

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

Friday, May 17, 1957

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Ralph W. Peterson of Augusta.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act to License and Regulate Operation of Trading Stamp Companies" (H. P. 895) (L. D. 1281) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. MORRILL of Harrison
HAUGHN of Bridgton
DUDLEY of Enfield

(Off record remarks)

Papers from the Senate Tabled and Assigned

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislature Research Committee be and hereby is directed to make a study of legislative procedures, practices and rules, or any other phase of legislative activity, that may accomplish efficiency and expediency of the legislative affairs of Maine (S. P. 587)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I move this matter lie on the table pending further study.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request a division on that motion of unassigned laying on the table. I request a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, and reminds the gentleman the motion is not debatable.

Mr. JALBERT: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman. I forgot about the unassign-

ment. I will assign it to next Thursday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman amends his motion to specially assign it for Thursday of next week. Will those who favor the motion to specially assign this for Thursday of next week rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-one having voted in the affirmative and thirteen in the negative, the motion to table prevailed, and the Order was tabled and assigned for Thursday, May 23.

Senate Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Minimum Wages" (S. P. 131) (L. D. 341) reporting Leave to Withdraw, as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of the Committee on Natural Resources reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Enforcement of Water Improvement Commission Orders" (S. P. 359) (L. D. 931)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Salary of Full Time Local Health Officers" (S. P. 394) (L. D. 1090)

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Powers and Duties of the Parole Board" (S. P. 200) (L. D. 545), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Establishing a Juvenile Probation System" (S. P. 271) (L. D. 696), as it is covered by other legislation.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to the Distribution and Sale of Publi-

cations Depicting Crime and Torture" (S. P. 282) (L. D. 741) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 579) (L. D. 1580) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass Authority of Joint Order

Report of the Committee on Retirements and Pensions, acting by authority of Joint Order (S. P. 577) reporting a Resolve (S. P. 582) (L. D. 1582) under title of "Resolve Amending the Resolve in favor of George E. Bagnall of Houlton" and that it "Ought to pass"

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

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the Resolve read once and assigned the next legislative day.

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act realting to Geological Survey Publications" (S. P. 232) (L. D. 633)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Investment of Certain State Funds" (S. P. 509) (L. D. 1450)

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

In the House, the Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Establishing a State Probation and Parole System" (S. P. 83) (L. D. 193) reporting that the new draft (S. P. 552) (L. D. 1542) under title of "An Act Creating a State Administered Probation and Parole Law" which had been recommitted, "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amend-

ment "A" (L. D. 1591) submitted therewith.

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

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

Committee Amendment "A", being L. D. 1591, was read by the Clerk.

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Tabled and Assigned

Report of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law" (S. P. 419) (L. D. 1178) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 419, L. D. 1178, Bill, "An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law."

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

"Sec. 3. R. S., c. 29, § 3, sub-§ IX, ¶ A, amended. Paragraph A of subsection IX of section 3 of chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1 of chapter 421 of the public laws of 1955, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

'A. Prior to January 1, 1956, any employing unit which for some portion of a day, but not necessarily simultaneously, in each of 20 different weeks, whether or not such weeks are or were consecutive, within either the current or the preceding any calendar year, has or had in employment 8 or more individuals, irrespective of whether the same individuals are

or were employed in each such day;”

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of “Sec. 4” and inserting in place thereof the following:

“Sec. 4. R. S., c. 29, § 3, sub-§ IX, ¶ A-1, repealed and replaced. Paragraph A-1 of subsection IX of section 3 of chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes, as enacted by section 1 of chapter 421 of the public laws of 1955, is hereby repealed and the following enacted in place thereof:

‘A-1. On and after January 1, 1956, any employing unit which for some portion of a day, but not necessarily simultaneously, in each of 20 different weeks, whether or not such weeks were consecutive, within a calendar year starting with 1955, had in employment 4 or more individuals, irrespective of whether the same individuals are or were employed in each such day. However, no contributions shall be payable from those employers covered by this paragraph for the calendar year 1955;”

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of sections 9, 10 and 13.

Further amend said Bill by renumbering sections 11, 12, and 14 through 24 to be sections 9 through 21 consecutively.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee.

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker, under Legislative Document 1178, I move that the amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, that Committee Amendment “A” be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This L. D. before us now amending the employment security law is a bill of the Employment Security Commission to clarify certain technical points. As they came before the committee and explained it, there didn’t certainly seem to be anything in that that would hurt either labor or industry, it was just for an administrative

thing. They also said at that time the way it was written it needed this amendment to further clarify things, and I certainly don’t want the House to kill this before they understand the reasons.

I would ask through the Chair of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, his reasons for killing this amendment.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, I have gone over the bill and looked it over, and I find certain parts of that bill which, the amendment which calls for the amount of money paid by the employer is taxable under that amendment. I also find that if the amendment is removed the employers supplemental payment would not be taxable, and on the removal of this amendment the benefits paid to the unemployed worker would not be deducted from the benefit fund. That is my reason for asking the withdrawal of that amendment. The rest of the bill seems to be very much in order.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in this House that is technically qualified to go into all the various aspects of this Bill, but if you kill the amendment you might just as well kill the bill because as the bill is written now parts of it will not work. I certainly would think that in all fairness we ought to give this bill its first two readings and then it would come back for third reading on Monday next, and if the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, can prove his points, why it would be certainly in order to do so then, but I think that if he kills the amendment he’s going to kill the whole bill.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, wishes to table the report, the amendment? The bill has had its first two readings.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be tabled until next Monday, then.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that with respect to Item number 12 Bill "An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law" the Committee Amendment "A" be tabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, that the amendment be indefinitely postponed. The Chair must remind the gentleman that the motion to table is not debatable.

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker, I merely arise to ask through the Chair of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, if this bill could be postponed until Tuesday. I'm not able to be here Monday.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that the amendment be tabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, that it be indefinitely postponed and be assigned for Tuesday of next week. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, to ask a question through the Chair. I understood the Speaker to say that the Bill had already had two readings.

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I thought it was just an acceptance of the Committee report.

The SPEAKER: The bill has had two readings and the question before the House was the adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

Will those who favor the motion to table the Amendment until Tuesday of next week, please say "aye".

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Amendment and Bill "An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law, S. P. 419, L. D. 1178, was so tabled.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Provide for Agency Stores for Sale of Liquor under Supervision of Liquor Commission" (S. P. 213) (L. D. 558)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BOUCHER of Androscoggin
WILLEY of Hancock
— of the Senate.

Messrs. CROCKETT of Freeport
DOSTIE of Winslow

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Presque Isle

Messrs. ANTHOINE of Windham

RICH of Charleston

PIERCE of Bucksport

COUTURE of Lewiston

— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. CARPENTER of Somerset
— of the Senate.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Pierce of Bucksport, the House voted to concur.

Ought Not to Pass Bill Substituted in Senate and Passed to Be Engrossed

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Authorizing Interlocal Cooperation" (S. P. 249) (L. D. 637)

Came from the Senate with the Bill substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed.

In the House: Report was read.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, that the House concur in substituting the bill for the report. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles.

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am speaking to you now only as an individual member of the Judiciary Committee. We had a hearing on this some time ago. It is a bill

that is recommended by the Council of state government, I believe, but on checking it over we find, at least I find, and just momentarily or a few minutes ago, I refreshed my recollection by discussing with a member of the Attorney General's Department who has just completed a study on the revision of the laws relating to municipalities, and the reason I underlined the title work that he was doing is because I wish you would recall that in the course of my subsequent remarks, and in refreshing my recollection with him and going over it with him, it became obvious that the language of this suggested uniform code is not the language that is customarily used here in the State of Maine. There is confusion as to its applicability. Secondly, it's complicated. It requires that any contract entered into between towns must be approved by the Attorney General.

I neglected to say at the outset that what this relates to, I can explain by referring to the preamble which says that the purpose of the Act is to permit local governmental units, municipalities in other words, to make the most efficient use of their powers by enabling them to cooperate with other localities on a basis of mutual advantage, and thereby to provide services and facilities in a manner and pursuant to forms of governmental organizations that will accord the best geographic economic population and other factors influencing the needs and development of local communities. It is a model for adaptation, but in this particular instance it hasn't been so rephrased and so simplified as to make it adaptable for current use.

In Section one, paragraph one thereof, it states in referring to agencies, which is correlative in this sense that the interlocking act in the local act permits the towns to have contracts with the other towns within the state, a town without the state or an agency of the state government of the United States, and there is some question whether or not a town or municipality in the State of Maine can enter an agreement with a municipality in another state without the consent of Congress, and because of these doubts that I have expressed, I hope that

the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, that with respect to bill "An Act Authorizing Interlocal Cooperation" the House substitute the bill for the report in concurrence.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, I am not an attorney, and I will not try to debate the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, on the technical wording of the bill. I do know a little of the operation of the Council of State Government, and the methods by which they formulate their proposed legislation. They have representatives from each of the legislatures of the forty-eight states represented, usually the Attorney Generals or Assistant Attorney Generals from each of the forty-eight states, and then they divide up into more or less local groups.

The group in which Maine is interested is the Northeastern Section which encompasses anywhere from eleven to fifteen different states depending upon the issues to be discussed. They spend a considerable amount of time in joint meetings proposing legislation which they feel will benefit all of the states once it has been adopted by them, and the purpose of this act as the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, has pointed out is to make it possible for municipalities to better serve the people by cooperating one with another. In instances such as could be cited, public utilities, water systems, it would be possible under a method of this type, as I understand it, for several towns to join together to have one municipal water system which then in turn would serve several areas, and I do recall bills coming before the Public Utilities Committee this session in which that very thing was requested of the Committee to enable certain towns to contract with other towns for the supply of water, and it is the type of thing that is presupposed in this particular L. D.

