and Operators' Licenses" (H. P. 1088) (L. D. 1572)

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

(On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, tabled pending third reading until later in today's session.)

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Rangeley and Eustis Light and Power District" (H. P. 907) (L. D. 1293)

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

Bill "An Act relating to State Owned Cars for Supervising State Fire Inspectors" (H. P. 26) (L. D. 31)

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

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, at this time I request permission to approach the rostrum.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may approach the rostrum.

(Conference at the rostrum)

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move we recess for fifteen minutes.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, moves that the House recess for fifteen minutes. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

After Recess

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the Clerk if he has in his possession an amendment to the Constitution relating to the four year term for Governor?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that that matter is in the possession of the House.

Mr. CHILDS: I will now move Mr. Speaker, that we reconsider our action whereby this amendment failed passage yesterday and I will at the same time now move that this matter lie upon the table and be specially assigned for next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House reconsider its action on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Tenure of Office of the Governor to Four-Year Terms, House Paper 157, Legislative Document 204, whereby the measure failed of passage, and the gentleman moves that the motion to reconsider be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday pending reconsideration. The Chair is going to order a division on this question.

The question before the House is the question of tabling the motion to reconsider. Will those who favor tabling the motion to reconsider please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twelve having voted in the affirmative and one hundred and ten having voted in the negative, the motion to table the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I now withdraw my motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Rowe.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action of yesterday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Rowe, that the House now reconsider its action of yesterday whereby Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Tenure of Office of the Governor to Four-Year Terms failed of passage. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire how Mr. Rowe voted yesterday, the gentleman who asked for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is advised that the gentleman voted "no" and is entitled to make his motion. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am opposed to this motion. I think I would like to get out of here in time for haying, and if we reconsider and reconsider — everybody had a chance to vote on a roll call the other day. The House had a good attendance and I see no reason why we should go on with this, we could be here until next September. Now I consider the item settled and let's go on from here with the new items.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, when the motion to reconsider is taken, I ask for a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Limerick, Mr. Rowe, that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it failed to pass Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing

the Tenure of Office of the Governor to Four-Year Terms and a roll call vote has been requested.

Will those who desire a roll call vote please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously more than one-fifth having expressed a desire for a roll call vote a roll call is ordered. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, but must remind the gentleman that debate is not in order.

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, point of information, on a motion to reconsider, may I ask whether it is a majority or two-thirds?

The SPEAKER: A motion to reconsider requires a simple majority. The Chair will restate the question.

The question before the House is that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it failed to pass the Constitutional Amendment Changing the Tenure of Office of the Governor to Four-Year Terms. The House will please be in order. Those who favor reconsidering the action of yesterday will please say "yes" when their name is called. Those who oppose the motion to reconsider will please say "no". The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Andrews, Babineau, Baird, Bartlett, Bean, Winterport; Beane, Augusta; Beyer, Blanchard, Bragdon, Brewer, Brockway, Broderick, Brown, Ellsworth; Bruce, Carey, Carter, Newport; Carville, Caswell, Childs, Christie, Cole, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Bath; Coyne, Cyr, Davis, Westbrook; Denbow, Desmarais, Dostie, Dumais, Duquette, Earles, Edgerly, Edwards, Elwell, Emmons, Ervin, Farmer, Frazier, Frost, Fuller, Gallant, Graves, Hancock, Hanson, Harriman, Harrington, Harris, Hatch, Hathaway, Heald, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hersey, Hickey, Hilton, Jack, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Jones, Karkos, Knapp, Latno, Leathers, Letourneau, Mann, Maxwell, Maynard, Miller, Nadeau, Nedham, Pierce, Plante, Porell, Prue, Quinn, Rancourt, Rankin, Rollins, Ross, Bath; Ross, Brownville; Rowe, Limerick; Rowe, Madawaska; Roy, Saunders, Shaw, Shepard, Smith, Falmouth; Smith, Portland; Stanley,

Stilphen, Storm, Tevanian, Thackeray, Totman, Vaughan, Wade, Walker, Walsh, Walter, Warren, Wheaton, Whiting, Winchenpaw.

NAY — Allen, Besse, Brewster, Burnham, Call, Carter, Etna; Crockett, Curtis, Dudley, Emerson, Flynn, Foss, Hatfield, Haughn, Hughes, Hutchinson, Jewell, LaCasce, Libby, Lindsay, Mathieson, Morrill, Rich, Roberts, Sanborn, Tarbox, Turner, Webber, Wood.

ABSENT—Anthoine, Browne, Bangor; Couture, Lewiston; Davis, Calais; Day, Emery, Hanscomb, Higgins, Hoyt, Kelly, Kinch, Lane, Morway, Violette, Williams.

Yes: 106, No: 29, Absent: 15.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and six having voted yes, twenty-nine no, and fifteen absent, the motion to reconsider does prevail. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I now move that this Resolve be finally passed and I request another roll call.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Tenure of Office of the Governor to Four-Year Terms be finally passed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker I surely don't want to throw any monkey wrenches in the machinery. This thing has happened so fast, I think it would be—it might not change the vote on anything—but I think it would be well if we could table it for a little while, and I so move that this be tabled and taken up later.

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, that this Resolve be tabled and specially assigned for later in the day, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that the Resolve be finally passed.

Will those who favor the motion to table please say aye, those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn until one o'clock.
(Cries of "no")

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. The gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, has moved adjournment. Will those who favor the motion to adjourn please say aye, those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Yesterday when the vote was taken on a four year term for Governor, when it came to final passage, I voted "no". Yesterday I voted my convictions what I thought was for the best interests of the people of the State of Maine. Today I shall vote "yes" on the matter, and the reason I shall vote "yes" today is that I shall give the people of this state an opportunity to vote on the measure. I certainly am not an obstructionist, and I know that many members of the Republican party yesterday who voted "no" on this matter are not obstructionists. We voted our convictions, we did not vote as a solid block, we voted as each and every one thought was right for the people of the State of Maine. I shall do everything in my power when this goes before the people if we pass it today to defeat this measure on referendum, because I still am of the opinion that it is not for the best interests of the State of Maine. But I think it is time, if there is this swell for it, this so-called desire to vote on it, let the people vote on it once and for all, and I hope they give it a sound licking at the polls.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, I think my brother, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, should be commended on his stand, and I am happy to see that his ear is finally tuned to the cry of the people.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Tenure of Office of the Governor to Four-Year Terms shall be finally passed. A roll call has been requested. Will those who desire a roll call please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously more than one-fifth having expressed a desire for a roll call, it is so ordered.

The motion is that the House finally pass Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Tenure of Office of the Governor to Four-Year Terms, House Paper 157, Legislative Document 204. Those who favor the final passage of this Resolve will say "yes" when their name is called. Those who oppose its final passage will say "no". The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Andrews, Babineau, Baird, Bartlett, Bean, Winterport; Beane, Augusta; Beyer, Bragdon, Brewer, Broderick, Brown, Ellsworth; Bruce, Carey, Carter, Etna; Carville, Caswell, Childs, Christie, Cole, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Bath; Coyne, Cyr, Davis, Westbrook; Denbow, Desmarais, Dostie, Dudley, Dumais, Duquette, Earles, Edwards, Elwell, Emmons, Ervin, Farmer, Frazier, Frost, Fuller, Gallant, Graves, Hancock, Hanson, Harriman, Harrington, Harris, Hatch, Heald, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hersey, Hickey, Hilton, Hughes, Jack, Jacques, Jalburt, Johnson, Jones, Karkos, Knapp, LaCasce, Latno, Leathers, Letourneau, Libby, Mann, Maynard, Miller, Nadeau, Needham, Pierce, Plante, Porell, Prue, Rancourt, Rankin, Rollins, Ross, Bath; Ross, Brownville; Rowe, Limerick; Rowe, Madawaska; Roy, Saunders, Shaw, Shepard, Smith, Falmouth; Smith, Portland; Stanley, Stilphen, Storm, Tevanian, Thackeray, Totman, Vaughan, Wade, Walsh, Walter, Warren, Wheaton, Whiting, Winchenpaw, Speaker.

NAY: Allen, Besse, Blanchard, Brewster, Brockway, Burnham, Call, Carter, Newport; Crockett, Curtis,

Edgerly, Emerson, Flynn, Foss, Hatfield, Hathaway, Haughn, Hutchinson, Jewell, Lindsay, Mathieson, Maxwell, Morrill, Quinn, Rich, Roberts, Sanborn, Tarbox, Turner, Walker, Webber, Wood.

ABSENT: Anthoine, Browne, Bangor; Couture, Lewiston; Davis, Calais; Day, Emery, Hanscomb, Higgins, Hoyt, Kelly, Kinch, Lane, Morway, Violette, Williams.

Yes: 104. No: 32. Absent: 15.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and four having voted in the affirmative and thirty-two having voted in the negative, with fifteen absentees, the motion for final passage of the Resolve does prevail since it has acquired the necessary two-thirds.

Thereupon, the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the Clerk has in his possession an amendment to the Constitution in relation to the change of election date.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that that document is in the possession of the House.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I now move we reconsider our action whereby this measure failed final passage yesterday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Date of the General Election, House Paper 66, Legislative Document 93, failed of passage. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In the interest of saving time, I see no reason for calling for a roll call vote on reconsideration. I shall if it passes, move for a roll call on the final vote, and I move when we vote on the reconsideration motion we vote by division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Date of the General Election failed of passage. A division has been requested. Will those who favor reconsidering the action of yesterday please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred and one having voted in the affirmative and twenty-six having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider prevailed.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I move this Resolve receive final passage, and when the vote is taken I move that it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. Is the House ready for the question? Will those who favor a vote by roll call, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously more than one-fifth having expressed a desire for a roll call a roll call is ordered.

The Chair will restate the question. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Date of the General Election" be finally passed. Those who favor the final passage of this Resolve will say "yes" when their name is called. Those who oppose the final passage will say "no". The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Andrews, Babineau, Baird, Bartlett, Bean, Winterport; Beane, Augusta; Beyer, Blanchard, Bragdon, Broderick, Brown, Ellsworth; Browne, Bangor; Bruce, Carey, Carter, Etna; Carville, Caswell, Childs, Christie, Cole, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Bath; Coyne, Cyr, Davis, Westbrook; Denbow, Desmarais, Dostie, Dudley, Dumais, Duquette, Earles,

Edwards, Elwell, Emery, Emmons, Ervin, Farmer, Frazier, Frost, Fuller, Gallant, Graves, Hancock, Hanson, Harriman, Harrington, Harris, Hatch, Heald, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hersey, Hickey, Higgins, Hilton, Hughes, Jack, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Jones, Karkos, Kelly, Knapp, LaCasce, Latno, Leathers, Letourneau, Mann, Mathieson, Maxwell, Maynard, Miller, Nadeau, Needham, Pierce, Plante, Porell, Prue, Rancourt, Rankin, Rollins, Ross, Bath, Ross, Brownville; Rowe, Limerick; Rowe, Madawaska; Roy, Saunders, Shaw, Shepard, Smith, Falmouth; Smith, Portland; Stanley, Stilphen, Storm, Tevanian, Thackeray, T o t m a n, Vaughan, Wade, Walker, Walsh, Walter, Warren, Wheaton, Whiting, Winchenpaw, Speaker.

NAY — Allen, Besse, Brewer, Brewster, Brockway, Burnham, Call, Carter, Newport; Crockett, Curtis, Edgerly, Emerson, Flynn, Foss, Hatfield, Hathaway, Haughn, Hutchinson, Jewell, Lindsay, Morrill, Quinn, Rich, Roberts, Sanborn, Tarbox, Turner, Webber, Wood.

ABSENT — Anthoine, Couture, Lewiston; Davis, Calais; Day, Hanscomb, Hoyt, Kinch, Lane, Libby, Morway, Violette, Williams.

Yes: 110, No: 29, Absent: 12.

The **SPEAKER**: One hundred and ten having voted in the affirmative, twenty-nine having voted in the negative, with twelve absentees, the Resolve is finally passed.

Thereupon, the Resolve was signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

(Off record notices)

On motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman,

Recessed until two o'clock in the afternoon.

After Recess
2:00 p.m.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The House is proceeding under third readers beginning with item eleven.

Amended Bills

Third Reader

Indefinitely Postponed

Bill "An Act relating to Requisites for Old Age Assistance" (H. P. 83) (L. D. 109)

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

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Shemman, Mr. Storm.

Mr. **STORM**: Mr. Speaker, I move indefinite postponement of this bill and its accompanying papers.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Gallant.

Mr. **GALLANT**: Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I would request a division on that motion.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm, that item eleven, Bill "An Act relating to Requisites for Old Age Assistance" be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested. Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. **CHILDS**: Mr. Speaker, would a member of the Committee let the House know what the price tag is on this matter and whether it is in the supplemental budget and so forth?

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, has addressed a question through the Chair to—the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sumner, Mr. Cole.

Mr. **COLE**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill with this amendment runs into about \$175,000 per year, and before this amendment was put on the bill, we couldn't get an estimate from the Health and Welfare Department because it was so outrageous. But with this amendment it is in the neighborhood of \$175,000 to \$200,000 a year.

The **SPEAKER**: Does that answer the gentleman's question? Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm, that Bill "An Act relating to Requisites for Old Age Assistance" be indefinitely postponed.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of this bill and

its accompanying papers please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-two having voted in the affirmative and forty-seven having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed, the Bill was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

Bill "An Act relating to Property Tax Exemption for Benevolent and Charitable Institutions" (H. P. 1036) (L. D. 1467)

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

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act Authorizing a Motor Vehicle for Driver Education (S. P. 434) (L. D. 1231)

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. 127 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.

Finally Passed Emergency Measure

Resolve relating to Construction of a Road and Terminal in City of Rockland (H. P. 587) (L. D. 836)

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. 132 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted Enactor Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Salary of Official Court Reporters (S. P. 40) (L. D. 55)

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

(On motion of Mr. Bean of Winterport, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 22.)

An Act to Reactivate the State Committee on Educational Television (S. P. 165) (L. D. 444)

An Act relating to Reciprocal Provisions for Penalties on Insurance Companies (S. P. 177) (L. D. 456)

An Act relating to Hydrologic Surveys (S. P. 291) (L. D. 790)

An Act relating to Advance Educational Subsidy Payments (S. P. 380) (L. D. 1076)

An Act relating to Operation of Diesel or Diesel-Electric Locomotives in Reverse (S. P. 389) (L. D. 1085)

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

Enactor Indefinitely Postponed

An Act relating to Examinations for Certain Persons to Practice Barbering (S. P. 539) (L. D. 1511)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT: Mr. Speaker, is a motion to indefinitely postpone this bill in order?

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is.

Mr. BARTLETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move the indefinite postponement of Item 9 "An Act relating to Examinations for Certain Persons to Practice Barbering", L. D. 1511, and I may have something to say about this later.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed now.

Mr. BARTLETT: Mr. Speaker, last week ago Wednesday the eighth of May, this bill came before the House and it was indefinitely postponed by a division vote of 83 to 32. Since then this measure has bounced around like a chicken with its head cut off. I won't attempt to detail the various actions that have taken place, but to say that on Monday

the thirteenth, while I was absent from this House on legislative business, the bill was recalled from its way to the Senate and after some preliminary action the motion was made to recede and this bill was then passed to be engrossed in concurrence. I wish to state now that I haven't changed my mind as to the merits of this bill, and I hope you the members of this House who voted with me to indefinitely postpone haven't either. Thank you.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I was opposed to this bill on its merits alone because I didn't think it did any good to anybody except it fenced in perhaps some barbers who were not to particularly interested in being fenced in from those that I contacted, and since this has been here, just the other day we voted not to fence in the brokers of this state, the real estate brokers. I am not a barber, never expect to be, but I am a broker and I don't believe, although I belong to all the organizations even the national one, of brokers, I was not in favor of fencing them in. I think that if a man wants to become a broker, he shouldn't have to come and work in my office for a year before he has a chance to take the examination as I have, and for much the same reason I am opposed to this bill because it just simply fences them in and says that a barber must practice a thousand hours out of every three years or has to take another examination. Now if this barber could take the examination when the time is up without waiting six months, I would not be opposed to it, but his time might run out in February and he'd have to wait until the next June before he could do any barbering. I don't see how this is going to be any help to anybody because in our small towns we do have people who are working at other things, but who more for accommodation for the people, do barbering perhaps a few hours each week. I want to go along with the indefinite postponement of this bill because I do not think it is of any value to the barbers or anyone else.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Carthage, Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Speaker and Members: I would like to support the motion of the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Bartlett, to indefinitely postpone this bill.

In the first place this Act would, if passed, either deprive many hundreds of the citizens of this state who live in the small towns and the rural areas of the service of any barber, or it would force the barbers in these areas to keep false records, or operate under cover and illegally.

In the second place it is, because of its absurd and impractical requirements of a specific minimum number of hours spent in actual barbering, absolutely unenforceable from my point of view, without a policing force of impossible proportions. To attain the minimum one thousand hours of required service, would a barber have to just count the exact time he was snipping away at our hair or would he be entitled to count the twelve or fourteen hours each day during which he might keep his door unlocked and be available to a customer?

This bill is without merit, is unenforceable, is discriminatory against many older, often infirm and needy citizens. I have had several letters from small town barbers in my area protesting against this proposed threat to their livelihood, as I am sure many of you have.

I hope we concur in this motion and I ask a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp.

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As Chairman of the Public Health Committee from the House, I would like to say that we had a hearing on that bill. It was very well attended, and it came out of our Committee majority "Ought to pass." I checked up on some of the small town barbers and they certainly thought it was all right, and I hope the motion of the other three gentlemen does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Let's break this bill down to what the real meaning of the bill is. It seems to me in reply to the gentlemen who raised a question at least in my mind, I think they have in others, how much will this hurt the small town barber? I say it will hurt them none, because any man who has to practice barbering no more than an hour a day which this bill when you break it down per day pertains, should not be in the barbering business. Secondly, I want to agree with my colleague the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp, this is a sanitation and health measure along with that, and I have checked in my own town, surrounding towns which are strictly rural areas, and I would never do anything to hurt those small town barbers because they certainly need all the work they can get, and if I thought for one moment it would hurt them, at least my constituents from small town areas, I would not be for this bill, but the way it's been described here to you that this is a menace to the barbering industry, I say it is not. When you read the bill over carefully and you see the purpose of the Bill from a sanitation and health viewpoint, I do not believe you will disagree. This bill, it seems to me, is a little mixed up and misunderstood too in this House. We have reconsidered this bill twice in this body. We have receded and concurred. We have asked for a Committee of Conference. There have been many misstatements made regarding this bill, and you will recall the other day that your Committee who was appointed to this Committee of Conference resigned in a body, through a misunderstanding, and I think the whole thing in general is misunderstood, but as far as moving the indefinite postponement of this bill, I hope it will not prevail because if you are interested in going to a barber shop, whether it be small or large, without hurting the small barber, and have sanitation, then I know that you will uphold this bill, and I certainly hope the motion does not prevail for indefinite postponement.

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

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker, I will say again as I said some time ago, probably last week, that about seven hundred cards were sent out to barbers all over the state and a return card was supposed to be sent back voting in favor or opposed to this bill. About three hundred and fifty cards came back and the barbers were in favor of the bill. Forty-five said they were opposed to it, so I think that is evidence enough that the barbers are in favor of the bill. I hope the indefinite postponement does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Baldwin, Mr. Sanborn.

Mr. SANBORN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I received a letter from a party of barbers as I imagine many of you here have done, and I would like to read a paragraph or two from it: "I know for a fact that barbers, no matter how long they have been out of the profession, they do not lose the technique of doing their work, and, by getting this bill passed, it will cause them a lot of inconvenience and expense every three years, to get their license. I think that if each year, when a barber applies for this license, the board would send him a list of changes, if any, in sanitation requirements made during the year, this would eliminate his having to take a new examination." Now, here's another paragraph I would like to read to you which I do not like.

"As a result of my opposing this bill, I was relieved of my barbering job. Evidently, a man who works for any employer today, has no freedom of speech or thought. If he doesn't think and talk like his boss, he's out. I had a feeling this would happen, but, I'm glad I did it just the same. Life is too short today to sell your body and soul to your employer; therefore, I would do this again no matter who I worked for, even if this was my only source of income." Ladies and gentlemen, if we do not postpone this bill, we're voting to suppress freedom of speech.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lovell, Mrs. Harriman.

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have in the town of Waterford a man who has only one hand. He has an artificial hand. This man is a barber. He has a shop in the corner of his home. It is immaculate and is kept very, very neat. This man does barbering evenings when the local men around are through work. He goes in there, and he charges the regular price. At a thousand hours a year, this would approximately be three hours a day. This man does not have that amount of business. This bill would put him out of business. He is not a wealthy man. He does this barbering to supplement his income and help support himself and his wife. I, therefore, hope that the motion of the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Bartlett, prevails.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just for the record, this is one thousand hours for three years. This would be an average of a little less than an hour a day.

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

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate that a barber got fired because he spoke against the bill. As I said before I think it's very unfortunate, but at the same time I don't think that this has anything to do with the merits of the bill because a man got fired. I don't think that's any argument at all. Another thing I would like to say about the bill, it was sent to the Public Health Committee because it is a measure for public health. The way it is now, a barber can stay out of practice for twenty years, and he can send in his \$3.00 a year and get his license through the mail, and in the meantime nobody knows whether that barber has become an alcoholic or has the shaking palsy or open sores or anything else, and he could be practicing barbering and giving his disease to everybody, and it is a public health measure and I hope the motion does not prevail for indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we are getting away from the facts. The barbers are examined for sanitary each and every year and whether he's barbering and when he opens his barber shop he's going to have that inspection whether he's been barbering three hours a day or ten hours a day. He's going to be under the sanitary setup of the Health and Welfare Department.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't like to see us get into a lather about this situation. Twenty barbers from Aroostook County have asked me to help kill this bill and none have asked me to support it, so I will go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of information, doesn't the amendment state that this would apply only to towns of 25,000 or more, and wouldn't affect the country towns at all?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, addresses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he chooses. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT: Mr. Speaker, that amendment has never been accepted. The amendment has never been added to the bill. It was in case we had to use it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is informed that amendment was never adopted by the House. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard.

Mr. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the barbers in my area, of course, are for this bill. I was present at the hearing, and it seemed to have a very fair hearing and the bill came out "Ought to pass." Now, it seems that this amendment would take care of whatever opposition there is

so I propose the adoption of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentlemen's motion for adoption of the amendment is out of order at this time. For an amendment to be considered the House would have to recede from its previous action whereby it passed the bill to be engrossed. That would be the proper motion at this time.

Mr. MAYNARD: I so move.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to rule that the motion to indefinitely postpone has precedence over the motion to reconsider. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Browne.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think this matter has been well debated today and on other instances, and it may be a close shave, but I'm going to move for the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Browne, has moved the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain this motion the Chair must have the approval of one third of the members in the House. Will those who favor the Chair entertaining the previous question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously more than one third having expressed their approval, the question now before the House is shall the main question be put now. Will those who favor the main question being put now please say aye; those opposed, no.

The main question was ordered on a viva voce vote.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Bartlett, that the House indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act relating to Examinations for Certain Persons to Practice Barbering, Senate Paper 539, Legislative Document 1511. A division has been requested.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of this measure please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-two having voted in the affirmative and forty-five having voted in the negative, the motion pre-

vailed, the Bill was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would request of the Members of the House if they have any written speeches or any written memoranda of what they may say or have said during the day, it would be a big help to the single-handed reporter if the members would turn over to him those written memoranda or speeches.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present an Order out of order and under suspension of the rules, and move its passage.

Order Out of Order

WHEREAS, the House is informed of the birth of a son, May 15, 1957 to Richard M. Danforth and Mrs. Danforth, the former Jacqueline Hanson of Gardiner, this baby being the grandson of the Gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

AND WHEREAS, the Members of the House are much pleased and wish to extend their heartiest congratulations to all generations of the Hanson and Danforth families:

BE IT ORDERED, that the baby boy be named Kenneth Richard Danforth and that the Clerk of the House be directed to send to Mr. and Mrs. Richard M. Danforth and to give to Representative Hanson, engrossed copies of this Order.

The Order received passage.

An Act relating to Beneficial Devises, Bequests and Legacies to Subscribing Witnesses (S. P. 566) (L. D. 1567)

An Act relating to Taxation of Domestic Fowl (H. P. 190) (L. D. 253)

An Act to Reactivate a Maine Committee on Problems of the Mentally Retarded (H. P. 195) (L. D. 282)

An Act relating to Teachers for Mentally Retarded Children (H. P. 336) (L. D. 468)

An Act relating to Expenses of Members of State Liquor Commission (H. P. 695) (L. D. 1002)

An Act to Revise the Laws Relating to Vital Statistics (H. P. 774) (L. D. 1107)

An Act Revising Law Relating to Pharmacists (H. P. 951) (L. D. 1352)

An Act relating to Retirement of Members of Portland Police and Fire Department not under State Retirement System (H. P. 1057) (L. D. 1512)

Finally Passed

Resolve for Purchase of Copies of "Maine Province and Court Records, Volume IV" (S. P. 93) (L. D. 224)

Resolve Providing for Judicial Review of Certain Criminal Judgments (S. P. 257) (L. D. 695)

Resolve to Reimburse Town of Whiting, Washington County (S. P. 295) (L. D. 792)

Resolve Reimbursing Liquor Commission for Working Capital for Warehouse Construction (S. P. 361) (L. D. 984)

Resolve Appropriating Money for Preparation of Court Rules (S. P. 404) (L. D. 1137)

Resolve Authorizing Preparation and Sale of Index to Private and Special Laws (H. P. 62) (L. D. 91)

Resolve Reimbursing Certain Municipalities on Account of Property Tax Exemptions of Veterans (H. P. 99) (L. D. 142)

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Testing Tanks for State Sealer of Weights and Measures (H. P. 586) (L. D. 835)

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.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, out of order and under suspension of the rules I move that item three under today's Bills in the Third Reading items, which was tabled for later in the day now be taken up. It is Senate Paper 533, Legislative Document 1503, Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959."