I think it also goes hand in hand with the thinking of this legislature when we adopted the so-called Sin-

clair Bill to allow for the cooperation of towns in forming large administrative districts for their school systems. It seems to me that if it can apply there, it certainly could apply as far as water districts, sewerage districts, bus services or other municipal services are concerned. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer either, but there are people of legal training in the unmentionable body in which this bill was passed, substituted for the report, and they apparently could see no harm in it, and I feel that it is a good bill. The philosophy of the bill is good in that it does the things that the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, has mentioned, plus it could get together on sewerage and drainage facilities and fire fighting apparatus. I think that one of the reasons for promoting the bill in the first place was the bad fires which we have had over the years, and the towns and cities can get together and fight fires and have interlocal compact which they could get together, maybe put out fires, where as it is now a town might burn up while they were arguing the point.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Hancock.

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I can concur with the remarks of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, but I find that since the bill came out of Committee there is a great deal more interest in it then there was in Committee, so if I might suggest that—asking the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles to go along in this way to concur with the Senate and give the bill its first two readings, table it until a date certain either Tuesday or Wednesday to allow the sponsor of the bill to discuss it with the Attorney General.

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

Through the avenue of the Speaker, may I respond to the the gentleman from York, Mr. Hancock, and say that is very agreeable with me. I simply rose and made these remarks because I had some questions about it, and I had substantiated or buttressed those questions by inquiry with members of the Attorney General's Department. I felt I had an obligation to bring them forward. I fully agree with my fellow townsman, the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, that this type of thing is very desirable and should be on the books but it is just a matter of applicable form. Thank you.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, looking at that bill, I just looked it over and it looks to me as though we had a situation over in Waterville, we have had quite a time over, over their sewer district, because they cover Fairfield and one or two towns around there. We couldn't seem to go along and establish a precedent and let them shut off the water if they didn't pay for their sewerage.

Now this might be a situation that would clarify that, and similar other towns where they joined together. They could go into a corporation of some kind that would be satisfactory and I think it has merit, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, will prevail.

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 substitute the Bill "An Act Authorizing Interlocal Cooperation, Senate Paper 249, Legislative Document 637, for the Report in concurrence. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was substituted for the Report in concurrence and given its two several readings.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Hancock.

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I ask that this lie on the table until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is advised that it would expedite matters if the gentleman from York, Mr. Hancock, would be willing to allow this bill to be assigned for third reading and then on Monday when it becomes a third reader to table it at that time.

Thereupon, Mr. Hancock withdrew his motion to table and the Bill was assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Weekly Benefits for Total Unemployment under Employment Security Law" (H. P. 1089) (L. D. 1573) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 10.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is the bill increasing unemployment compensation from thirty to thirty-three dollars. The original bill had increments in odd cents, such as six-sixty, nine-ninety, twelve-ten, thirteen-twenty, and so forth. This just evens out those amounts. But since this bill hinges on other bills, which their passage one must depend on the other, I move that it now be tabled until next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that Bill "An Act relating to Weekly Benefits for Total Unemployment under Employment Security Law" be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday next pending further consideration. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the House, a group of sixth grade pupils from the Dixfield Elementary School accompanied by their instructor,

Mrs. Frances Dunn. On behalf of the House the Chair extends to you young ladies and gentlemen a most hearty welcome and we hope you will enjoy yourselves here today. (Applause)

Non-Concurrent Matter

Report of the Committee of Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Trial Terms of Superior Court in Aroostook County" (H. P. 970) (L. D. 1370) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith. Which Report and Bill were indefinitely postponed in the House on May 9.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To save time and uphold our former action I move that we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, moves that the House adhere.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I only want to say that I concur with the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, that the House adhere. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing the Bounty on Bobcat" (H. P. 108) (L. D. 146) and Minority Report reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1064) (L. D. 1522) under title of "An Act Repealing the Bounty on Bobcat" and that it "Ought to pass" on which the House accepted the Majority Report on April 25.

Came from the Senate with the Minority Report accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with the Senate, and I hope that I don't have to speak for an hour on this measure.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that the House recede. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville.

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I move that both of these reports and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is advised that the motion to recede takes priority over the motion to indefinitely postpone. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I will try to refresh some of the members on what is going on here. This legislative document 146 was a bill introduced increasing the bobcat bounty from \$15 to \$25. The Committee did not go along with that. They wanted, some of the members wanted, the bobcat bounty left as is, and I think we handled it first wanted, the bobcat bounty left as so. Then the bill was recommitted and came out in new draft repealing all bobcat bounties, and then the House stayed with their former action, and the other branch accepted the minority report. If the members of the House want the bounty left on bobcats as it is, the papers should be postponed or some action. The thing has been thrown around so many times I don't know where it is now, but I do know some of us would like to see the bounty left at \$15 and not repealed.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Jack.

Mr. JACK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I really think this is a waste of money. It has cost the Fish and Game

Department \$12,150 this last year. The bobcat hunter is exactly the same as the rabbit hunter or the fox hunter. He enjoys that sport and he would not stop even if the bounty was taken off. I think that they are throwing money away on something that is very valuable to our state without a bounty, the same as the bear should not have a bounty on them. It is one of the largest animals we have in the state, and it is just throwing money away. I hope the motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker, does the motion to adhere take precedence over the motion to recede and concur?

The SPEAKER: No sir, it does not. Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief remarks in regard to this bill. I will try to be brief. Over the nation it has been proven that bounties is not a successful method of taking care of any predator, and at least circulated in the House this morning, on some of your desks at least, there was a paper here put out by the Department of Inland Fish and Game which shows what they have done on bear bounties from 1922 until 1956. In 1922 they paid a bounty on 931 bobcats. Then in 1956 down through the years they have been catching them every year and down through the years in 1956 they caught 810. Of course there are more places to work now and less people are doing it, but the bounty is much greater now so the exact price paid in 1956 was \$12,150. I see no reason for going on and throwing this money away any longer. Thank you.

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

Mr. EDGERLY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would rather see the bounty stay on bobcats. If they paid twelve thousand this last year, if they had the boun-

ty off a few years they would pay thirty thousand to kill them, they would get so many. Inside of four years they will be awful pleased to put a bounty back on. I don't know but what I would vote not to have the bounty so you could teach them something. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House now ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville.

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the price that is paid for the bounty on wildcats is very small compared to the damage the wildcat does to the deer.

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 a question to clarify something. If we should adhere, does this mean that there will be no bounty?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, that the motion to adhere would not be in order in the first place. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lovell, Mrs. Harriman.

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, means that if we recede and concur, does that mean we have no bounty?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the House that if the House recedes, it means that it will be receding from its former action whereby it adopted the majority "Ought not to pass" report. In other words, if the House recedes, the bill will be kept alive. Just what the bill does, as far as the bounty is concerned, the Speaker is not acquainted with it. The Chair recognizes the same gentlewoman.

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Ashland, Mr. Prue. The bill would originally increase the bounty on bobcats from \$15. to \$25. The Committee felt that this increase was not warranted, and passed the bill of the gentleman from Ashland, Mr. Prue, "Ought not to pass." That left the bounty on bobcats exactly on the Statutes as it was, which was \$15. per bobcat killed. Then the bill was recalled

into Committee and a repealer was put on. By putting a repealer on this bill, it did away with the bounty, just cut it right off. O.K. The Committee could not go along with this wholly and a majority report was brought out from Committee which said the repealer should not pass. That means that we should not repeal the bobcat bounty. There was a minority report that said the repealer should pass. In the House we accepted the majority report leaving the bounty exactly as it is, \$15. In the unmentionable body they accepted the minority report. Otherwise the other body has agreed that there should be no bounty. If we recede and concur with the Senate that will do away with the existing bounty of \$15. per bobcat.

Now this is individual feeling among the representatives. For my part I don't think it amounts to too much in taking care of the predator. However, the history of the bounty if you will look on your desk you will find a paper, from '22 to '31 the bounty was \$10, then in 1932 they put on an additional \$20. on bobcats. During the year of 1932, they killed 1,857 bobcats. The Department and the people of the State of Maine felt many of these bobcats were trapped or killed over the Canadian line and brought into the State of Maine to collect the bounty. Anyway, during the year of 1932 the State paid \$28,610 in bobcat bounties. In 1937 the bounty dropped to \$15. and it has remained that way ever since. Last year they trapped and killed with dogs 810 bobcats and as has been told you it cost the State \$12,150. Now, that is the history of the bobcat bill as has come before our Committee.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that the House recede from its former action whereby it accepted the majority "Ought not to pass" report. Will those who favor the motion to recede please say "aye."

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville — The Chair has been

doubted. Will those who favor the motion to recede please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-six having voted in the affirmative and sixty-one in the negative, the motion to recede did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, that this Bill "An Act Increasing the Bounty on Bobcat" House Paper 1064, Legislative Document 1522, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. The Chair now understands that the pending question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, that the House adhere. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville.

Mr. CARVILLE: I didn't think I made the motion. I asked if my motion would precede. The motion I made was the motion that the two reports and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that the effect is the same, indefinite postponement or adhering. Is it the pleasure of the House that the House adhere?

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Soliciting Political Contributions by and from State Employees" (S. P. 467) (L. D. 1347) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence in the House on April 25.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

On motion of the gentlewoman from Patten, Mrs. Harrington, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Majority Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating

to Services of State Police on Maine Turnpike" (H. P. 106) (L. D. 144) and Minority Report reporting "Ought to pass" on which the House accepted the Minority Report and passed the Bill to be engrossed on May 15.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett.

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now insist on our former action and ask that a Committee of Conference be appointed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, that the House insist and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, that the House recede and concur. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. HAUGHN: When the vote is taken I request that it be taken by division. When we recede and concur it means that you agree with the Senate to kill this bill. If not, the motion as previously made by the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, would be that we get together and see if we can iron this thing out. I hope that motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, does not prevail and I request a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett.

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have only asked for a little courtesy to be extended to me. I hope that my request—

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, that the House recede

and concur, and a division has been requested. Is the House ready for the question?

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.