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, moves that by unanimous consent and under suspension of the rules the

House now take from the table Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959." Does the Chair hear objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think it is well to make a comment that we have before us today four of the most important measures, I believe, that will affect Highway for the next biennium, and we might as well be perfectly frank, that there are many people who have different opinions on how our highway program should be decided. I can assure you I am not going to go into any speech because there are certainly members of the Highway Committee who are better versed to answer any questions and objections than I am.

However, I would like to make a brief comment on procedure. The other day the opponents to certain parts of this particular measure in front of us were cooperative in allowing this Bill to have its first two readings with the understanding that we would enter into serious debate on the third reading. We are now at that point. I understand an amendment has been prepared and will be offered to the Bill. And it has been suggested to best resolve the issue suggested and approved on both sides of the question that a roll call vote be taken on the final adoption or rejection of the amendment. I would therefore suggest that those who have had the amendments prepared present their amendment and that the issue be debated.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin.

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, is this the time to present the amendment or should the Bill have its third reading?

The SPEAKER: Presenting the amendment would be in order at this time.

Mr. ERVIN: I offer an amendment and I would like to speak briefly on it.

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

The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 533, L. D. 1503, Bill, "An Act to Make Allocations from the General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959."

Amend said Bill be inserting at the end thereof before the Emergency clause a new section to read as follows:

Sec. 3. Limitation. Under the provisions of this act or any act enacted by the 98th Legislature, whether submitted to the people of Maine on referendum or not, the income to the General Highway Fund shall be segregated, apportioned and expended, on the interstate highway system in Maine only north of Augusta for the fiscal years 1957-58 and 1958-59.'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin.

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, my remarks shall be brief, and I will try to stay with the subject and not vary off. I would like to read that amendment to you once more so that you will thoroughly understand the impact of it. Under the provisions of this Act or any Acts enacted by the 98th Legislature, whether submitted to the people of Maine on referendum or not, the incomes to the general highway fund shall be segregated, apportioned, and expended on the Interstate Highway System in Maine only north of Augusta for the fiscal years 1957-58 and 58-59.

In effect this amendment directs the State Highway Commission that it is the will of the 98th Legislature that they shall expend the revenues designated for the Federal Interstate Highway program on the road north of Augusta. This is very simple language, and I think it is thoroughly understood. It is quite apparent to me that on a proposition as large as the twenty-four million dollar bond issue which will come up a little later, that this legislature should have the right to de-

cide how this money shall be spent and where it shall be spent.

I would like to quote a short excerpt from a speech delivered by the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, under whose jurisdiction the Federal Bureau of Public Roads operates. The speech was made on April the 22nd, 1957 before the Municipal Bond Club in Boston. I quote: "I say to you categorically, that the Commerce Department will not build roads parallel to toll roads unless the toll road is full to complete capacity and that there is need of another road. It is not only wrong, but, it is immoral and everything else for the Federal Government to take any action that places in jeopardy, obligations that have been honestly and fairly entered into between the buyer and the seller, respecting toll road obligations." That is the end of the quotation.

I think the members of this legislature are fair people, and as fair people you will agree with these statements. But it is difficult for many of the people in Maine to reconcile the widely publicized Federal policies with what is apparently happening in this state.

Specifically, why is it necessary to designate and construct 50 miles of proposed new Interstate System between Portland and Augusta as a duplicate facility, when the Maine Turnpike, a toll highway, already built, meets the requirements.

Now, I do not believe that it is necessary for me to talk long or loud or lengthy. I think the issue is clear cut and it is understandable.

Mr. Speaker, I now move that this amendment receive passage, and when the vote is taken, I request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, that the House adopt House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to if I may, address a question to the sponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. BRODERICK: At present it is my understanding that they are to reconstruct so-called Turkey's Bridge at Portland, Maine, at the cost of some three million dollars which will come under this Federal Interstate Highway Program. My question is whether or not this amendment would stop that program of reconstruction on Tukey's Bridge?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Broderick, I guess you have caught me out in left field without a glove. As I understand this amendment, that all money that would be expended in the next two years on the State Highway Program would be used only north of Augusta, and I would say in answer to your question, that you would probably have no more building done in the southern part of the State for the next two years.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: That is what is wrong with this amendment. Actually there are a few people who are fighting and fighting quite hard to defeat any interstate construction of highways from Portland on to Augusta. I think those people, to some degree at least, although sincere, lack perhaps the foresight in what is involved here. The proposed highway construction is not being built for this year, or five years or ten years from now, but rather fifteen and twenty years from now, the needs that we may have at that time. If we do not take advantage of the Federal Interstate Highway Program today, I am sure in my mind at least, that five or ten years from now the State of Maine will be building that same road from their own funds entirely. That is all I have to say for now.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it has never been our intention, and I did not help draw up this amendment,

to exclude Portland from its, I can't think of the word they use, but to get on to the Turnpike, it should have that. The loop, the Portland loop, thank you, and it should have that if it is necessary, but it can be done very easily by tying it in with the Turnpike. Now, I don't think I am shortsighted. I don't think I'm not visionary. I think I have many connections over many years that have shown that I have a great deal of interest in the State of Maine. I never opposed the Turnpike, yet the Turnpike itself goes by my back door and hurts my business, if it hurts anybody's business. I have never felt that that was true, and if it were true, it is one of the things that we have to put up with because we do have to have progress, we do have to have roads. I also have perhaps another interest which some of you do not know, but my husband has been with a construction company for more than twenty-eight years, and my bread and butter depends on construction work, so I certainly am not opposed to roads. I was not opposed to this road at first because we were given to understand that it was a military road and it was necessary to get to the Brunswick Air Base and from thence on to Limestone.

After this furor came up, and I was very lukewarm to it because I have no desire to do anything to hurt the State of Maine, the ends did not begin to tie in very well and gradually after many hearings and many sittings in, we have now reached the point where we know this is not a military road. First I would like to read an excerpt of a letter from Sinclair Weeks to you, and after I finish I will send this down to the court reporter. "We believe, however, that the toll road will have sufficient capacity to serve through traffic between Portland and Gardiner for a considerable period. Consequently, the Bureau will not agree to participate in the completion of the Brunswick-Gardiner section of the Interstate System until the toll road in that region reaches its point of traffic saturation. Of course, under that circumstance, it is anticipated that completion of this link of the Interstate System would not in any way jeopardize the financing of the Maine

Turnpike." Now, that is an excerpt from Mr. Weeks, and this is a paragraph written to Sinclair Weeks by someone in my jurisdiction. "In your last paragraph you state," meaning this paragraph which I have just read to you, "The Bureau will not agree to participate in the completion of the Brunswick-Gardiner section of the Interstate System until the toll road in that region reaches its point of traffic saturation. The current average daily traffic count of the northern section of the Maine Turnpike is dependent on the area, from 2500 to 3000 cars. The Federal Bureau of Roads has informed us that its capacity" meaning the toll road "is from 25,000 to 50,000. With this highway currently at from 5 to 10 per cent of capacity, it becomes perfectly obvious, from your statement, that the highway from Brunswick to Gardiner will, in fact, not be built at all. But will be left dangling in mid air at Brunswick or, that the ultimate designation will be to follow the coast approximately along the present alignment of Rt. 1. Our Highway Commission is also planning to construct in the near future a section of this highway from Waterville. Now, assuming that it will be impossible to build the highway from Brunswick to Gardiner, as you infer, how is the Waterville section going to be connected to the Portland-Brunswick section? We have an obvious dilemma. Either we are going to have to designate the Maine Turnpike all the way to Augusta and then build north from Augusta, or we are going to have to abandon, as Interstate, the Waterville section, and build from Brunswick down the coast. Of course, this is predicated upon my understanding that this must be a continuous system. Assuming that the intention actually is to build the Brunswick to Gardiner section, it must, certainly, be agreed that under the conditions you have outlined it cannot be done in the thirteen year period. How can such a policy be justified in line with the stated intent by the Congress to simultaneously complete the different sections of this Interstate System to the end of the thirteen year period?"

Now, the problem is this. You are either going down to Brunswick and

stop there which just seems inevitable. You can't, in some way if this is to be its Interstate System, it has got to go across the State of Maine. If you cannot build from Brunswick to Gardiner for thirteen years at least or longer, then it is a bottleneck. I think any of us who are interested in the State of Maine will agree that if I were in New York, or if you were in New York or Boston, the farthest distance we'd probably wish to go in Maine in a hurry is to Bangor. We might not go that far, but that is the ultimate. After that a good two lane road would take us anywhere we wanted to go. I would like to point out to you that if we spend this twenty-four million dollars in a bond issue, we do not know how we are going to finance our roads at the end of the next four-year period. No one knows it. It has been so stated repeatedly that a new program of some kind will have to be worked out because at that time we will have two bond issues on our hands. Now, I ask you if it is being shortsighted to feel that at the end of that four-year period we should have a good through road from Portsmouth to Bangor or if we should have what we presently have, a turnpike to Augusta. A loop around Waterville, a loop around Bangor and a dead end ending at Brunswick with another road built to turnpike specifications, all completed for four lanes except for the two lanes on which land has been taken by right of eminent domain from Portland to Brunswick. It just doesn't seem sensible. I would feel exactly the same if I did not represent Falmouth, which I do.

The two lanes from Portland to Yarmouth should be completed, and this is the reason why. It is not clearly understood, but remember this, that the traffic count as given by the Highway Commission is broken down into three sections between Portland and Cousin's River, and the first count that we have is from Martin's Point bridge to the spur, and there the count is the heaviest of all. It drops down after that and I am not going to bother with those figures, they are on the record, but it is now around nine thousand a day, a little better. I am giving round figures, and it is estimated that in 1975 it will go to 14,300 and

the latest figures he gave us was 17,000 plus. Then I want to point out to you that if it were through traffic that we're calling this, it would not be that section that was so badly congested because the spur already goes around that section, and any through traffic going up the turnpike and going up to Brunswick would not be in that section. It would take the spur and go to the end of the spur, but remember the heavy congestion is backward from the spur back toward Portland, but, however, with these two lanes added we should not have trouble, but I think they will have to be added within two or three years at the most to take care of the natural flow from Portland outside, and I think we are all familiar with any city the congestion night and morning that we get. And, I myself, feel that this amendment would have to be changed so that Portland could have its loop. Now Portland's loop comes up around through East Deering anyway, that is the way it is set up, and then it ties in with the new route there in the vicinity of Martin's Point bridge but it could just as well come back down Washington Avenue and tie in to the turnpike. There's absolutely no reason why it couldn't. There is not as much building there as there is where it is already laid out to go. The simple fact is that the engineers never considered anything else. And as we have gone into this, I try to feel out why they did do as they did, but we know that if we go back to the 1944 Act, when the first Act was laid out for a defense road, then points were picked. There was no money involved, but points were selected across the state, and the points selected were Kittery, Portland, Brunswick, Augusta, Bangor and on up. I think you and I would have selected those points at that time because whether it was feasible or not to cross the city rather than by-passing it to Lewiston, I think most people were doing it. I wasn't, but there were many who were, so I think we would have selected those routes. Also this loop has been in the making for a great many years, and with those points already selected, it was a natural, you see, when they just looked at

the paper apparently to go ahead with this thing. Apparently, they did not take into consideration the turnpike. We are told that there was some background work there to build public roads, before the time of this Commission so that Lewiston should have been designated in the first place.