The SPEAKER: Fourteen having voted in the affirmative and eighty-one in the negative, the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, has received the courtesy. The motion does not prevail.

The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, that the House insist and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Majority Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought to pass" on Resolve Authorizing Study of Proposed Road from Millinocket to Grindstone (H. P. 768) (L. D. 1101) and Minority Report reporting "Ought not to pass" on which the House accepted the Majority Report and passed the Bill to be engrossed on May 10.

Came from the Senate with the Minority Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. EMERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move we recede and concur.

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

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, while I am not opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Emerson, I am curious enough about this road to ask a question through the Chair of the gentleman as to why he feels we should recede and concur. Perhaps he can explain why he feels his original bill was not worthy of trying to save.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, has ad-

ressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Emerson, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. EMERSON: I was advised by a member of the association that I represented, who was also a member of the State Highway, to make that motion. I feel positively the State is not in a position right now to make that survey and it could be made at a later legislative year perhaps.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Emerson, that the House recede and concur. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Application and Qualification for Real Estate Brokers' Licenses" (H. P. 740) (L. D. 1054) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 14.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Needham.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Now that the other body has given this bill its blessing, I certainly hope that this House will go along with that action. There have been some rather harsh things, words, said about this bill which I do not believe are justified. The issue is whether the added regulation or requirement is a reasonable one or an unreasonable one. The issue is that simple. The purposes of the bill is to raise the standards of the real estate profession and to protect the public, and certainly these are laudible purposes. No one appeared in opposition to the bill at the hearing, not even those who have spoken against the bill here in the House, and I believe that my good friend the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, was at the hearing. Many of the real estate people throughout the state appeared at this hearing and spoke in favor of this bill, and the members of the Maine Real Estate Commission, all the members of the

Maine Real Estate Commission, appeared at the hearing and spoke very strongly in favor of this bill. The bill was reported out of Committee "Ought to pass" by a unanimous vote.

I am unable to understand why the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, and the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, both holding licenses as real estate brokers, and a great majority of the brokers in this state as well as the Maine Real Estate Commission are so far apart on this bill. The law would certainly have no adverse effect on them, and as far as I could see the law would have no adverse effect on anyone; and therefore, I just do not see why they are so opposed to the bill when they must know that the great majority of the real estate brokers and the Real Estate Commission of this state are strongly in favor of this bill. With all due respect to them, I do not believe that their judgment should be substituted for the judgment of the great majority of the brokers in this state or the judgment of the Maine Real Estate Commission or the judgment of the Committee who heard this bill, and I believe that this is one instance where the recommendation of the Committee should be followed and accept. I therefore move that this House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am inclined to go along with the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Needham, and wonder in my own mind why I should oppose this bill because I think it would be of great assistance to me. I think I could really work it to a distinct advantage for myself from a mercenary standpoint. I think that if I wanted to get together with my fellow brokers in the community and some young man should approach us and state that he wanted to hire with us as a salesman that I should tell him that we didn't need any salesmen at all, and I think that would take care of his situation pretty nicely. I think he would have to do some shopping around, and, of course, he

might be successful, but I think that we could trouble him just a little bit with this particular bill.

I don't think there is any great need of going through a long discourse this morning in regard to this bill. I think it was quite well understood, at least my sentiments in regard to it, and in speaking of the activities of the Committee, I can assure you that having been in contract with several members of the Committee since this bill received a unanimous "Ought to pass" report, that their thinking has changed considerably and if some member of the Committee would like to discuss it briefly this morning, I think perhaps it would be most helpful. I certainly would urge you to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Needham, and if we are successful in defeating his motion, I would move that we insist on our former action and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons.

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I haven't changed my opinion on this bill. I still think it is highly restrictive legislation and I can see no need of a year of apprenticeship for a man to be allowed to take the examination. I think the Commission has an examination now to prove the qualifications of anyone who wishes a real estate broker's license. I agree with the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, that it would very definitely enable brokers in a small town if they wished to make it very difficult for anyone to secure, have that year of apprenticeship.

I still stand on what I said before, and if many of you gentlemen or ladies of the House know anything about, in general, real estate or any conventions or committees, you know very well that in many instances bills may be presented or resolutions taken to which many of the members may not adhere, they may not even know anything about it. They just sit or never heard anything about it and take no stand until the question is really raised.

Since last week I have talked with one broker at least who very defi-

nitely agrees with me that this is bad legislation.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill has been before this legislature as long as I have been here. It has always been defeated. I have served on the Committee that heard this bill a couple or three times in the past, and the thing that is against the bill is that the man, the youth, the young man that wants to be a salesman or a broker, he has to work as a salesman with some broker for a year. Well now you people that live in the small towns and there are many of you, it is all right for the city, but there are many small towns that don't have any broker. What show has the youth got to participate on a program like that to learn the business? He has no chance at all, and I believe that if a man, we have fully discussed the thing here in the House and the House voted on it, and I believe that if a man has the qualifications and can pass the examination which is rather rigid, he should be allowed to become a broker, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Needham, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from St. Albans, Mr. Hughes.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I seem to be on the other side of the fence this morning, but I am a member of the Business Legislation Committee and when this bill was heard there was absolutely no opposition to it, and if this bill is as bad as it has been stated, it seems to me that someone should have appeared against it. I have held a real estate salesman's license for several years. I believe this bill has its merits and I will support it. They speak about the real estate broker in a small town could refuse a salesman's license in that town. I don't believe there is anything in the bill but what would let a salesman if he was desiring to get into the real estate brokerage business, there is nothing in the bill that would prevent him from be-

coming a salesman for a broker in a city nearby or at quite some distance. I don't believe he would be restricted in any way, shape or manner from becoming a salesman or a broker, and I wish to concur with the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Needham.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few brief remarks in support of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley. It occurs to me, I have known of several instances, where a real estate broker with a good business has died. His wife has been able to continue the business by being able to take the examination and go on. She had been actively participating but had not taken a license before. This would deprive them of that privilege.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Hilton.

Mr. HILTON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I also am a member of this Business Legislation Committee and I support my colleague the gentleman from St. Albans, Mr. Hughes, in stating that there was no opposition at this hearing. There were more of these eloquent speeches heard. I am not an authority on real estate brokers. I base my opinion on the evidence that was presented at the hearing.

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to just one word in House Amendment "B" to this bill. I suppose I will be accused of having an LLP degree, that of a legal lint picker, but in the last line where it says "in the discretion of the commission", meaning about the license, "by furnishing to the Commission proof of experience equivalent thereto or by furnishing to the Commission a certificate that said applicant has passed a real estate course of study at an accredited college or university." I am rather doubtful if there is any school of higher learning in the State of Maine that has a real estate course as such. Now, if you

take the instance of the Portland University Law School, the only one in the State of Maine.

If the Commission in its discretion would not accept, we will say the successful passage of well two, three, four-year course at the law school as equivalent, but required that they have passed a real estate course at an accredited school, they wouldn't satisfy because as far as I know Portland University Law School wouldn't be considered accredited. Now, it is approved, but accredited. The distinction is this, that for accrediting a law school, and the same thing applies to a university, an undergraduate school, the accrediting depends upon the upon the number of full time professors and the number of volumes of library that is available, and I am reasonably certain that on that basis, just using it as an example, that the Portland University Law School students if they were required to satisfy the second qualification here rather than the first, mainly that of accreditation, they wouldn't be able to do so. I don't believe that there are many, if any, courses available in the State of Maine where a person could acquire a real estate course at a college or university. So, that is one more disability that the bill presents in itself.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard.

Mr. SHEPARD: Mr. Speaker, I seem to be one of the few that feel that this is a good bill. It is designed, in my belief, to protect as much as anybody the purchaser or seller of real estate. I, for example, have handled insurance for several years. I now intend to sell real estate as a real estate salesman. Whether this bill becomes effective or not, I would still follow the recommendations of the bill. That is, to serve as an apprentice affiliated with some broker, and to further emphasize my trust and belief in brokers and knowing that they would not take advantage of a salesman, I perhaps will request permission to serve under the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw. I know he won't take advantage of any poor real estate salesman.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Blanchard.

Mr. BLANCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I am also a member of the Committee on Business Legislation that passed this bill "Ought to pass," and I think my colleagues will bear me out in this which I know is not a good reason. I think they will admit I signed it for the sake of Committee harmony. I now oppose the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. LaCasce.

Mr. LaCASCE: Mr. Speaker, I feel that in this instance this bill is a real estate brokers' bill for their protection, and for that reason there were not any opponents at the hearing. I also feel that the real estate brokers have protection enough. I live right on the edge of New Hampshire. New Hampshire has no requirements whatever. All you have to do is to apply and get your license. I do happen to know of one instance where a salesman is working for a broker and he is under contract that if he terminates his term as a salesman, he has to wait a year before he can apply for a broker's license. So that to me these people have plenty of protection right now. I think this bill should be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. NEEDHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a few remarks in rebuttal to some of the things that have been said. It has been suggested that if this bill became law that the brokers could take advantage of anyone who wanted to become a salesman, and say, well there is no room for you here. I don't think there is any force at all to this argument because we have a real estate commission in this state who would protect the rights of any person who wanted to become licensed as a real estate salesman, and that person could make complaint to this Commission, and I am sure that such person would have any number of opportunities to associate or be employed by a broker so as to obtain the neces-

sary training to entitle him to a broker's license.

And another thing the bill, as amended, provides that where the person can show the Commission that he or she has had the equivalent experience or the equivalent of experience of the year's training or apprenticeship would give him or her, that the Commission can waive the year's requirement, and that I think would adequately take care of the case cited by the gentlewoman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham, about the lady whose husband had been a broker and who had died, where she had participated with him in that business but had not been licensed. Now, in that case as a result of her having participated although unlicensed, she would have had the experience and the Commission could, and undoubtedly would in such a case waive the year's requirement and allow her to take her examination.