I assure you that I am not against the bond issue. I am not against roads. I am very much interested in them, but it does seem a pity that we should waste this much money in that section, and you must bear in mind that you will have ten lanes in twenty-two hundred feet, that you already have a road out there that was built to control access specifications as we knew them before 1956 except for these two lanes, and I do think that we will have to make some move later on so that we can get that loop in Portland because we certainly should have that in it.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: One thing I would like to point out. The reason that this Interstate Highway is laid out from Portland on through Brunswick is quite obvious. The Federal Government is putting up 90 per cent of these funds you must remember, the state 10. I imagine it's going through Brunswick for the reason of picking up the Brunswick Air Base. It has to be that way. I would like to move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We are speaking about a highway system that extends lengthwise through the state. It doesn't go clear to Fort Kent but it is aimed at Houlton for the present time. I would submit to you that the most dangerous part of this highway, and the part that needs the most immediate attention and the weakest link in this lengthwise system is

that part of the highway that goes between Bangor and Augusta, and I certainly feel that to do the most good for the state that we should spend the next two or three years in establishing that as a safer link and a more convenient link in our lengthwise highway system so I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, does not prevail.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, referred to Tukey Bridge and I am trying to identify Tukey Bridge on the sketch that I have before me. Is that the bridge that goes over the Fore River?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, may answer if he chooses.

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman know where the Marine Hospital is in Portland?

Mr. QUINN: Would that be what they call the Presumpscot Bay?

Mr. BRODERICK: The Back Bay area, beyond.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, now I would like to speak in opposition to the motion to postpone the adoption of the amendment. As I understand the present highway program, the Highway Department intends to build, to reconstruct and build that dual highway, Route 1, from Portland to Brunswick irrespective of this federal interstate non-access highway, and if that is the program and if they do that, it would appear to me that that dual highway, Route 1, between Portland and Brunswick will take care of the traffic in that area for many years into the future. It does seem to me at this time to be a waste of these highway funds that are so hard and so difficult to obtain to build another highway between Route 1 and the turnpike as far as Brunswick this year and then wait until the turnpike is paid before it's continued further north. It would seem to me much more practical if the highway was extended

from Augusta north where we need a highway, an interstate highway, a limited through way, and if we did construct it from Augusta north as this amendment would require, we would hasten the paying off of the obligation on the turnpike because we would give the users of the turnpike a continuous highway north, and I think that program ought to be completed and have that paid off before the through way is built between Portland and Gardiner.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin.

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one point clear. This amendment affects only 90-10 money. Your other federal road program 50-50 would not be affected by this amendment. This is only for the 90-10 money to be used for the Interstate Highway System.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Figures of traffic count, in part, were given to us. Speaking generally on the whole program, I presented a measure asking monies to make a survey as to whether or not our area should or should not have a badly needed third bridge. A few years ago that same measure was introduced. The Highway Department after making a survey on their own decided a third bridge was needed, the location, after the measure was approved by both branches and signed by the Governor, calling for a two and a half million dollar bond issue, it seemed that the location was not proper, it could well be that the two and a half million dollars should the bond issue pass, would be money badly spent. I worked very diligently with the former representative from Auburn, Mr. Leslie Jacobs, for the measure. When that was shown to us, we in our area, immediately reversed our stand and asked the people to vote for the Bangor-Brewer bond issue, but not to vote for ours. At this session I reintroduced the measure, the Highway Department saw fit in their good judgment to turn it down. I accepted the report of the Committee and that was it. The words

"designated routes" have been mentioned. We in our area have consistently voted for bond issues. I voted for one previously a few years ago. I intend to vote for this one. We are certainly aware that this involves 90/10 money which swings around Brunswick because bearing in mind that the Lewiston and Portland Road separates the two largest cities in the state. We also are certainly very much aware of the fact that we are very definitely forgotten people in our area in so far as roads are concerned and one would only have to look at the accelerated program for the next two years and one would only have to look at what this proposed program is and is going to be.

When we stay here and, I remind myself of the words of Representative Quinn a few weeks ago, "Are we representing ourselves or are we representing our state?" I could stand here for two hours and toss figures around, and true figures to prove that our area is, has been, and apparently will be forgotten area. When we cannot get a few thousand dollars to make a survey after counts show that twenty-four, twenty-five thousand cars a day go over a bridge, I think it's somewhat conclusive proof that we are forgotten people. I, for one, am elected to represent my city. The State of Maine as far as I'm concerned, on an overall program comes first. I am not looking for pickings. If I did, it wouldn't do me any good anyway. If it wasn't for the fact that the money that we saved this morning is going to be tossed back into the general fund, I'd say let's use the money we'll save on these extra elections and use it to at least tar and place a little asphalt on some of our roads.

Again I reiterate I'm not here to represent special interests, to hurt the State of Maine program, even though it might step on the pet corn of the city I represent. I shall vote against this amendment. I shall vote against the next one. I shall vote for the bond issue, stand up to be counted. I shall vote to raise the registration fees of cars, the license fees, and I don't expect anything but better and progress for my state.

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, coming from the Town of Brunswick, I find myself somewhat in a position between a barrel of TNT and a stick of dynamite. It has been suggested here that the turnpike from Portland to Augusta be designated as the Interstate System. I think it should be pointed out to the people here in the legislature that the mere fact that you designate a road a part of the Interstate System or part of a federal primary or federal secondary or state aid road or any other designation you may wish to attach to it, it isn't going to mean it's going to take care of the traffic that was to go through some towns that are elsewhere located. Roads are built to take care of traffic. It doesn't make any difference whether this section of road was built on private individual funds or whether it was built 90-10, 50-50, 40-60 or any other sort of division you want to make. The traffic count in that area still demands a four lane, divided, controlled access highway. It has been statistically proven all over the United States that accidents are decreased by the rate of sixty-six and two thirds per cent on controlled, divided highways. Brunswick lies right in between the Portland area and the mid-coast route one section. Should we not look at the economy of the mid-coast route one section? Aren't those people down there too a part of the State of Maine? Don't they too have a right to have good roads? I know this is the old song, the most important road in the world is the one that passes by your door. I know when we have to construct highways, some people are hurt and some people are helped. I also know that the traffic count between Portland and Yarmouth is such that it demands a four lane, controlled access highway regardless of whose funds, what funds or what federal funds you make. You must remember that the turnpike from Portland to Augusta breaks off to the north, route one, the present designated Interstate System breaks off to the east. And this part designated from Portland to Augusta of the Interstate System is in no way in God's little world going to take

care of that traffic between Portland and Yarmouth, and I think you should understand that. I still feel that the economy of the people of the whole state, I am certain the State of Maine is not divided into two sections. I will heartily and readily agree with those people who live north of Augusta, there is nothing I would like to see any more than they do, but I hope the day is not too far distant in the future when we will have it, a controlled access highway right straight down through the state. The concept of the whole Interstate System of the United States we must all remember is based on a military defense highway.

There is a large federal military installation in Brunswick, two of them, I beg the pardon of the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Jack, one of them is in Topsham, but that's merely across the river. Is the federal government going to spend millions and millions of dollars on two federal military installations and not have some sort of a high-speed controlled access highway that they can move into and out of those installations? I don't believe so. They're going to have it. They demand it. Wouldn't we be foolish to spend money doing something right now and in five years have to turn right around and rebuild? I am not saying this in defense of David Stevens. Put yourselves in David Stevens' shoes. How would you look as a Highway Commissioner if you did not build the kind of a road and the type of a road that the traffic demanded. That's what roads are built for. I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, for the indefinite postponement of this amendment prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, my good friend the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh and I are in agreement in many respects. We both want good roads. We both want a road across the state. We will both agree that there is a military installation at Brunswick, but I pose this question to the House, how are we going to service the Brunswick

Airport if we are only going to Brunswick with our controlled access road and stay there for thirteen years, and maybe beyond that because by the Highway Commission's own words, they cannot even go beyond Brunswick at the end of the thirteen year period unless authorized by the Bureau of Public Roads for the one fact that they will be in direct competition to the Maine Turnpike.

As for this traffic, as I pointed out to you, the thing that is not understood by all of you is this, and I wish you would listen carefully as I explain to you these lanes of traffic. If you are familiar with the southern end of the state at all, remember this. We now have four lanes of turnpike coming from Kittery to Portland. We have three lanes of the old Route 1 coming into Portland. That is seven lanes. We have another road that is being used a great deal which is Route 202 coming across from New Hampshire up through Sanford and coming in at Gray, not at Portland, at Gray tying in more or less with the turnpike or with route 100. The road is not by my door. I am on route 100 and the turnpike goes by my back door. I can see it all the time when I'm at home. Remember we have these seven lanes coming into Portland. The other two lanes come in at Gray that are coming in from New Hampshire.

Going out of Portland now, we have at the present time the old Route 1 which is now Route 88 which has two lanes. We have a new road built to turnpike specifications, built to controlled access specifications as we knew them before 1956, and that is a four lane road to Brunswick except for these two lanes that have not been finished. The land has been taken by eminent domain and in good faith it was built and, Mr. Stevens, or the Highway Commission I should say, has said that it was good until at least 1965. We have, that is four roads there and two old ones is six and the middle road which I really do not think is fair to count. However, it is a road used quite a lot, has two more lanes.

If we build four more lanes, we will then have four of the old, four of the new and two of the old 88 plus the middle road, ten lanes in

twenty-two hundred feet plus two more lanes that are usable. That's going out of Portland toward the north, toward the coast. We also have four lanes of turnpike coming north on the opposite side of Portland plus two lanes of the old Route 100, of which I am a resident, which gives us six or sixteen lanes and then we have three or two going into Sebago region all leaving Portland and only seven coming in. Now I ask you, if you think that the traffic congestion is going to be that bad from Portland out, not from Portland to Kittery. Then I want to point out to you again to refresh your memory that the heavy traffic count which has been given us by the Highway Commission is from Martin Point Bridge to the end of the Falmouth spur, so-called. Now the Falmouth spur, so-called, is opposite exit nine and takes the traffic from the turnpike over onto Route 1. Now the congestion is between the end of that and Portland. If the congestion congesting that bridge were caused by through traffic, they would be taking the spur, yet the traffic drops very rapidly from there into Cumberland. These are figures taken from the Highway Commission themselves. I did not evolve them I assure you, and while I am on my feet, I would like to explain to you where Tukey bridge is because I think you do not understand it. Over the years there has been proposed a loop for Portland, and the loop for Portland included a new bridge, that's Tukey's Bridge. The bridge I am talking about is Martin Point. If we build this loop in Portland, they will come across and replace that, and then instead of turning right or according to which direction you are going, but instead of going in one direction on to a new road in Falmouth, they would loop back and hit the turnpike in the vicinity of exit nine where the turnpike leaves to take the spur across in Falmouth. It might be in Falmouth or it might be in Portland, but they can have their loop. It is generally agreed and I believe has been agreed by many of them there that it is exactly as feasible. There would have to be some surveying done. We all know that, and so I say to you the fact that this loop was left out is un-

fortunate. I will, in a few minutes, present you with an amendment.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken twice to the question. I believe I must ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that the first time the gentleman spoke was to Mr. Ervin's motion. We are now talking to a new motion. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, as far as the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, mentioning this should be built from Augusta on, we here in the Legislature could build this highway in circles in Aroostook County if we so saw fit. The problem is the federal government would not subsidize it. Inasmuch as the federal government is putting up 90 per cent of these funds, they say it is going through Brunswick. That is the Interstate designation because they want to pick up that airport. Either we do it on this basis or we'll build our interstate highway on our own.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Speaking for myself, ever since we came down here I've heard so many figures and so many terms about different highway designations that I certainly am not going to throw any more out, and the few comments I will make will not be statistics, they will just be one or two points which I have checked in to for my own curiosity. It has been said, and I would like to speak to the question in front of us frankly which is, shall we or shall we not adopt this amendment. I am not going to take issue with the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, whether or not we should build a four lane road or another lane or another dual lane, I'll leave the technicalities up to her. She's doing an excellent job. I did settle one thing in my own mind though, I found out with this deluge of information which has been laid on our desks by various departments, Bureau of Public

Roads, that, will it save the tax payers money to do as people suggest fixing up the present road or how much more will it cost to build this new high speed expressway? I'll admit it's hard to believe but the cold facts are that it will save the taxpayers of Maine on construction, and don't let anyone misinterpret me and say that I'm not talking about later maintenance, but let's just talk about original construction, it will save the taxpayers of the State of Maine \$790,000.00 to build the nine miles that's so much in debate as the Federal Interstate road rather than building it under the present 50-50 standards. That was the main thing that made up my mind that I would not be wrong in voting for the program as it has presently been laid out by the Highway Commission.

The second point I think you ought to know about this amendment is this. I presume the advocates of the amendment are saying by prohibiting construction south of Augusta, you will transfer that money north of Augusta. I checked that point and I have yet to get from the Bureau of Public Roads any assurance that if we give up spending the money in the proposed area in Falmouth that we will not lose that mileage. There is no assurance that that money will be put north of Augusta as the opponents of this amendment, I think, are hoping. I would also like to speak as a resident who is not in the midst of the controversial area and confirm what the gentleman from Lewiston said, Mr. Jalbert, he certainly is losing out under this federal interstate program in the next two years. In the Portland area, the Augusta area and the Bangor area, there is going to be spent fairly nearly the same amount in those three areas. I am sorry to say Lewiston is not mentioned, he is right. So if anyone is trying to paint a picture, the next two years will see the Portland area benefiting. I repeat, Portland, Augusta and Bangor are going to split just about three ways this federal interstate money, and I would feel a little bit guilty to go along with the amendment and say if Bangor is going to get a third of the stake, I would vote for

the amendment and I want just a little bit more, but I repeat, if I did vote for the amendment there is no assurance that by killing the southern end of the state's share I would have it put up in Augusta or Bangor. There is no assurance.

I would like to close by reading just one short paragraph, very short, two lines. That's from the Wall Street Journal of this week. Coincidentally it happens to be on the new proposed Interstate Highway System, and I'll tell you why I'm reading this because if we pass this amendment, I have a suspicion we may lose this nine miles. We won't gain it—we will lose it. The Wall Street Journal says that "so far the forty-eight states have pinpointed the location". I'll skip the figures out of deference to the reporter, "in the nationwide system which totals forty-one thousand miles. The final thousand miles still hasn't been apportioned among the states although Colorado claims this addition was intended for it, other states in a fever for more mileage have put in applications totaling almost thirteen thousand miles. "We'll have our hands full picking out the thousand most vital miles without getting state officials and congressmen all het up," says one worried federal road planner.

So if we adopt this amendment and we relinquish the nine miles that are so controversial, I don't think we'll hang on to it. I suspect it will go back in the general fund. There's a very good chance some other state will get it. And someone may say well are you just spending money for the sake of hanging on to it. I am saying if you are going to build a road down in the area, and apparently people in the area agree that you do need a road. If it's going to save the state out of its pocket three quarters of a million, I don't think we are breaking faith with the people of the State of Maine to do it the cheapest way possible.

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

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, well maybe I'm confused, but as I have read this amendment I cannot see where it is attempting to dictate or to determine where the interstate highway is to go from Augusta,

south. I can't see that it has anything to do with designating either the old turnpike as part of the interstate highway or whether or not it will subsequently go from Augusta to Brunswick to Portland. As far as I can see it only says that for the moment let us spend our money on the federal interstate highway by commencing at Augusta and proceed north. I think that everyone is agreed that the interstate highway is to go across the state. I believe that the highway north from Augusta has been designated and is pretty well accepted by all parties concerned. The only question then is where along the route of this interstate highway system shall we first commence, and it does not attempt in any way to determine whether or not the interstate highway will eventually proceed from Augusta south through Brunswick to Portland or whether or not the turnpike will be subsequently determined as that portion of the interstate highway. I, therefore, cannot see any personal objection with it, and I oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp.

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker, our representative, the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, has quoted that there are less accidents on non-access highways. There are many super highways in other states which are not non-access highways, and according to statistics have very few fatalities. Our representative, the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, says his people from Lewiston are a forgotten people, and I would like to make the remark and be sure of it that if we build that interstate road from Portland to Brunswick, our territory will not be forgotten territory in years to come.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like now to present amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" and speak briefly to it.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, offers House Amendment "A" to House

Amendment "A" and moves its adoption.

The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 533, L. D. 1503, Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from the General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959,"

Amend said Amendment by adding at the end thereof before the period the following: 'except for construction of the so-called Portland Loop to tie in with the Maine Turnpike at or near Turnpike exit 9, so-called.'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that this loop was left out of the original amendment. I am told that it is essential to Portland to have this loop, and it has been generally agreed among our planning Boards, we have regional planning, that they feel the same. Our own planning board member does. Some of the different men have worked on this quite considerably. They have not, of course, been able to do surveys, but it is very reasonable that some of these men who are engineers, I have several engineers in my town who have been in the employ of the State Highway Commission, who are now with other construction companies, and they find that it looks very feasible, a certain route. However, we cannot tell the Highway Commission just how they will get back to the Falmouth spur there, so-called, at the entrance of exit nine.

While I am on my feet, I think I'd like to clear up a few of the figures of my good friend the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman. First I want to remind you when we talk of the completion of this, he says nine miles of road, I don't think there's quite that much, but I wouldn't be sure of the mileage, you will probably have to do that with 50/50 money because you will have this congestion trouble at the end of Martin Point bridge. You quote figures to me, but those are

the figures of the Highway Commission themselves, and the fact that they cannot be taken care of by a controlled access road shows in itself because of the fact that you already have a controlled spur there with a toll gate, at the end of the Falmouth spur and the traffic congestion is back toward Portland. That's where the high count is. The count drops off after the turnpike comes into that road. Remember that even with what the turnpike is spilling into No. 1 right there in Falmouth near the Cumberland line, the traffic count drops abruptly to what it is back on the new Route 1, so-called now, and we shall have to have those two lanes anyway, but if we are to consider that we would not build those, which is what my friend the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, said, remember it will cost \$2,500,000 of 50/50 money to repair that road, to build that road. Half of it would be borne by the Federal Government, making a million and a half that we would have to spend to complete this road. Now, with this road completed, you will have a good four lane, divided road with control points along it all the way to Brunswick built to the same specifications as the turnpike, and by their own figures good to at least 1965. It will have taken care of the Portland problem, and will also have taken care of going down further on the coast, but if you build the additional road, the extra four lanes, you will have added between \$7,500 and \$10,000 a mile maintenance cost all these years. Besides, let alone the business that you will have destroyed. We haven't even mentioned that, but just think of the maintenance cost that you have added and you have not solved your traffic problem.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, that House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" be adopted.

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope you will bear with me for just a moment. All of this study of this particular area started back in 1944 when the Federal Bureau of Public Roads Act

was passed in 1944. If my arithmetic is correct, that was some few years ago, but if we spend, seemingly to some members of this House, the lengthy time of discussing it here, it has nothing to do in comparison with matching the length of time that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, the present and past Highway Commissions have spent in studying this acute problem.

I want the people of Yarmouth and the people of Falmouth and the people of Cumberland to know that I'm not trying to be an obstructionist. I fully sympathize with your problems as I have told them personally. It's an acute problem and it's a difficult problem, and someone is going to be hurt. You just can't help it. We are talking about a four-year program when we speak of our bond issues, and so forth so that excludes any talk, I would say, or conversation or any discussion of a road from Brunswick through Gardiner. At the present time, there are bills nearing completion of that four lane, divided, controlled access highway from Brunswick to the Yarmouth town line. The reason I am opposed to the amendment is what are we going to do, to try and take care of the traffic even on the present location of the interstate system when they come off of this four-lane, divided, controlled access highway at the Yarmouth town line from there on into Portland. That's all I was trying to confine my remarks to. That's all I'm concerned with, and I again want to repeat to those people of Falmouth, Cumberland and Yarmouth, I am just as concerned over the situation as you are.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would remind the House that the pending question at the moment is the adoption of House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A".

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want you to bear with me. I didn't want to interject myself into this conversation because my head is just whirling with figures, but this whole thing is based on humanity. When I say humanity, I mean you

and me. I'm going back to what the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, said, in 1943, so I'm old enough to remember that year. I want you to visualize along with me. Suppose we had built Tukey's bridge before the last Congress took and passed this Federal Aid Program. Suppose we had the four-lane highway from Portland all the way through to Brunswick and it was completed. I wonder where then the Federal Highway Program would have begun. Would it have begun in Portland? Would it have been put on a different route? I want you to remember this too. Those people who are on the present Route 1, when they saw the construction of those four-lane highways starting from Yarmouth to Brunswick, they felt secure then that they could go ahead and invest their money, which they have done. I can see now five brand new motels there. Something that the Maine Publicity Bureau was crying for, just get rid of these one small cabin type motels. Let's put some money into this state. Come here and invest it, they did. They were looking ahead to the future feeling secure that that road was going to be there for theirs and generations to come. My constituents down home have cried to me and hollered to me, we are going to lose so much taxes. We feel just as interested as you about this 90/10 proposition and the 50/50. We feel right now that you've got adequate roads from Yarmouth to Brunswick.

I want you to bear in mind before I sit down, and keep this in mind, what about those people that have all got those motels, and particularly I want to mention, one concern that is spending in salaries alone in the Yarmouth area \$30,000 a year in salaries. Of course, if I lived in Houlton or if I lived around Fort Kent or if I live the other side of Bangor, it isn't going to affect me. No, but right in my own territory where they've got the money invested, it is going to hurt me. I just want you to keep that in mind before you go along with the indefinite postponement of these amendments.

The SPEAKER: Before recognizing the next speaker, the Chair

requests the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, to the rostrum for the purpose of presiding as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Cote assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem amid the applause of the House and Speaker Edgar retired from the Hall.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not wish to speak to the present question which is the adoption of the amendment, and I do not intend to say very many words on this subject. However, for some time I have wanted to reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, and compare his conception of a federal super highway with mine. I look upon this Federal Interstate System as a through corridor extending from one end of the State of Maine to the other, and as I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, it seemed to me that his argument was that it should be set up wholly on traffic count. Now, is a question that I ask him or ask you to ask yourselves, are you going to build a section in every city where traffic count warrants, and if so, how do you propose to connect those heavy traffic centers to make what I might think of as an interstate system running from one end of our state to another, which might be, all of these areas might easily connect with by the proper type of access roads? I am not asking for any reply. I am merely commenting on his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending question before the House is the adoption of House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I think possibly I might be able to answer the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, although I'm not an authority on highways, and I'm not certainly on the Highway Committee, and I might answer him, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in this manner, and strange-

ly enough, the answer centers around a story that the gentleman from Lewiston, now the Speaker, Mr. Cote, told me. It appears that a few years ago, he attended a political rally in Canada, and for some of you who have not attended those rallies, I assure you that no holds are barred. When they have these forums, both candidates must be in attendance and if you've got even an iota of a skeleton in your closet, the time for the evening is to duck, and duck quick. The story goes thusly. It seems that this candidate was very much in disfavor with a group of constituents in a certain part of his area, so to correct the situation which involved bridges, and I hope my friend the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, is listening, the gentleman candidate stated: "If it's bridges that's bothering you, we shall build bridges," to which a voice in the back of the hall hollered: "Bridges you clown, we haven't even got rivers." Well then, said the candidate: "We'll build rivers."

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the question of House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" submitted by the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith. Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, just so I'll know what I'm voting on because I know there's a roll call vote intended, am I to presume it would be in order to adopt this new amendment and then take the roll call on the major amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question is the adoption of House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A".

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, do I understand if we adopt House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" and let it go by voice vote, that we can then call a roll call on the amended amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tem: That is correct. The gentleman is correct.

The question is the adoption of House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A". All in favor signify by saying aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, as to indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A". The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, has requested a roll call. Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell.

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Highway Committee, I hate to see any misunderstandings in your mind when you vote on this particular issue. I would like to point out a couple of things which I have noticed in the discussion.

First, it is my understanding that if the bond issue passes that the section of road between Augusta and Waterville, or at least the largest part of that section of road, will be built under the Interstate Program in the next two years. Further that they have scheduled a section of road between Bangor and Orono. I gather from the discussions that that is not the understanding so far.

Further I would like to reiterate what the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, has already said. That is, our friends to the north who think that they would have more money if this amendment were to pass would probably find that they would actually have less. The question that is involved here is whether or not we shall reverse the program of the Highway Department for these next two years as it applies to the Interstate System. The one thing that disturbs me the most here is, when I see this House assuming the prerogatives of the highway engineers, the Highway Commission, the Highway Committee, in attempting or even considering to rewrite this multi-million dollar program in one afternoon. That the program is delicate and complicated is evidenced by the performance of the amendments themselves, when they unintentionally omit a three million dollar item, the Tukey bridge. I want to do the right thing in the program as much as anyone in this House, and I'll tell you I'm not ready on the basis of any evidence

that I have heard to accept this amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I dislike, I will not speak long, but I want to clear up one or two points that I think are not clear. We are not trying to lay out a road for the Highway Commission. In the first place, we only ask the Highway Commission, all of this is presumably laid out. We only ask, because of the great confusion, and I think you are all in agreement this afternoon that there is great confusion about the need of this road, the whole program, so we only ask them to defer building that section of the road for the next four years. You now have a bill before you to study the highway needs of this state, and I am sure that if that highway study group should still determine, and the need should exist in four years, that section of the road could be built just as well as it can in the next four years. We are not, any of us, going to suffer without it. We may suffer if we have it. It is not our desire to delay construction. It certainly can start in any section of that system across the state that the Highway Commission sees fit, and I have something else I wanted to say. I think there is misunderstanding on this point. Remember this, that any of this federal money can be picked up at any time within thirteen years. There's no such a thing as losing this money to any other state or anyone. Any amount of this money can be picked up at any point during the next thirteen years.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A roll call has been requested. Will all those desiring a roll call please stand and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously more than one-fifth of the members having arisen a roll call is ordered.