None of the speakers who have opposed this bill have touched upon what I think is a very important point. We have a real estate law here in this state and that real estate law is primarily for the protection of the public, and prior to 1937 we had no such law, but since 1937 there has been a tremendous amount of real estate sold in this state, all over this state so much so that it became necessary and has been very desirable and a very good thing for the people that own homes that they have that protection. It has been a good thing for the business itself. It has raised the standards, and you have a Real Estate Commission to regulate and see that people do not get into this business who are undesirable and who shouldn't be in it.

Now the purpose of this present law is simply to raise the standards. The opponents of this measure have not had the opportunity to look at this picture and study it carefully and to provide for the people in the state what is needed. On the other hand, the Commission has had that opportunity. The Commission consists of members appointed by the Governor who have been in the business for at least ten years before they are qualified and they come from the most important and the most qualified people in the bus-

iness. They know what the problems are. They know where the weaknesses are, and they have had the opportunity to study this thing and have had the general picture of it and are in a better position, I submit, to suggest to you people what the law should be and how it can be improved. Another thing is, the opponents have explained or attempted to explain why if this is such a bad law that the National Association of Real Estate Brokers have adopted this provision as one of its basic recommendations for a model law.

I think this is a good law. It provides for some regulation and it provides for some restriction. People generally don't care for any more regulation than they have to submit to, but I submit we are living in a world today that is a regulated world. We are regulated at every twist and turn, but those regulations come as a result of our own volition. We vote for them. We have them because they are necessary and I think that this law will accomplish a great deal of good, and I hope that you will go along with my motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons.

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, something has been made of the fact that there was no opposition at the hearing. I suggest that to the members of this legislature, as they all know, it is very difficult to attend hearings. You all have your own Committee hearings. You have other bills, and certainly if I had had the chance I would have opposed this at the hearing.

Now, there are two points I would like to reiterate. One is that a certain amount of technical knowledge is needed and I think that is met by the examination given now by the Real Estate Commission. I agree with the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Needham, that the regulations we have now are very essential. I think we have plenty of them though. Another thing is that essentially when it comes to the matter of a real estate broker's license, it's the character of the person as you all know and the Commission is not going to find out or do much

to change the character of a person by a year's apprenticeship. That is an important thing, and as I say their present examination proves for their information that the gentleman who may be applying, or lady who may be applying, for a license has sufficient technical information. Again I think this is highly restrictive legislation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, just one brief remark. I have a great deal of admiration and respect for the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, and certainly I am highly complimented by his desire to serve under me as a salesman. I would, however, want to warn him that as a salesman he cannot close a real estate transaction, and it is approximately two hundred miles from Bingham to Stonington, and I would be most pleased, because I think the world or him, to have him make at least five sales a week and call regularly at my home. Thank you.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have heard a very full discussion of both sides of this question, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, has moved the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain this motion it must have the approval of one-third of the House. Will those who are in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count. Obviously more than one-third have approved the Chair entertaining the motion.

The question now before the House is shall the main question be put now. Will those who favor the Chair putting the main question now please say aye, those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The main question is the motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Needham, that the House with relation to Bill "An Act

relating to Application and Qualification for Real Estate Brokers' License," House Paper 740, Legislative Document 1054, now recede and concur. A division has been requested. Will all those who favor the House receding and concurring please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

The gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, wishes to be excused from voting on the grounds of personal interest. Is this the pleasure of the House? The gentleman is excused.

A division of the House was had.

Fifteen having voted in the affirmative and eighty-eight in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference. I will withdraw my motion and I will now move that we adhere to our former action.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, that the House now adhere. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The following paper from the Senate not on the Advance Journal:

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Monday, May 20, 1957. (S. P. 590)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

Orders

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if L. D. 1113 is in possession of the House?

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: Out of order and under suspension of the rules, the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby yesterday the House indefinitely postponed both reports on Bill "An Act relating to Benefit Eligibility and Definition of Unemployment under Employment Security Law, House Paper 780, Legislative Document 1113.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons.

Mr. EMMONS: I just arise for a point of information. I note that the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, who was very much in favor of indefinite postponement of this bill, is not in his seat. I just rise to a point as to how we can protect him until Monday.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, that if he wishes to protect the interests of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, a motion would be in order to table the motion for reconsideration and especially assign it.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to approach the rostrum?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may approach the rostrum.

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons.

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the information I received before is still in order I now move that this matter be tabled and specially assigned for Monday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, that the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, be tabled and especially assigned for Monday next. The Chair must advise the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, that debate is not in order.

Mr. ROWE: I just wanted to question the time of assignment on this.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ROWE: Yesterday the vote taken on this was fifty-eight to fifty —

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is debating.

Mr. ROWE: I am giving my reasons for the —

The SPEAKER: You may merely question the time of assignment.

Mr. ROWE: I would advise assignment for Tuesday of next week when most members in the House will be present.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, moves that the item be tabled and especially assigned for Tuesday of next week. His motion is in order. Will those who favor the motion to table the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, and especially assign it for Tuesday of next week, please say aye.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, was so tabled.

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

Mr. SMITH: I would like to know if the House is in possession of Senate Paper 539, Legislative Document 1511, Bill "An Act relating to Examinations for Certain Persons to Practice Barbering".

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I voted on the prevailing side yesterday I would like now to move now to reconsider our action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed. I would like to present an amendment.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair will request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort to the rostrum the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, to serve as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Totman 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 Rockland, Mr. Stilphen.

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Yesterday I didn't take any part in this particular bill which the gentle-

man from Portland, Mr. Smith, has been so kind to have reconsidered, because I haven't had too much attention called to it. But after the action was taken yesterday I had many calls from many of my constituents who are barbers, and yesterday afternoon during the debate the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, who is absent now, made reference to the fact that the barbers in his community and the barbers in other small towns were going to be affected by this. Now at this time to have this reconsidered we are offering an amendment which is going to include only towns over eight thousand people.

And inasmuch as some of the gentlemen who have spoken on this bill have previously spoken on other bills, and I make reference to the Milk Commission, I may say that the men in the milk industry should take care of their own industry and not be interfered with by us folks who are in the funeral business and who are in the law profession and so forth. And we accepted that fact. We would like to have them accept the fact that the barbers would like to run their own business and I am sure that the barbers throughout the State of Maine, and particularly in cities over eight thousand, want this bill because it is a health measure. And I hope the motion by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Smith, to reconsider this so we can get it back to the place where we can amend it, does prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Dostie.

Mr. DOSTIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this motion because the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Bartlett, is not in his seat—until next Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Dostie, that this measure be tabled pending the motion to reconsider until Monday next.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, for debate on time of assignment only.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would move that it be tabled until Tuesday when there will be more

present. I am afraid Monday there will be a pretty short House here.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Dostie, that this item be tabled pending reconsideration until Tuesday next. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of No)

A division has been requested. All those in favor of the motion to table pending the motion to reconsider until Tuesday next on Bill "An Act relating to Examinations for Certain Persons to Practice Barbering", Senate Paper 539, Legislative Document 1511, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty members having voted in the affirmative and thirty-nine in the negative, the motion to reconsider was tabled until Tuesday next.

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Browne from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to the Taking of Certificates of Sureties by Bail Commissioners" (H. P. 468) (L. D. 661) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass Bill Substituted for Report

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Travel Allowance for Members of the Legislature" (H. P. 85) (L. D. 122)

Report was read.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have now arrived at the major piece of legislation for the season. As you recall this started off way back in January sometime with a controversy over legality on one of these bills, but not the present one I am going to speak on, but it pertains more or less to all of them throughout the discussion, whereby we could not increase our own salaries or our own expenditures during the

current session in which we are sitting. After an appeal for a decision from the Supreme Court, it was so ruled whereby we were authorized to do such which would be expenditures, not compensation or pay, and from that order I construe to mean just expenses, not compensation or pay. Thereby we did proceed to revoke our previous order, the joint order, and came back with a bill which is not this first one before you but the second one which will come up after this.

Getting back to the increase in mileage for legislators, there are opponents who did appear before the public hearing who have expressed these views, that we can and we should operate our cars or travel expense on five cents per mile. That depends how you travel. If you travel with a car, of course, a new one will be a little cheaper to run than an old one, but the cost is still there regardless of the age of the car because if you buy a new car that is additional expense over the old one for the cost of a new car. It is also a known fact that our tires, our insurance, our cost of operation, repairs and everything in general certainly increase far in excess of the moderate fee which is being asked which I believe is conservative, asking eight cents. These people who can operate on five cents a mile, I would certainly be happy to have them come to my home to pick me up and pay them that five cents a mile, because I know that truthfully speaking we cannot, and I don't believe that we should, operate our car on five cents a mile. It is just impossible to do. I know there are many in this House who are concerned with this issue, especially those who live a farther distance than I do. I will not personally benefit to the extent some may from farther distances. We hear the argument used whereby two or three cars will group together and travel together, cutting down the cost of this transportation, but do they realize the distance that most of them do ride? They have to do it to even pay the expenses of anywheres near the cost which is not even up to cost by doubling up and, of course, we do have a bill coming up a little later for the

state employees which will have an indirect bearing on the outcome of these bills no doubt, and I know there are numerous here who are interested and I will reserve my remarks for a second try. I might add I wish to substitute the bill for the report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The motion now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that the bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: The people who inspect potatoes up in Aroostook County receive nine cents a mile for their traveling expense, but those people have to ride over potato rows and over rough field roads. They take out of their car more than we would take out of it over these turnpikes or over these improved roads in a long, long time. Personally, I bought four new tires this winter, but even so I feel that I can travel on less than five cents a mile with my car. Someone asked me at the hearing how I travel. I have traveled by car, I have traveled by train. I find in travelling by plane, my travel allowance will pay my fare by plane from here to Presque Isle and return, that is with the tax allowance which is given to members of the legislature. I find that I can travel on the train and have eight or nine dollars to the good, and I can travel by car with less expense than the five cents a mile which is allotted me. This would be quite an expensive proposition for the State of Maine to bear if we raise this fee to eight cents a mile, and I am opposed to this bill.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the bill, as you are probably well aware, that sets the travel allowance eight cents a mile and makes it retroactive somewhere near the beginning of the session. I merely want to call your attention to this fact and also to the fact that the

Appropriations Committee unanimously turned this matter down.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, who rises to a point of information.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask through the Chair if the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, is familiar with the first bill as it does not make it retroactive. I think he will find that the one coming up later is the one retroactive. This particular one only pertains to the beginning of the next legislature. The other bill is the one to which I believe he has reference to, not this particular bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem: I presume the gentleman is not asking a question but correcting a statement.

Mr. HAUGHN: I believe you are correct. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A division has been requested. The question before the House is that the original bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee.

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

Mr. MILLER: I would just like to go on record, having been in charge of the Naval transportation for five years during the war we found that it cost us seven and one-half cents a mile to operate cars. The reason I get up here is because I would like to make that a record. I am very familiar with the operation of vehicles, in my own business and having been in the Navy as I said before, and I just wanted to take the doubt out of anybody's mind that they can operate a vehicle for less than five cents a mile.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. BEAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Members of the House: I do not propose to debate this question to any great length, but the Appropriations Committee did give it serious consideration and we came out with this unanimous report "Ought not to pass" believing it was justified.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The

Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, with all due regard for our hard working committee, they deserve all the praise and credit in the world for their thoughts and their thinking, but I don't believe that they had any other alternative but to come out with all major legislative bills such as these are, but with one consideration, to leave it up to the mercy and wisdom of this body. I think that is the thinking of that committee from reports I have had.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I believe that the members of this House are here because they felt a duty to their community, to their State, and I don't believe that a matter of five cents a mile or eight cents a mile for travel is very important to the members. I move we accept the committee's report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is that Bill "An Act relating to Travel Allowance for Members of the Legislature", House Paper 85, Legislative Document 122, be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report and a division has been requested.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-one having voted in the affirmative and forty-eight in the negative, the motion to substitute the Bill for the Report prevailed, the Bill given its first and second readings and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms conducted the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, to his seat on the Floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Edgar resumed the Chair.

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, the House recessed until one-thirty o'clock this afternoon.

After Recess
1:30 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under House Reports and we are at item number three.

Ought Not to Pass (Cont'd.)

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Travel Expenses of Members of Legislature" (H. P. 196) (L. D. 283)

Report was read.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, this is the second most important piece of legislation, whereby I believe there will be one more coming up. In all seriousness this Bill certainly arrives at an opportune time to prove to you people the need of a retroactive bill, which this is.

I don't know how the report has been brought out, but the emergency preamble has been taken off, at least it was before the Committee, it does make this Bill retroactive for your expenses for mileage right from the first day we started the session, which of course, if it were accepted, would not become law until ninety days after adjournment. So sometime along in August, if you see fit to pass this Bill, you people of course will receive an additional three cents for each mile you have traveled during the session which it will allow you.

Some are going to say, why do we ask for this for ourselves? This particular bill was a controversial one at the beginning of the session whereby we were wondering if we were acting within legal bounds to increase our expenditures. The Attorney General's office at that time disclosed to me that it might be possible compensation of wages. So we introduced a joint order asking for this, which at that time I tabled and kept tabled until such time as after a passage of this body requesting an opinion of the Supreme Court as to whether or not we were within our bounds to be able to do this, which they so ruled that we could do not by a joint order, but by a bill or an act. So I introduced the Bill which originally had an emergency preamble on it, which before the Committee I withdrew

the emergency preamble and it is now just a straight bill.

You people realize that after this week you are working on your own with no returns for your expenses except the regular mileage. There is no one receiving any wages, which is not in this bill of course, but you do have that expense out of which would be wages as an expenditure for your being up here the additional time beyond the regular session, which in all likelihood the present time, it doesn't look like next week but possibly a bigger part of the week following. So that is additional expenditure on yourselves.

I do not feel we are not justified in asking for this additional compensation of expenditures. I know there are some who might feel, "Well, what are the people back home going to say or think?" From all accounts of the last Legislature when we did pass a two hundred and fifty dollar increase, which was granted to this Legislature now sitting, there were several comments made not detrimental toward the increase granted but in favor of it, and as a matter of fact it was said that we did not grant sufficient increase. As for your labor, compensation for your time and sacrifice, this was not to be a legislature of idle rich but to make it possible for the younger generation to be able to come up here and meet their expenditures and not to make money out of it, that is not the intent, but to at least cover the expenditures. And I certainly hope this Bill receives favorable passage and I now move to substitute the Bill for the Report and ask for a division when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to advise the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that to the best of the knowledge of the Clerk and the Chair, the Bill came out of Committee with the emergency clause still on the Bill.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, if that be the case then I would move that this Bill now be tabled for the opportunity, if that be the procedure, to present an amendment, taking the emergency preamble from it, because before Committee it was agreed upon that that emergency preamble would be taken from it,

and if it is not in that form I would certainly like to put it in that form without an emergency preamble.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that if he would want to stick with his motion to substitute the Bill for the Report that the emergency preamble could be removed by an amendment at third reading of the Bill.

Mr. HAUGHN; I would be happy to do that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Travel Expenses of Members of Legislature", the Bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that an amount in excess of five cents per mile is predicated upon depreciation, insurance, registration and other factors concerned with operating a motor vehicle. I submit that we all own our own automobiles and that none of us purchased one especially and in particular to attend these sessions of the Legislature. It is my feeling that if we want a raise in pay let us be men enough to say so, stand on our own two hind legs and argue the point out. Let's not try to sneak in the back door to try to get a slight increase in pay.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition to this measure. I readily agree that the Law Court came down with a decision that such a measure as this would be considered personal services and not compensation. Let me suggest this to you: If we could make this eight cents a mile whereas it is considered personal services, why couldn't we make it twenty cents a mile or fifty cents a mile or a dollar a mile? In other words we certainly would be increasing our compensation.

Now, the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, has somewhat proven my point that it is compensation because he now points out that we have been down here for

twenty weeks and the next week is going to be at our own expense, and he feels that this should have some measure, it would give us some money for the next week, so he must also be considering it somewhat compensation. And I might also remind the gentleman that the only reason it is done on a twenty week basis is because we felt that was the expeditious way to get paid. We get twelve hundred and fifty dollars for being in the Legislature and not for any twenty week period. Would the gentleman also think it would be right if we only stayed down here twelve weeks to reimburse the state that amount of money received for twenty? And for these reasons I am opposed to this measure and also because I think it would leave a bad taste in a lot of people's mouths if we do something like this, and I therefore move that this Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Travel Expenses of Members of Legislature", the Committee Report be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can certainly appreciate the comments made by my good friend, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, but I think he has misconstrued the thinking at least of my intent where by from his statements, at least from my thinking, there was compensation. The Court has so ruled that this is not compensation, this is expenditures, and that has been proven by the report of the Court. Otherwise they would never have authorized us within our body to increase within our own sitting. That was determined by the Supreme Court and I don't question their integrity and their handing down of decisions. That has really been determined in their decree.

As far as buying a new car I will agree with my friend, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, we do not buy our cars especially for this. But he did agree to one

point that there are expenses whether it is a new car or an old car. Those are expenditures. And as far as staying here an additional week, I do not wish to imply, that if so, to my friend from Portland, Mr. Childs, that I meant that that would be compensation. But you still have these expenditures which are in excess of what we are getting paid for. As I said, it is not the intent of this Bill to make money or for personal gain. I would never be for that type of legislation, but I do believe, in fairness to the younger people who cannot afford to come down here, and there is just as much wisdom in some of them who are not of a financial standing able to come down here and devote the time, and the people that I have heard at least, and talked with, do believe should be justly compensated to the extent of covering the cost and that is the objective of this Bill, and I hope the motion of indefinite postponement does not prevail.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There is one thing I think we should consider, and that is that we all knew when we came down here what we were going to be paid for our services and what the mileage was. We have that to think about. And another thing, there has just come to our desks an amendment on the bill for pensions for retired teachers, cutting that appropriation which was asked for by one hundred dollars. Are we going to vote ourselves or future legislators an increase in our mileage and then refuse to give these poor aged retired teachers a hundred dollars a year? I think it is pretty small business.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A little later on in the session, perhaps once or twice, I shall ask for economy in government, so at this time I will go along with the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, for indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, just to get the record straight, I hope that the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, was not of the opinion that I was questioning the integrity of the Law Court. I said I disagreed with them on this particular opinion of theirs. I have disagreed with the Law Court on many occasions, I am not questioning their integrity.

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

Mr. BEAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: These same arguments that we have heard this afternoon were discussed fully by the Committee on Appropriations in considering this Bill, and we came to the final conclusion on the unanimous vote that the arguments against outweighed the arguments in favor. And I thoroughly concur with the arguments that have been advanced this afternoon opposing this Bill, and I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, prevails in indefinitely postponing the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Travel Expenses of Members of Legislature", House Paper 196, Legislative Document 283, the Report be indefinitely postponed, and the gentleman from Portland has requested a division.

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

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-three having voted in the affirmative and twenty-eight having voted in the negative, the Report was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

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

Travel by State Employees" (H. P. 892) (L. D. 1278)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the mileage situation is being well discussed this afternoon. This is a bill that I sponsored for the Maine Employees Association, and I would like to just make a few brief comments in regard to it.

This Bill pertains to increased mileage allowance for state employees who are using their private vehicles in conjunction with their official duties as employees of the State. Present allowances for state employees who use their vehicles are seven cents for the first five thousand miles and six cents for each mile thereafter. Now this Bill would increase the allowance to nine cents for the first five thousand miles and seven cents for each mile thereafter.

Now, most business firms who pay their employees for the use of their vehicles in conjunction with their work pay a varying figure from eight to ten cents per mile, and then the present figures that establishes their reimbursement for mileage is based on the 1949 and 1950 costs of operations. And I think we are all quite aware of the substantial increase in operational costs since 1950.