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act to Make Allocations from General Highway Fund for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959",

Senate Paper 533, Legislative Document 1503. All those in favor will answer yes when their name is called, those opposed will answer no. The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YE—Andrews, Babineau, Baird, Bartlett, Bean, Winterport; Beane, Augusta; Beyer, Blanchard, Broderick, Carey, Carter, Etna; Carter, Newport; Carville, Childs, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Bath; Couture, Lewiston; Coyne, Crockett, Cyr, Davis, Westbrook; Desmarais, Dostie, Dudley, Dumais, Duquette, Earles, Edgerly, Edwards, Elwell, Emmons, Fuller, Gallant, Graves, Hancock, Harris, Haughn, Heald, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hersey, Hickey, Higgins, Hilton, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Jones, Karkos, Kelly, Kinch, Letourneau, Libby, Mathieson, Maynard, Miller, Nadeau, Pierce, Plante, Porell, Prue, Rancourt, Rankin, Ross, Bath; Rowe, Madawaska; Roy, Saunders, Smith, Portland; Stilphen, Tevanian, Thackeray, Totman, Wade, Walsh, Warren, Wood.

NAY — Besse, Bragdon, Brewer, Brockway, Brown, Ellsworth; Browne, Bangor; Bruce, Burnham, Call, Caswell, Christie, Cole, Curtis, Emerson, Emery, Ervin, Farmer, Flynn, Foss, Frazier, Frost, Hanson, Harriman, Harrington, Hatch, Hatfield, Hathaway, Hughes, Hutchinson, Jack, Jewell, Knapp, LaCasce, Lane, Leathers, Lindsay, Maxwell, Morrill, Morway, Needham, Quinn, Rich, Roberts, Rollins, Ross, Brownville; Shaw, Shepard, Smith, Falmouth; Stanley, Storm, Tarbox, Turner, Vaughan, Walker, Walter, Webber, Wheaton, Whiting, Winchenpaw.

ABSENT—Allen, Anthoine, Brewster, Davis, Calais; Day, Denbow, Hanscomb, Hoyt, Latno, Mann, Rowe, Limerick; Sanborn, Violette, Williams, Speaker.

Yes: 77, No: 59, Absent: 15.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Morway, voted?

The SPEAKER pro tem: Mr. Morway, the gentleman from Fairfield, is recorded as having answered no.

Seventy-seven having voted in the affirmative, fifty-nine in the nega-

tive and fifteen absentees the motion prevails and House Amendment "A" is indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick

Mr. Broderick: Mr. Speaker, I now move to reconsider the action of the House in indefinitely postponing this Amendment, and I hope that you will vote against me.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, now moves that we reconsider our action whereby we indefinitely postponed House Amendment "A". Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

A viva voce vote being taken the Chair was in doubt and ordered a division.

The SPEAKER pro tem: All those who are in favor of reconsideration will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twelve having voted in the affirmative and one hundred and six in the negative the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

House at Ease

The Speaker assumed the Chair and called the House to order.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to thank the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, very much for his assistance. (Applause)

The suggestion has been made that rather than adjourning at five o'clock and coming back this evening that the House work until six o'clock and forget the evening session. (Applause)

The Chair gathers that that meets with the approval of the House, so we will work until six or as near to six as circumstances make it possible, and not come back this evening.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I now move under suspension of the rules by unanimous consent that we take up the second tabled item, item num-

ber four on page seven, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959", Senate Paper 541, Legislative Document 1520.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, requests or moves that by unanimous consent and under suspension of the rules item number four under third readers, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959", Senate Paper 541, Legislative Document 1520, now be removed from the table. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, if it is in order at this time I would like to present House Amendment "A" to L. D. 1520.

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

The Clerk will read House Amendment "A".

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 541, L. D. 1520, Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959."

Amend said Bill by inserting after the caption "CONTRIBUTIONS AND TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS" the following:

'To General Highway Fund
Highway bond retirement and interest

1957-58, 1,000,000; 1958-59, 1,000,000'

Further amend said Bill by correcting totals therein affected by the adoption of this Amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I first would like to state that I have always been very much opposed to touching any money in the general fund, but I have heard sev-

eral terms used as to the users of highways, and so forth, should pay for the construction of those highways, and I believe that there are approximately three and a half million dollars annually which is going into the general fund which is derived from the sales tax of cars, trucks, heavy equipment, trailers, and those are the vehicles that wear out our highways. I have heard it spoken many times by both parties, of economy, and I feel that the time has arrived when we must consider each and every citizen in our state when it comes to economy.

As it appears at the present time with the legislation that has been passed, without a doubt, the bill will come out of the Taxation Committee for the cent increase in the sales tax that it ought to pass. We have not acted upon that measure of yet, but we must have added revenue, especially for the so-called Jacobs or Sinclair bill. Now, on this two per cent sales tax, what the state is deriving from the sale of these vehicles, trailers and accessories is better than three and a half million dollars annually, and if the one cent increase should be added to the sales tax, it would give us better than five million dollars annually or better than ten million dollars biennially, plus if the economy remains the same or continues on practically the same level in the state, it could probably add from five to seven per cent to that sum. Also if the cent increase in the sales tax is passed, I believe it has been quoted that there would be approximately two million, three hundred thousand dollars which up to the present time has not been especially dedicated. So, therefore, that money would not in any way affect the general fund if it were not dedicated. This amendment allows for a million dollars annually for each of the two years, and the first year we know very well it would probably cost a very, very little, and presuming that the bond issue did pass, it would be very doubtful if it would cost a million dollars in 1958 and 1959, but any surplus from these monies would still be accrued and remain in the general fund. I believe sincerely that these are monies that are going into the general fund which definitely belong to the highways or the high-

way fund. I've heard the point argued many times that it was not, that it would be changing our tax structure. Probably that is true, but I believe as we continue on through life that many changes are made. We are talking of progress today, and I feel that the time has arrived when there should be a change. Therefore, without taking any more of your time, I move the acceptance of this amendment.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sorry to have to disagree with my friend the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, but I feel that this would establish a very dangerous precedent. I am willing to vote for a bond issue to build roads because I like good roads, but I think that it would establish a very dangerous precedent to dip into our general fund to build roads or to finance the bond issue. It's very easy to get money to build roads, but it is very difficult to get money for educational institutions and other institutions in the state, and when the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, says that there are three and a half million dollars going into the general fund annually, I think we've got a long ways to go before we will have any great surplus because we can spend a good many millions on our institutions before we will be up to standard. I want you all to realize that percentage of our per capita income, we are third in the nation as far as road building. We are forty-fifth from an educational standpoint. If we have some extra money, let's give it to the small towns for educational or tax relief. They could stand it. They're being pressed now to pay their teachers and to run their other institutions.

As I say, I am in favor of the roads, but I think it would be very dangerous to take general fund money. If we take a million this year, it would be very easy to come back two years from now and take two million or four million or even five million and our institutions certainly would suffer. I feel that the general fund should be left alone as far as road building is concerned. I feel that if we have money that we can

use that there is no better place to put it than right out in our small towns on our educational subsidies because every dollar that we send out there, we relieve the local tax burden. So, Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am for the bond issue, and I would remind my good friend the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, that we've got to sell it to the people, and I do not believe that we'd be able to sell it to the people by putting a \$1.00 fee on our drivers' license. There are about four hundred thousand of those people, and there are a great many who are not interested too much in state government. A good many who are working at just ordinary jobs and they feel that they are being picked on. I hear it from all sides now. What we must consider here, I believe, is that we are talking about a bond issue which is going to come along. I believe what the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, has had in mind is how we are going to take care of this situation. I think this is a much better way to take care of it. From the automobile is paid in a great deal of money. All of this gas tax and all of these license fees as you know is dedicated revenue and goes there. I feel that how you may take it out of the general fund when you take it out and say that the money that's paid for sales tax on these new automobiles or for tires, or the tax of oil or where ever it may be, you could say that this money was taken out of the general fund which now goes into the general fund to pay for these particular things, to pay for this road. I think the people would buy that, and they might buy this other thing, and as far as we dare not do these things here for fear the next legislature might not, that is we're not legislating for the next two years, I presume the next two years will have just as bright a bunch of people in here as we've got now, I think they always have had, and I think in their wisdom they'll do as they see fit and nothing that we do here as

a precedent I think will carry any weight at that time. I hope the movement does not prevail.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A few years ago the Fish and Game Department attempted to tap the general fund for two fish hatcheries and very nearly succeeded, at least in Committee, in doing it. It is my opinion that the Fish and Game Department wanted to go into the dedicated revenue project, and the commission was given to them by the mechanics that would have to be used. So far as the Highway is concerned, the Highway Department, I feel the same thing pertains there. I don't think it should be tapped piecemeal. I don't think it should be tapped now. Actually they are in a dedicated revenue mechanics and I think it should definitely remain there, and if we are to get out of the dedicated revenue business, so to speak, in so far as the Highway Department is concerned, it should be done in its entirety and not piecemeal, and that would go for any department that operates under dedicated revenue. In so far as setting a precedent, it's partly right, but it certainly would do one thing and that's to open the door wide open for any and all recurring and non-recurring items that come before us where they really belong within those departments who operate under dedicated revenue program.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just another thought. I well concur with many of the remarks that have been made by the gentlemen who spoke previously. I believe that we have, through the Sinclair Bill, set it up in such a way that many and practically all the municipalities or towns are going to receive much more money from the subsidies received under the educational program. I also believe that we will move from 45th up very rapidly as soon as this program can be put into operation. What bothers me is

the fact that if a tax once goes on it does not appear to come off. I am definitely opposed to raising our license fees, registrations, and so forth. At the last session of legislature, we had what they call patchwork taxation, and I don't think there's a member in this House that can say that any item was taxed which was an essential to any family, and yet we were criticized for the patchwork taxation and that's what I would consider this. Now, as it stands it would probably cost us in the neighborhood of a little better than a million dollars in this biennium if the bond issue is passed. And four years from now, we come back or there will be another convening of the legislature anyway, and they will be facing the same problem if they are going to continue on with this accelerated program. I've heard it suggested that the gas tax would probably become four or five cents more if this program was carried on, because they couldn't see how they were going to carry on the program unless they had such financing. We all know that it costs us plenty to drive a car on the road, but we also know that we are going to have, as I understand it, more monies than what was anticipated in the first place. We are going to be able to finance this program, I believe, very easily during the next biennium, and as one of the other gentlemen stated previously, no matter what we do at this session it can be all annulled and changed over, the whole system, at another session. I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, for indefinite postponement does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox.

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker, I believe two years ago we were told that the two per cent sales tax and the taxes we gave would not run the State of Maine. I understand now in the unappropriated surplus, we have over twelve million dollars. We must have got that from the sales tax. Now we're talking of increasing the sales tax to three per cent. Who knows what the unappropriated surplus will be two years hence? So I don't think that taking a million or

so dollars out of the general fund will hurt the finances of the State of Maine any, so I hope the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would like to ask through the Chair to the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, that if we should go with this amendment and if new funds would be needed to continue this construction at another session of the legislature, where would he get the money? Would he again tap the till of the general fund?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I believe I emphatically answered that question a few minutes ago when I said it was going to be up to the future legislators as to what they did for business at that time. They can annul whatever we have done or would do at this session if they saw fit. That is the problem that comes up every biennium.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, if it is up to the other sessions of the legislature to determine what they should do for future construction, I think that it is important for this legislative session not to start tapping the general fund so we won't be setting a precedent for other legislative sessions, and I hope that this House will go along with the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller's motion to indefinitely postpone this amendment.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, to indefinitely postpone this amendment. As I understand it, we are considering appropriation from the general fund. It is the regular

budget document, not the supplemental and, as I view it, this million dollars would only be available if an increase was passed in the sales tax. And, therefore, I think this amendment, if it came in anywhere, should come in on the supplemental appropriation and not this one.

I would like to inquire from anyone on the Appropriations Committee if the general fund could stand this with the current—stand this million dollar tap with the current revenue as it is.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member of the Appropriations Committee who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Bean.

Mr. BEAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In answering the question of the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen, I would answer in this way, that it would depend entirely upon later action of this House regarding how much money they want to use in the supplemental budget and also the capital budget which both are still under consideration in the Appropriations Committee, and we haven't arrived at a final decision as to how they are coming out. We expect to have them out in a few days, but so far they're not. So the question, I'll answer it that way. It depends how much money you want to spend on the supplemental budget plus the capital budget.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act to Appropriate Money for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1953 and June 30, 1959.", Senate Paper 541, Legislative Document 1520. The Chair is going to order a division.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of this amendment please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-one having voted in the affirmative and thirty-eight having voted in the negative the motion prevailed and House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I now move that under suspension of the rules and by unanimous consent we take up the third tabled item, which was item number seven on page seven, Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose of Building State Highways", House Paper 1056, Legislative Document 1504. I would like to speak briefly.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, now moves that by unanimous consent and under suspension of the rules the House remove from the table Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose of Building State Highways", House Paper 1056, Legislative Document 1504. Does the Chair hear objection?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As I probably stated earlier, we sat down last night with those people who represent the other side, so to speak, of this highway issue, and I believe that I can speak honestly and fairly that it was mutually agreed that there was perhaps not too much point in debating twice the bond issue. I would like to explain what I mean by debating twice. To pass for third reading and pass to be engrossed requires but a majority, but to pass for enactment requires two-thirds. It's my own personal opinion that it would certainly assist the business of the House to let this bill be engrossed over the weekend, with the understanding that both sides enter into the real debate on the

two-third enactment stage, and with that thought in mind, that thought only, I would move that the bill be given its third reading at this time.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I request a division on the motion of the third reading.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the House give the third reading to Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose of Building State Highways." The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, has requested a division.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell.

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I should like to impress upon the House the importance of these highway bills, especially those relating to financing, since they involve the funds for the support of all the highways in the state for which the state is responsible—if they were added end to end would reach nearly all of the distance around the world. Further than that these highways are in a climate which is probably as severe as nearly any other state in the Union, and are in a state which is very sparsely populated. To accomplish this purpose is, to say the least, no small order and to compare it with any other state would be unrealistic. For all practical purposes in discussing highway financing, we can talk about the construction program, and I think cover the field pretty well because in the final analysis any shortage in highway funds is reflected in the construction program. Since highway revenue is dedicated revenue, and the first call on it is to retire bonds which are already outstanding; secondly, to take care of highway maintenance, and third, to cover new construction, we need approximately six million dollars a year in additional revenue for each one of the next four years.

The program which has been outlined provides for construction consistent with our sister states which

participate in the Federal Program. The program looks ahead for four years. It says at once that four years is the longest that we can project a program with any degree of accuracy in these times of changing values, and it also says that four years is the shortest length of time which we can plan with any degree of efficiency. I am pleased that the House this afternoon saw fit to leave the designation of the Interstate System with the Highway Commission. Something was said here yesterday about the question of members assuming their responsibility for government. I think that this is an acid test. We've heard a lot of discussions in the hall about days ago, and we have heard of the Federal Program condemned. I can assure you, however, that when you vote on the bond issue, you'll not be voting on either one of these other two issues. You can't vote on the pay-as-you-go issue because you have already paid 90 cents toward it whether you go along with it the other 10 cents or not. So it is not a pay-as-you-go proposition, it's a case of pay and stand still if you don't choose to participate further in it.

We are not voting on the merits of the federal interstate program because that's already the law of the land. We are not voting on our participation in it, as I have said, because we are already participating in it to the tune of 90 cents that you are contributing through your federal gasoline tax. The question is, should we provide the other 10 cents in order that for once in our lives we may go forward in stride with the rest of the country, or will we become bogged down on whether or not the people are willing to pay \$1.00 extra on drivers' license and \$1.00 extra on registration fee, which argument you can see refuted thousands of times every day by going down to the entrance of the Maine Turnpike and see the citizens of the state who pay \$1.95 for one ride down the turnpike, which by the way represents 100 per cent of their share of the cost of the road rather than the 10 per cent which is being discussed here.

In summary, I would say this, that I should be very happy if I thought

that adding \$1.00 to the driver's license and \$1.00 to the registration fee was the biggest problem that we face in the highway financing in the state. To me all that takes is a little intestinal fortitude for which I think we will actually be more respected by the voters.

To me the real problem is a never-ending one, and we can't solve it by postponing it or avoiding it. Our real problem is the cost of highway construction and maintenance which will always be high in the State of Maine. That, I think, is our cross which we have to bear. To indulge in self-pity is to be unrealistic, and I'll agree that we must always be looking for more equitable means of securing highway revenues and that we study every possible alternative thoroughly, but I think that we have no sound alternative but to go along with this bond issue, and with the item eight which is the increase in registration and drivers' license fees to support it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go along with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, through this third reading and debate this issue when it is an enactor and will require a two-thirds vote. I should like to remind you that none of us are against the bond issue except that we would not like to see the bond issue wastefully spent.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose of Building State Highways", House Paper 1056, Legislative Document 1504, be given its third reading at this time. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, has requested a division.

Will all those who favor the motion to give this Bill its third reading at this time, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred and twenty having

voted in the affirmative and none having voted in the negative the motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would like to take the opportunity to thank the House for their cooperative spirit in which they have tried to move this legislation along. I think it is going to benefit our adjournment date in the end, and I sincerely hope that all of you realize no one is forfeiting any rights to take a final crack, so to speak, at the Bill if they are so opposed to it.

I would like now to address the remarks that I am about to make to an item, the final item that was specially tabled today, that would be item eight, An Act increasing registration fees. I think that I should be as fair as possible in my feeling on the matter. I think the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Bean, a few moments ago, expressed my thoughts that it's a little bit premature to try and judge whether or not at this point we could take a million dollars out of the supplemental budget. I reserve the right to say later whether I am for or against the idea, but I do think the Members in the House, including the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, would be better able to judge, and all of us will be better able to judge, when we see the appropriations bills come out of the Appropriations Committee. Therefore, I would hope that on this item eight, we might pass this bill to be engrossed hoping that the other appropriations bills will come out, and if necessary, hold this bill until we reach a decision on whether or not we want to try again to amend the supplemental budget. Therefore, at this time I ask that item eight be taken off the table by unanimous consent and passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, moves that by unanimous consent and under suspension of the rules, item number eight under third readers, Bill "An Act Increasing Registration

Fees for Motor Vehicles and Operators' Licenses, "House Paper 1038, Legislative Document 1572, now be taken from the table. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, now moves that this Bill be given its third reading. Is there objection?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Orders of the Day, and under Orders of the Day the Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Motor Vehicle Financial Security Act", House Paper 987, Legislative Document 1411, tabled on May 8 by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, pending acceptance of either report, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, both reports were retabled pending the acceptance of either report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 21.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought to pass" and Minority "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Benefit Eligibility and Definition of Unemployment under Employment Security Law", House Paper 780, Legislative Document 1113, tabled on May 15 by the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, pending the motion of the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau.

Mr. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill was passed at the 96th Legislature, it was then known as the holiday bill. This bill affects very

few workers in the State of Maine, mostly shoe workers in the area where I come from. It also concerns, you have to be working under union contract between employer and employee to be affected by this holiday pay. As far as the employer is concerned, he agrees through bargaining contract to pay holiday pay already agreed to pay the bonus, and it doesn't affect him, he has already agree to pay the bonus, and he's going to pay regardless of whether, no matter how it affects the Commission. To get at this matter, if a holiday should fall, you know the peak of this shoe industry is seasonal, they loaf in the spring and they loaf in the fall and some of the holidays are in the fall, in October and November. Now if this holiday should come during the week where the employee, naturally through no fault of his, there is no work in these factories so they apply for compensation through the Unemployment Security Commission. What this bill would do would penalize the worker and prevent him from getting his holiday pay to which he already has agreed with the employer to receive. Now there would be a penalty imposed upon him, and it doesn't cost the employer any money. As far as the Security Commission is concerned, it would only affect the funds to the amount of \$5,100.00. Personally, I think it would create some hardship upon these workers and it certainly wouldn't raise the fund of the Unemployment Commission to any great extent, so I would move that this bill and both reports be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Benefit Eligibility and Definition of Unemployment Under Employment Security Law" both reports be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, said this doesn't mean too much money, but it does affect a lot of small industries. In considering the many money labor bills that we have, I said the other day

it's difficult to consider any one on its merits alone. Now, the Labor Committee agreed to recommend to this legislature increases in unemployment compensation from \$30. to \$33. The workmen's compensation from \$30. to \$35., and an increase in specifics under workmen's compensation. If these bills should receive passage, that would be certainly quite a concession to labor. Until four years ago, this bill was not in effect, and at that time four years ago, the Union people came in and recommended this holiday exemption. The law was changed at that time to exempt holiday pay from wages. Now, industry and especially the small industries in the state have always thought that this was not fair. They have to pay holiday pay certainly counts on taxes, why should they be exempt here? And so this year industry, and again I say especially the small industries, have requested that it be changed back as the law used to be. The majority of the Labor Committee felt that since it was recommending so much for the working man that it was only fair to do something for industry, and rectify this one point that the small concerns feel is definitely inequitable. As far as the working man is concerned, the law is negligible from this in comparison to gains they would get if the other bills that we have recommended receive passage. I certainly hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of this bill, and agree with the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. I have some of these small industries in my area, and boy, they need a lift. As far as the working man goes, he will not be hurt by this. He is already getting a great deal of benefits out of this Legislature, and this only has to do with the man probably getting double pay or in other words getting another day's pay when he is already collecting unemployment compensation for which the employer has already made contributions. So, I think this is only a fair and just bill, and that it should pass, and I hope that you do not go

along with the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if the loss is negligible to the workers involved affected by this bill, I maintain that the loss to industry is also negligible. Would the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, please indicate if he can, how much money is involved in this bill, how many workers and how many industries?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. ROSS: That is a very difficult question to answer. We asked the Commission that and they didn't know because it varies from time to time. But let me say right now that that is part of the compromise that I think industry is willing to go along with. If this Legislature defeats this Bill, industry will try their hardest to defeat some of the other bills that the working men and labor in this state really want. And I think this certainly is a small concession.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think it is perfectly within the rights and prerogatives of the Committee to horse trade with industry. I don't think it is within the rights of anyone in the Legislature to perform this kind of horse trading. I therefore hope that the motion to postpone on this Bill does prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau.

Mr. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker, I have served on the Labor Committee for four terms, I have listened to all these arguments for four terms, and after I listened my first term on this Committee I might as well have gone home and forgot about all the rest of it because the arguments are always the same, they never vary. We might as well have representatives from Labor and representatives from industry settle their problems and make a

report to us because that is all it amounts to. It is just a waste of time.

Now, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, has said that this is an insignificant bill. It may be as far as the Security Commission and all the Workmens Compensation bills are concerned, but to my people in my area in Sanford, they are deeply concerned about this, they don't want to lose their holiday pay, they have made a contract with the employer and the employer has agreed to give them this holiday pay, and now if they loaf this particular week they go to the Unemployment Commission and it is going to be taken away from them. They are certainly going to lose it. That may be all right to some people who have a lot of money, ten or twelve dollars doesn't mean too much, but a man with a family that works in a shoe factory, he likes to get that ten dollars, it means a whole lot to him. And if it was going to affect the fund I would say well and good, I will go along, but it is only affecting it by \$5,100 and I don't see how much harm it is going to do to anyone. And when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Hickey.

Mr. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order I would like to make this motion, that the motion that has been presented here lay on the table until the other bills comes out. Would that be in order?

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Hickey, moves that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Benefit Eligibility and Definition of Unemployment Under Employment Security Law", House Paper 780, Legislative Document 1113, both reports lay upon the table unassigned, pending the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

Will those who favor the tabling motion please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question be-

fore the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, for the indefinite postponement of both reports. Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, might I inquire through the Chair of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, why this is not a matter for labor management negotiation?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, who may answer if he so chooses.

Mr. ROSS: This was a bill before this Legislature. Labor and management tried to get together on all bills, and you could not get, as I mentioned the other day, a compromise that both would agree to. The bills, the money bills have already come before this House, they have been passed. This is one of the smaller industry bills. The House has already agreed through engrossment to do a great deal more for labor than this could certainly ever take away from them.

The SPEAKER: Is the House now ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, to straighten out a statement, this bill does not take away anybody's holiday pay nor does it interfere with any agreement that labor has with management. This has only to do with unemployment compensation.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair must remind the gentleman that he has already spoken twice to the motion.