Now, the Bill is based entirely on percentage increase in operative costs. I would like to get some information from some member of the Appropriations Committee in regard to their decision in regard to the Bill if I may. I would like to ask a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Bean, I am wondering if the Committee considered the increased cost in operations from 1950 to the present date, because that was wholly what the Bill was based on.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Bean, who may answer if he so chooses.

Mr. BEAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In reply to the question of the gen-

tleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, the Committee did take into consideration all of the angles they could think of regarding these measures, and again came out with a unanimous report "Ought not to pass" believing that we were justified in so doing.

The SPEAKER: Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, due to our previous action in regard to item two whereby the Bill was substituted for the Report, I think that I would be remiss in accepting this Bill to sponsor for the Maine Employees Association if I did not now move to substitute the Bill for the Report, and I will make that motion and ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I appreciate the comment of government economy, I am all for it, but I wonder if we are having another what I call slave thing, that is what economy means. This morning, with no criticism for the vote, we did relinquish revenues to the state to the tune of seventy-five thousand dollars by releasing the buses from excise tax on gasoline tax. I just want to convey that thought. One minute we are talking economy and the next minute we are giving it away.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If I understand the remarks of the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, this is for privately owned cars that the departments ask employees to use. And with all due credit to that great committee, the Appropriations Committee, in the last six years gasoline has gone up at least eight to nine cents a gallon, if my figures are right, especially high test gas, automobiles have gone up seven or eight hundred dollars. Now we must bear in mind that they are not only paying for just mileage on the gasoline the car uses but the owner must be given some consideration for the wear and tear on his car. I think the motion

of the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, to substitute the Bill for the Report is very fine.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I would just like to remind you of the talk backed up by the figures that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, gave us the other day, showing us that these cars operated by state employees, if they were owned and taken care of by the state, could be operated at about five cents a mile and some a little less. I am just wondering how we really could go along with this Bill inasmuch as that has been shown that they can be operated and are operated, and that takes in everything, depreciation of the car, the price of the car, that takes in the price of the garage, the depreciation of the garage and the gasoline, that takes in everything, and they can be, they are being operated for five cents per mile.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to disagree with the approach the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, takes to the problem. I think in regard to the state owning and maintaining vehicles, that you certainly must consider the fact that they are in a position to buy an automobile for a lot less money than you can as well as the other supplies used in conjunction with the operation of the vehicle. And there has been substantial increases in the cost of operation since 1950 and I think this is quite well known to all of you, and I still think there is some justification in substituting the Bill for the Report, and I would hope that my motion would prevail.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not much for figures but the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, did have all these figures before them, and another thing,

I should have them here with me today, but one thing that we did consider was the figures of certain companies operating in the state here do pay for car operation, and they seem to compare very favorably with what we are suggesting for operation for state employees.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe that our state employees are well paid, I believe that they took their positions expecting only the mileage that they now get, and I believe that we have no financial or moral obligation to raise their pay by increasing the compensation for mileage. There has just been handed to me a letter, I haven't had time to peruse it, but from the Merrill Transport Company. "It might interest you to know that in our own particular case we only pay five cents a mile for a person to use their automobiles, and they can make money on it. We have proven that they are able to over a period of years. One would also only have to take the figures of ability to buy a new low price car, run it for thirty thousand miles, take actual experience on the cost of operating same and it will be found the cost came out to considerably less than the nine cents per mile that they are talking. As a matter of fact it came out to less than five cents a mile. These are the types of things that will drain our treasury balance if they are allowed to be instigated into the plan of operation." This is signed by Paul Merrill of the Merrill Transport Company.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons.

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I really shouldn't inject my thoughts into this but some of these quotations of prices surprise me, I would like to run my car for that much, that little money. I would like to suggest that over a long period of years I have kept very good track of costs of my car because I hoped to deduct those costs on an income tax re-

turn. Let me suggest for some years when our cars cost us nine hundred or nine hundred and twenty-five dollars and our gas price was way down, they would keep those prices down to per mile cost of four point five cents a mile or four point seven, three or four years ago it had gone up to seven point one, and the last car I traded cost me nine point two cents a mile, and I am certainly as economical as possible in running them.

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

Mr. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to ask through the Chair of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, just what kind of car these employees make the money out at five cents a mile, because I drive forty thousand miles a year and I would be very happy to find that car.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman address that question through the Chair to the gentleman?

The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. RICH: I would be happy to give that information if I had it, but I am sorry to say I do not know the type of car they operate.

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

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As an operator you might call me the lamp lighter. I have been lighting lamps in Portland, gas lamps; from gas lamps I went into horse and buggy, being an operator of transportation for over thirty-five years from horse and buggy to automobiles. Any man that says he can operate a car at five cents a mile is farfetched. The national car record people of the United States base their car operations at eight cents a mile. You rent a car for eight dollars a day which calls for twenty-four hours and eight cents a mile for a standard car. For a hydromatic or an Oldsmobile it goes from nine, ten to twelve cents a mile. I would go along and say that you cannot operate a car

less than eight cents a mile, which I operate myself in my business for a number of years. But five cents a mile is outmoded, it is impossible due to the cost of gasoline, cost of tires, cost of insurance and everything else, it is impossible, gentlemen. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons.

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, someone whispered in my ear when I quoted the nine point two that they didn't realize I owned a Cadillac. I would like to say that I have bought used cars for the last fifteen years, and none of them were Cadillacs.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe the utility companies in the State of Maine are pretty conservative in their figures, and the figures given to me were eight point four up to nine cents. These are definite figures from the utilities in the State of Maine.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees", House Paper 392, Legislative Document 1278, the Bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report.

Will those who favor substituting the Bill for the Report please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Forty-three having voted in the affirmative and sixty-six having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to accept the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee?

Thereupon, the "Ought Not to pass" Committee Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the vote we have just taken

I don't think that we could possibly go home and justify our actions of this morning as to item number two. Having voted on the prevailing side I now make a motion that we reconsider our action of earlier in the day as to item number two, L. D. 122.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby the House assigned for third reading Bill "An Act relating to Travel Allowance for Members of the Legislature", House Paper 85, Legislative Document 122. Is this the pleasure of the House?

All those who favor the motion to reconsider please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I would now move that we indefinitely postpone item number two, Legislative Document 122.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, my good friend, has attempted to compare item two with item four. There should not be any comparison. On item four every single mile is reported, every single mile, during the week when not coming to and from home is not reported; on item two they are compensated only on one round trip a week. That is not taking into consideration the extra miles they make in serving their constituents. I don't think there is any comparison and I hope that the House does not favor the motion of indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I anticipated this move through the rumors that were rumbling through the halls at lunch time that if item three did not receive favorable passage and item four received the same treatment there was a certain group who felt they were influential enough in this body to kill item number two. And maybe they are justified in their

thinking, but I want to express this, that from your personnel boards in the State of Maine because of low price paid for travel allowance, as you will notice the unemployment list is not filled, and with all the unemployment in the State of Maine there is some reason for it. A good many departments in this State right now cannot get men to travel and do justified service to their jobs because of compensation to travel in their own cars. They have to wait until State cars are available for them. The service is not being run wholly and fully as it should be because of the low fee paid for mileage. If you consider those factors as good government or economy as it is called, I am sorry to say that I cannot go along with indefinite postponement. I hope it does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The chief reason I arise to speak on this item is because I was on the rostrum this morning and could not express my opinion which I feel very strongly on as regards the consistency on voting something for ourselves if we deny it to other people in State Government. I will not attempt to go into facts and figures, I will not attempt to confuse you by comparing statistics, I will simply say that I think it is a very simple principle. I don't have the nerve to stand up here and vote something for future legislators if on the other hand I turn it down for State employees. I think it is as simple as that. I certainly hope the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, also at the present time there is an order upon the table directing the Legislative Research Committee to study legislative action, anything to do with the legislature. I am of the opinion that there are a lot of inequities in the legislative salaries the way it is set up. First of all you run into a situation where people in the immediate area do not have expenses and the ones who are able

to commute do not have the expenses of staying here and so forth. And also probably during the course of the Research Committee they will take into consideration the process and try to set it up on a more equitable basis. I don't think that tomorrow morning's headlines would look very well if it says that legislators raise their mileage salaries and at the same time defeat the state employees' salaries. And I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that with respect to item two. Bill "An Act relating to Travel Allowance for Members of the Legislature", House Paper 85, Legislative Document 122, the Bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madwaska, Mr. Rowe.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I voted for item four because I believe that the State employees, I think they can be compared to a comparable unexploited group in this State. I also voted for item number two earlier in the day because I believe that the eight cents per mile is justified. I will vote against the motion for indefinite postponement and I am consistent in my vote.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that Bill "An Act relating to Travel Allowance for Members of the Legislature", House Paper 85, Legislative Document 122, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Portland has requested a division.

Will 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. Ninety-three having voted in the affirmative and twenty having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Bill was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I voted myself out of some money but I am happy, because I think there is a drive starting in this House and we are going to bring back an old fashioned word, and that word is "economy." And I think this may well be the start of an economy drive so the taxpayers of Maine will not have additional taxes to pay after we have convened.

The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Smith, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can't go along with my colleague the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, when he says he sees a trend of economy, when just a day or so ago in the Senate they gave the farmers a—

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is out of order in mentioning the other branch of the Legislature.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Members of the Legislature" (H. P. 1023) (L. D. 1456)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce.

Mr. PIERCE: Ladies and Gentlemen: A few moments before final cloture the bell was ringing, I was headed for my seat. In the rotunda it was called to my attention that no bill had been introduced increasing the salaries of future legislators. While the bell was ringing I turned to port and went into Mr. Slosberg's office, confirmed the statement given me, raised two fingers, "Make it this, Sam", and this is the Bill. I did that only as a means of consideration by this Legislature. I frankly picked the figure two thousand out of mid air because I do recall in a previous session we had used that nice round figure.