Mr. LETOURNEAU: I would ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, requests permission to speak more than the two times allotted to him. Is this the pleasure of the House? It is a vote, the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen, I don't care how you put it, how you try to get around it, if this Bill is passed it

will certainly take the holiday pay away from an employee when he loafs that particular week. I don't care how you put the motion, I don't care how you state it, when he applies to the Unemployment Commission for his weekly benefits his holiday pay that falls upon that particular week will be deducted from his benefits, and if you don't call that losing it I don't know what it is.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Benefit Eligibility and Definition of Unemployment Under Employment Security Law", House Paper 780, Legislative Document 1113, both reports be indefinitely postponed. And a division has been requested.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of both reports please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-eight having voted in the affirmative and fifty-six having voted in the negative both reports were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Obstructions in Windows of Liquor Licensed Premises", House Paper 430, Legislative Document 606, tabled on May 15 by the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, to indefinitely postpone the Bill.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: On consulting the liquor Commission today I find that there are three hundred and forty-two active beer parlors or restaurants, you might call them, and seven part time restaurants. This Bill would assist officers in checking on patrons, whether there are minors in these places, and other people who shouldn't be served there. This Act would

not prohibit the posting of a menu or other reasonable matter. It does not mean there should be nothing in the window, but simply provides that there should be a clear view from the street. Even venetian blinds could be used without obstructing a clear view. We have a rule now in the rules and regulations of the Commission which says "signs or other advertising matter shall in no manner obstruct the view of the interior premises from the street, and shall be of reasonable dimension." If this rule is good why not complete the picture by making the view clear as far as the interior is concerned, as far as obstructions on the interior are concerned. If it is good to prohibit obstructions on the outside, why not on the inside? I was very grateful to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, for permitting us to table this Bill for the purpose of offering an amendment. But in view of the fact that this does not entirely prohibit something placed in the window like a menu or even venetian blinds I do not feel that there is any need of offering any further amendments. I feel it is good to give the officers a clear view and that could be obtained with some objects in the window, and so I feel that there is nothing here that would be detrimental to any place which wants to operate a decent clean establishment, and I move for the adoption of this Bill. I would like a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to remind the gentlewoman that the question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, to indefinitely postpone. A division has been requested. Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, that the House indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act relating to Obstructions in Windows of Liquor Licensed Premises," House Paper 430, Legislative Document 606. A division has been requested.

Will all those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-one having voted in the affirmative and eighty-three having voted in the negative the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Disposition of Commissions on Pari Mutuel Pools", House Paper 947, Legislative Document 1340, tabled on May 15 by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, pending acceptance of the report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox.

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, for tabling this for me, but now I want to accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox, moves the House accept the "Ought not to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to Savings Bank Life Insurance," House Paper 700, Legislative Document 1007, tabled on May 15 by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, pending acceptance of the Report.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question on this item through the Chair of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. TOTMAN: Somewhere along the line last night I got the impression that debate on this particular item would be quite lengthy, and I

wonder if the gentleman would consider possibly tabling this item until tomorrow since it is twenty minutes to six.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, in answering the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, I had a two hour debate prepared because this is a very important bill for the people of the State of Maine. My intention is to make a few short well chosen remarks relative to the Bill and then I will ask that the report of the Committee be accepted.

The SPEAKER: Does that answer the question of the gentleman?

The Chair recognizes now the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: I spent a lot of time preparing that two hour address that you are going to miss out on, but the nub of the question is these mutual savings banks in the State of Maine are all as you know, started by the Legislature, and they only have the powers that the Legislature has given to them. This Bill here is only asking the Legislature to give the mutual savings banks the opportunity to sell small policies of insurance in a convenient manner over the counter to the small wage earner that is a person that established a mutual savings account, believing that it would give an opportunity to the lower income groups to purchase needed dependable insurance protection at a substantial savings. Now, I am aware, being an investor in a mutual savings bank, that a mutual savings bank is in business for its depositors. The money deposited in a mutual savings bank pays the overhead and any profits go to the benefits of the mutual savings accounts. That is why in my home town the mutual savings bank is paying three per cent interest on these savings accounts. Now, I want to compare that with what the trust companies are doing in their insurance departments. They are stock companies, they are not mutual companies. They are stock companies and they are in business for the stock owners. They have to earn a profit to pay dividends to the stockholders. They are paying one per cent interest on the savings accounts in the trust companies. Now, that difference carries over and would carry over

into this insurance program if this insurance program was put into effect. There would be savings there for the small holder of small policies. These policies would only go from two hundred and fifty to five thousand dollars. That would be the limit, the five thousand dollars. And it would be helpful to the savings people coming into the savings bank and doing business. I have talked it over with the sponsors of the Bill, it is getting late in the session, is is an important Bill, you haven't heard the last of it, between now and next session there is going to be a lot of information to the public so we will know more about it. It is an important piece of legislation for the small wage earner, and in view of the fact that the stenographer has more than he can handle, he doesn't want to write a two hour debate, so I move for the acceptance of the Report of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, moves that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the "Ought not to pass" Committee Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Pari Mutuel Horse Racing and the Stipend Fund", House Paper 748, Legislative Document 1062, tabled on May 15 by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, pending acceptance of the Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox.

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker, I would now like to offer House Amendment "A" and move its passage.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman defer his amendment until the Bill has had two readings? At that time the amendment would be in order.

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass" Committee Report was accepted

and the Bill given its first and second readings.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox.

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

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

The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 748, L. D. 1062, Bill, "An Act Relating to Pari Mutuel Horse Racing and the Stipend Fund."

Amend said Bill by striking out the 12th and 13th lines of "Sec. 2" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'as "breakage," ½ of which breakage shall be retained by the licensee and the balance shall be paid to the Treasurer of State. Said maximum shall'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the 11th and 12th lines of "Sec. 4" and inserting in place thereof the following:

' "breakage," ½ of which breakage shall be retained by the licensee and the balance shall be paid to the Treasurer of State. Said maximum shall'

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "A" shall be adopted?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald.

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have finally got to a subject that I feel qualified to talk on. The hour is getting late, I have got documents all over my desk on this and I could talk as long as the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, but I just want to tell you that I represent the Maine State Association of Agricultural Fairs, and this Bill of mine is the result of many meetings with many committees and many of the officials of the fairs, and we have come up with what we think is the very best thing to help the fairs in their plight, if they are not helped they will have some trouble. And rather than going into a lot of talk now I just move that the Bill go

through and the amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, moves that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox.

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: Some of you ladies and gentlemen serving as members of this body perhaps have not familiarized yourselves with the disbursement of the amount of money that is taken in from the race tracks, or in other words, gambling. The breakage is the odd amount of money they don't give the bettor. For illustration how this works, if the parimutuel figured to pay the bettor \$2.29 on a two dollar ticket, they would give the bettor \$2.20 and keep the nine cents known as breakage. At Scarboro Downs last year the state's share from the breakage was \$45,120.93, so you can see why that track wants this bill as written to receive passage. Gorham Raceways paid the state last racing season on breakage \$12,529.82 and you can hardly blame Cianchette for wanting this bill to pass. As you can see, if you get the report from the Harness Commission, that the other tracks paid approximately \$19,800 breakage to the state.

Members, these are the total amounts paid our state for the 1956 season on breakage and if you will look at the report from the runners, you will see where they handled in 1950, through the pari mutuel windows, \$5,476,814.00, in 1951, \$6,867,529.00, and have increased very year until 1956 handling \$7,365,929.00. Now with the bettors putting more money through the windows each year, this amount of breakage will increase tremendously. With the amount of money that is needed to support the state, and the taxes we have got to levy against a great many poor people in our state, don't you think and believe that the voters that had confidence in all of us to send us here to represent them are going to feel that we have not done our duty and will have done a better job if at least we continue to take the amount they have now and keep it for our funds. I do not want to return home after we adjourn, and I don't believe the rest of you do,

and have our constituents ask us why we deliberately gave this amount of money away from the state funds, and gave it to the owners of race tracks, and certainly one of these tracks is a complete monopoly as there is no other running track in the State of Maine. The tracks were very smart in uniting with the harness racing track and securing one of the most capable lobbyists that has appeared under the dome of this State House. And this is a dangerous situation for us legislators when these two groups unite and present us with this bill that deliberately takes money rightfully belonging to our state and fatten their own treasury.

If you members will look on page ten of the red book put on your desk, some time during this session, you will find where the stipend fund for agricultural fairs figured \$36,829.59. Now double this when the bill increases the percentage to one per cent. This bill takes 17 per cent instead of 16 per cent from the \$2.00 ticket that the bettors bet. It will give the fairs \$73,659.00 based on last year's funds, and it will give the state an increase of \$36,829.54 more for the General Fund, and that is the reason why I am in favor of the bill, but we need the amendment.

And then, according to this bill we are going to lose \$45,129.93 from the runners alone and make a gift of that to them. And whereas there is a bill on the table now raising the drivers' license fee from \$2.00 to \$3.00 and registration on pleasure cars are increasing by a sizeable amount, and the money is certainly coming from the poor people of our state who can't afford to play the horses, and inasmuch as we are looking for new taxes, let's take it from the gamblers and not from the poor people. I know the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, who is president of the Fair Association is going to object, and has objected I should say. In all due respect to him, and his capacity, he will naturally be against this amendment. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, is afraid the running track as well as Gorham Raceways will oppose this as they want all the breakage instead of half as they are getting now, and the gentleman from

Union, Mr. Heald, is afraid of losing his bill. Now I don't want him to lose this bill, as I want all the fairs to get help for the 4-H Clubs and also for the exhibits of some of our fairer sex who offer their arts for your approval. This is why I plead with you to vote for my amendment.

As I look over the bills which we have passed which call for money and the numerous bills still before us which call for more and additional money, I am convinced this is a good bill with the amendment added, which will result in income for the state, and that is why I want it. This amendment I am presenting will mean that we will pick up \$77,448.55. These figures were obtained from last year's audit. The bill as now written increases the general fund revenue by one-half per cent and the stipend by one-half per cent which goes to the agricultural fairs. This does not cost the tracks anything as the bill raises the percentage from 16 per cent to 17 per cent of the bettor's \$2.00 ticket. This amendment puts the one-half per cent breakage into the bill where it belongs. Why should we vote for this bill as is and give the tracks money which belongs to the state? We shouldn't. My amendment will place this money to the credit of the state where it belongs, and remember this one-half per cent breakage is now in the state's statutes. This is good sound business, and I ask you not to support the motion of the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald. This amendment is a very major part of our legislation that is going to be scrutinized by our constituents, and I would like to have a roll call vote on it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is now seven minutes of six and I don't want to take any longer time than I have to, but down home we have a small Cumberland Fair Association and we don't want to kill the goose that is laying the golden egg. We think we have got a fine bill here and we have a lot of data to substantiate it if we had the time, and I hope the House will go along

with the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill for the race track, it is a good bill for the State, it is a good bill for the agricultural fairs possibly. The only person that gets hurt with this bill is the public, and I would feel remiss in my duties if I didn't move to indefinitely postpone this bill and all accompanying papers. Had I been in the legislature in 1949, I feel certain I would have voted against the race tracks, but now that they are in I can't see any justification whatsoever for increasing the take from sixteen to seventeen per cent. The suckers don't have an even break now, and let's not take a little more away from them. As far as I am concerned, I am for indefinitely postponing this bill and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that the motion that takes precedence at the moment is the motion of the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A". Is the House ready for the question? A roll call has been requested. Will those who desire a roll call on the question of indefinitely postponing House Amendment "A" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously less than one-fifth having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call is not in order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Dostie.

Mr. DOSTIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go along with the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald. We have a little fair, Windsor Fair, not too far away from Augusta, it is a good fair. I also ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act relating to Pari Mutuel Horse Racing and the Stipend Fund, House Paper 748,

Legislative Document 1062. Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-five having voted in the affirmative and eight having voted in the negative, House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, it is very late in the day and I am sorry to take even a minute, but a bill went through yesterday under the hammer when I was asleep I guess, and I move that we reconsider our action of yesterday on L. D. 717, An Act relating to the Evidence of Intoxication and Chemical Test of the Alcoholic Contents of the Blood. I would like this privilege and I would like to table it to the first opportunity possible just to present an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Evidence of Intoxication and Chemical Tests for Alcoholic Content of Blood of Motor Vehicle Drivers". Is it the pleasure of the House that the House reconsider its action?

(Cries of "no")

The SPEAKER: Did the Chair understand the gentleman to say that he wished to table the motion to reconsider?

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, any way that I can save the bill so I

can speak on it at a later date if possible. I hate to take the time tonight because I know it is late, but I would like the privilege of speaking sometime on it.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman assign a date for taking it off the table?

Mr. HANSON: I would like it to be next Monday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, that the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee and that this motion to reconsider be tabled and specially assigned for Monday, May 20, pending further consideration. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "no")

The SPEAKER: Will those who favor the motion to table the motion to reconsider please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, that if a motion to adjourn is approved at this time, this bill would become the first order of business after the routine calendar tomorrow, and it would greatly facilitate matters if the gentleman were willing to have this come up tomorrow as the first order of business after the routine calendar.

Mr. HANSON: I certainly would be, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

(Off record notices)

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor,

Adjourned until nine-thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.