We do have before us somewhere a bill calling for annual sessions. I do not recall whether or not that bill

does call for salaries. Without some vehicle we would have no salary for that annual session unless it is possibly written into that bill, that I do not know. In order that we may really consider what we believe is fair, and I wholeheartedly agree with the previous statement made by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, in order that we may properly consider that, my suggestion would be, and of course not knowing what action would probably be taken by other bodies, if we did substitute the Bill for the Report, and assuming that it might be frowned on by other persons, it is highly conceivable that we would come up with a Committee of Conference, who could undoubtedly come up with a fair and just reason as to which figure, we should pass. Because of those reasons, and I do not care to debate the merits as to whether or not we are receiving sufficient funds, because of those reasons I will now move to substitute the Bill for the Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, with respect to Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Members of the Legislature", moves that the Bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In going along with the theory behind the explanation for the Bill of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, and because I will accept at least for the time being his explanation that it does tie in with the annual session bill, which will be coming into this House, I am quite certain, on Monday's calendar, I would move that this item be tabled until Monday.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that with respect to Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Members of the Legislature", House Paper 1023, Legislative Document 1456, the Committee Report be tabled and specially assigned for Monday next, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, that the Bill be substituted

for the Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report was so tabled.

Resolve Substituted for Report

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Authorizing Forestry Resource Survey (H. P. 588) (L. D. 837) which was recommitted.

Report was read.

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

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have an excellent and a practical piece of legislation before us in Legislative Document 837. This is a Forestry Resource Survey as advocated by the PAS Citizens Committee. There was no opposition to the principle of this Resolve when it had its public hearing, and the hearing was very well attended by land owners, industry and private individuals. The enactment of this legislation will give the State and the 99th Legislature a very valuable tool with which to evaluate our seventeen million acres of forest. Further it will make it possible for the appointed committee to present accurate and sensible recommendations to the next legislature for the improvement and efficient control of this resource.

We have in the State of Maine this vast natural resource in the form of trees which is capable of returning a greater income to the people of Maine. No comprehensive survey has ever been made although several area surveys have been made and others are in the process. The Committee would be able to use all of the information from previous surveys and such cooperation has been indicated. This Resolve states that it is in the interest of perpetuating, preserving and promoting the progressive economic development of the forest resources of the State of Maine, and also for encouraging and developing comprehensive forestry programs, and at best to secure for the people of the State the future and undiminished productivity of forestry resources.

Our National Congress at Washington, D. C., has been asked to

provide over a million dollars for hardwood research alone, which should indicate to you the awareness of this and related problems. We need to know how to improve the taxation of forest lands, how to encourage conservation through selective cutting, how to make better use of wood and how to plan for the maximum recreational advantages involved. For these reasons and many others I now move that the Bill be substituted for the Report.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, that with respect to Resolve Authorizing Forestry Resource Survey, the Bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is the first time I heard the word "economy", and it sounded nice upon my ears. I think the man is sound, I think we should be careful what we take back to our taxpayers. I attempted early in the session, perhaps some of you will remember, when I saw a two thousand dollar bill here swell into twenty-three thousand five hundred, but I was knocked right down.

Now, if you want to start on economy let's keep right on the program, and here is twenty-five thousand dollars, which isn't much. I have talked to the tax assessor and talked quite seriously about this same project we are talking about, I don't know who is going to do this one, but they are doing that all the time from his office. I talked to him on the bill that the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, had in here on severance, and I think if you want to have economy and start the thing agoing, I move for indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that the Committee Report be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I think in answer to economy that we should well consider this Bill. In my area in the last twenty-five years, within

ten miles of where I live there has been twenty-six million or more feet of lumber cut off and not one acre has been reseeded. I am in hopes that something may come up somewhere whereby that we will be looking for future generations and not just economy at this particular time. I think we should consider the economy of this future generation when millions and millions and millions of cords of wood has been taken from our forests and millions and millions of feet of lumber has been taken and has not been reseeded, I think it is high time that we started something somehow, somewhere to consider something about it, and I am opposed to the indefinite postponement of this Bill, and I hope it does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Vaughan.

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I received from the second district congressman a notation on an amendment which he has made to the Soil Bank Program, and in it is the reforestation program of abandoned farms throughout the country. Now, if that is true on a national basis we are very much out of step if we indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. BEAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have before us this bill along with some others, and it is true that there is money available through the Soil Bank Program which will later be made available to this House. For that reason the Committee felt that we were justified in passing this one out "Ought not to pass".

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to help this bill along and I might not by speaking, but speak I must on this. One of the chief ideas to keep in mind if you vote this bill down is this: That this bill has come out of the PAS Citizens Committee. The Citizens Committee, on the basis if this bill is passed and

the study is made, will make certain recommendations on the basis of this study which no department doing the same work can make. Also this bill is going to provide us with data which certain recommendations can be made by the Citizens Committee. If this bill is voted down at this time that data is going to be made unavailable to the Citizens Committee, and therefore recommendations which this legislature should have, or the 99th Legislature should have at its next convening. Therefore I am going to vote against indefinite postponement.

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

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the PAS Committee I would like to just make a few comments very briefly. We were very much in favor of this sort of a survey, first of all because we feel it is much more comprehensive than any that could be made or has been made by the State Department. Also there is another very important phase. So often we hear our citizens say, "Tell me why there are such expanses of wild lands that could be taxed." And certainly we should know where they are, how we could tax them and so forth. That was another reason. We can't keep coming to this legislature and hiking the sales tax a penny. We can't keep hiking other taxes. And certainly if by this survey we can find a source of revenue that should be taxed, then I think we have spent, whatever the price of the bill is, it has been very well spent. And that is the other reason that we were very much in favor. I hope so, we would dislike very much to see this bill indefinitely postponed. dies and Gentleman of 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: If you are interested in economy this bill spells economy with a capital E, and you can repeat that over and over again, it is economy, it is economy for the future of the State of Maine. It is not a stopgap measure, it is permanent economy. It is resisted by many who wish to

preserve the status quo, which is an unfortunate thing, but we have a large group that always want to preserve the status quo. And also they continue to lay waste to our second most important natural resource. I am against the indefinite postponement and I request when the vote is taken it be taken by division.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that with respect to Resolve Authorizing Forestry Resource Survey, House Paper 588, Legislative Document 837, the Committee Report be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, has requested a division.

Will 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.

Twenty-one having voted in the affirmative and seventy-six having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, the House voted to substitute the Resolve for the Report, and the Resolve was given its first reading and assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Tabled

Mr. Stanley from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Pollution Survey" (H. P. 255) (L. D. 353)

Report was read.

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great number of arguments here on the floor of the House over pollution, classifying streams and so forth, and in that discussion many words were uttered concerning the hardships that are worked upon municipalities and sewerage disposal plants to meet that day when we are going to have complete abatement. This is starting in a very small way, state aid

to those municipalities which are starting their plans now to reach that day.

Having been a member of the Board of Trustees of the Brunswick Sewer District since it was formed, having acted as Clerk of that Board since it was formed, knowing every move that we have made has been towards the erection of a sewerage disposal plant, I now know pretty well the problems faced by the majority of the communities in this state.

With help from the state, which you are naturally going to have to expect just as the state is going to have to expect help from the Federal Government, the Federal Government has already recognized the problem and set aside fifty million dollars which is a small amount but is enough to help them get started on the program. I would now like to make the motion that we substitute the Bill for the Report.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House: I guess when they pick members for the Appropriations Committee they just pick hardhearted people, and apparently this House is not a hardhearted group, because most of our decisions have been overruled. I would just say in reference to this particular bill that in the supplemental budget you will find that there is four hundred and eighteen thousand dollars appropriated for each year of the biennium. There is also appropriated for pollution abatement, and also in the supplemental budget you will find an item of twenty-five thousand dollars for the Water Improvement Commission to help the communities in making plans for pollution abatement. Probably one of the reasons the Appropriations Committee gave an "Ought not to pass" report on this particular item was that because they felt that the House in voting the way that it has, was not too interested in abating pollution. I think our vote, recorded as it has been recorded, will show that we are not too interested in abating pollution. But we are putting in, the Appropriations Committee, as hardhearted as we are, are putting in four hundred and

eighteen thousand dollars for each year of the biennium plus twenty-five thousand dollars for each year of the biennium for the Water Improvement Commission purposely for helping the communities of the State. I think that we have done a considerable amount and I think that the people of this House will feel that that is sufficient.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley. Did I understand him to say that this is in the supplemental budget?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer if he so chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Yes you understood me correctly.

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like then to change my motion to allow this item to lay upon the table until the supplemental budget is discussed, pending acceptance of either report.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Pollution Survey", House Paper 255, Legislative Document 353, the "Ought not to pass" Report be tabled unassigned pending acceptance.

The Chair must remind the gentleman that no debate is allowed—

Mr. STANLEY: I won't debate, I second the motion.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that this Report shall lay upon the table unassigned pending acceptance. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report was so tabled.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair requests the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, to the rostrum

for the purpose of presiding as Speaker pro tem.

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

Bill Substituted for Report

Mrs. Harriman from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Closed Season on Deer in Towns of Deer Isle and Stonington" (H. P. 160) (L. D. 207)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard.

Mr. SHEPARD: Mr. Speaker, I move that we substitute the Bill for the Report and I would like to speak briefly to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SHEPARD: First I want to assure the House Members that this thinking isn't the result of the epidemic of substituting the Bills for the Reports. We have been picking on the Appropriations Committee, now we are switching over to the Inland Fish and Game Committee. I would also like to say that it isn't without the consideration of the Committee's thinking on this, the motion that I have stated. I realize that it has been taken up in executive session many times. It is a problem presented in a different manner than the usual manner of public hearing and I understand the gentlewoman from Lovell, Mrs. Harriman, House Chairman of the Fish and Game Committee, will explain the Committee's position on it later.

Most of you have surmised by reading the title of the Bill that it is a local problem. As a general rule local problems are of little interest to other than those involved. Those of you who were members of the 97th session may remember that a bill was introduced and passed to permit hunting of deer in the towns of Deer Isle and Stonington. This was an unusual procedure in that the island had always been closed to deer hunting. It was sponsored by a small group who perhaps could be criticized for

not taking it up in a public meeting such as town meeting or the newspapers or something, but they perhaps felt that there was not too much opposition, some misunderstanding anyhow, there was a considerable opposition afterwards from the residents of the island, after this bill became law. We have had two years of open season, '55 and '56, and considerable dissatisfaction from both towns.

Following election in September, you House Members can appreciate my position in that I was button-holed by both sides, by those that were for the open season and those that were opposed. In an effort to be fair with both sides and really learn what the majority of the people wanted to do we hit upon an idea of conducting a poll. As a basis of who should participate in this poll we worked and mailed to people listed as voters, resident voters and property owners in both towns. We mailed out nearly two thousand of these questionnaires, which the Speaker has distributed to your desks. I did this for an informative purpose so you could read what the questionnaire consisted of and make sure that it didn't favor one side or the other, and that they couldn't vote unless they did sign so that we could check to determine that they were resident voters.

We received nearly a fifty per cent reply to those questionnaires, receiving over a thousand, discarding some because they did not sign them, and others said we will give you as our representative proxy, and we did not include those. As a result of this poll and a petition to close the island we did introduce such a bill. The public hearing was held, I believe, on February 12, and the Committee has been trying to decide the issue ever since because of the different aspects of the poll taken.

To me I felt that this was a fair way to handle the local question. It is similar in respect to what we accomplished yesterday in deciding to put the four year term for governor out on referendum to the people to be decided by their vote. I still feel that the question we will decide here today is whether a local problem such as deer, which could be consid-

ered a natural resource, will we permit the people to settle that issue by home rule?

The voters, after receiving these questionnaires in the mail had the opportunity to read the questionnaire, give the thing some thought, mark the ballot and return it to the sender, their representative. I did keep these in strict confidence, they were not made public, only the totals, and were brought in to the Inland Fish and Game at the hearing, instead of asking the opponents to come over in a body. To me we accomplished the same thing as holding a public hearing where nine hundred and sixty-five people were involved.

The procedure could be criticized in saying that you can't handle a deer problem or any other local issue on that basis, but so I will know, and perhaps other members who might use this as an example, when the motion to accept the Bill for the Report is taken, following discussion which there may be, I would request a division so we will know whether this meets with the approval of the House Members or not.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, that the Bill be substituted for the Report.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Lovell, Mrs. Harriman.

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of this House: When this Bill, L. D. 207, came to the Committee, the first thought that it could be put out in new draft under which Stonington and Deer Isle would be put under game management. Mr. Shepard, the gentleman from Stonington, in his case I say gentleman with no reservations, came to me and said he thought his area would accept a compromise, closing Deer Isle and leaving Stonington open to deer hunting for two years. He hoped during that period to sell the idea of game management to his constituents. This Bill has remained in Committee during the entire session. The Committee is reluctant to close any area, the wardens would rather leave the situation as is, and there has never been a hunting accident in this area. However, the people in this area

want the place closed to deer hunting. In executive session we tried to agree on this separate compromise, but many members of the Committee have wearied of trying to effect an agreement and we passed this Bill out with the "Ought not to pass" Report.

Now, the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, has the unfavorable duty of trying to save his bill on the House floor. The residents want Stonington and Deer Isle closed to hunting. I have said before and I reiterate, that the matter of fish and game is not a matter of birds and beasts and fish but a matter of people. I have been told by a legislator that I do not understand politics, but if some things are politics I don't think I care to understand them.

May I say, Ladies and Gentlemen, public relations are very important to any business, and fish and game in the State of Maine is definitely a big business. We, the representatives of our respective districts, strive to maintain good public relations. I have felt that during this session, and I must say that I have felt, that the matter of public relations in matters pertaining to bills before the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game have been sadly ignored. I wish the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, the best of luck.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Probably you House Members have noticed that this is an unusual bill. It has the unanimous support of the Committee, which is unusual for this particular committee.

Now, I would like to say a word in regard to the questionnaire sent to the people of Stonington. I am sure that if this same questionnaire was sent to the people of my town, the property owners and so forth, that the vote would be liable to be in the majority of wanting to close the deer season because if the same petition was sent to the people who hold licenses in the town it would be different. Because in our town we have had for several years fatal accidents caused by hunting. And the decision of the Committee, a lot

of it bore on the fact that in many towns they had accidents from hunters, and in this particular area they had none. We couldn't find any justification in closing the island. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, that the Bill be substituted for the Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard.

Mr. SHEPARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel I left out an important bit of information pertaining to the questionnaire. I mentioned the total vote returned but of that total returned six hundred and twenty-two voted no, they were not in favor, and three hundred and forty-two voted yes, they were. It was almost two to one in favor of closing the island.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is perhaps not a major party issue admittedly, but I was requested by an out of state resident who lives on Deer Isle to make one comment, but before I do I would like to have a piece of information. I would like to direct my question through the Chair to the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Baird, asking him if he would be kind enough to tell me what is the situation on the islands of Vinalhaven and North Haven, do they have an open season or closed season on deer?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, asks a question through the Chair to the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Baird, who may answer if he so chooses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Baird.

Mr. BAIRD: The Island of Vinalhaven and the Island of Isle au Haut are both closed, the island of North Haven is open and has a regular season, but North Haven doesn't have very many deer and we haven't had any trouble there about it being open. I would suspect that a few deer have been shot there but they have never been registered. While I am on my feet I would sup-

port my good friend, the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, saying that I was down to Deer Island two years ago when the season was open and I had quite a frightening experience down there. If they have never had any hunting accidents down there they are very lucky because I saw things down there that would scare you to death. In fact I saw one man get right in back of a house and lay down behind a cellar wall he was so scared. I want to go on record as supporting Mr. Shepard, I know what the problem can be on these islands where they are cut up with bays and coves and so forth, a small area, a lot of summer cottages and so forth, he has got a terrific problem there and I want to support him. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen.

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go along with my colleague, the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, because I was that gentleman down in back of the wall. I admit there have been some experiences in my life but I think that was the one I was most happy to escape from, and I assure you that there is a condition down there which needs remedying, and if possible to close that by law here I would vote twice if I possibly could.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Baird, for answering my question and then some. I would like to point out, if you have a map in your desks, that apparently the majority of our heavily populated by summer residents islands are closed, and as I said earlier, I had a resident of Deer Isle from Pennsylvania, make the comment that since they have opened the season down there he was very much concerned and worried because his home has been hit on occasions and it is quite a problem. These summer people who have looked to Maine as a place to come, particularly these small islands, are unhappy about it. I would venture a guess that if we should open Mount Desert Island to deer hunting it would have quite an effect

upon the summer residents. Therefore, I would certainly support the motion of the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, that the Bill be substituted for the Report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett.

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am probably as familiar with Stonington as I spent a few of my boyhood days on that island. I went to school there when I was about eight years old, and I know the location of it very, very well and I certainly want to support the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, that the Bill "An Act relating to Closed Season on Deer in Towns of Deer Isle and Stonington", House Paper 160, Legislative Document 207, be substituted for the Report. Is the House ready for the question? The gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Shepard, has requested a division.

Will all those who are in favor of substituting the Bill for the Report please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred having voted in the affirmative and one having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its first and second readings and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Emerson.

Mr. EMERSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we reconsider our action of this morning whereby we voted to recede and concur on item twenty on page four, House Paper 768, Legislative Document 1101.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Emerson, that the House reconsider its action of this morning whereby we voted to recede and concur on Resolve Authorizing Study of Proposed Road from Millinocket to Grindstone, House Paper 768,

Legislative Document 1101. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Emerson.

Mr. EMERSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At this time I would like to insist and I ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Emerson, now moves that we insist on our former action and requests a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Ought to Pass in New Draft New Draft Printed

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve Authorizing Study of the Problems of the Uninsured Motorist (H. P. 991) (L. D. 1420) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1093) (L. D. 1589) under title of "Resolve Authorizing Legislative Research Committee Study of the Problems of the Uninsured Motorist" and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Bragdon from same Committee on Resolve in favor of Town of Newport, Penobscot County (H. P. 338) (L. D. 470) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1094) (L. D. 1590) under title of "Resolve relating to Research and Experimental Work in Relation to the Eradication of Aquatic Weeds" and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted, and New Drafts read once and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass Printed Bill

Mr. Bragdon from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Travel by Inspectors of Table Stock Potatoes" (H. P. 497) (L. D. 709)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs

on Bill "An Act Increasing Pensions of Elderly Teachers" (H. P. 258) (L. D. 356) 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. 258, L. D. 356, Bill "An Act Increasing Pensions of Elderly Teachers."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 5th line the underlined figure "\$1,300" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$1,200'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 7th line the underlined figure "\$1,200" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$1,100'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 9th line the underlined figure "\$1,100" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$1,000'

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Committee Amendment "A"?

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

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, I was rather surprised to see this Committee Amendment "A" reduction in the amounts asked for the elderly teachers. And I am in order I believe, to talk on this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, I was at the hearing at the time that this bill was presented to the Committee, and after the Committee heard the stories and evidence about these elderly teachers I wouldn't possibly believe that they could decrease the amount asked. It must be remembered that the majority of the elderly teachers are elderly women that don't even have, a big percentage of them, the advantage of a family, to help them because they never were married. They dedicated their lives to teaching and furthering the education of other people's children. And I don't believe it is possible for the members of this House to ignore them and the amount asked for as measly as it is. I thought possibly the Committee might even break a precedent and

recommend a larger increase in their pension. I believe that the Appropriations Committee, the day they put this out, must have had a sleepless night. Therefore, I move that Committee Amendment "A" to L. D. 356 be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, that the Committee Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We would all like to get everything that we ask for in this life, and especially in this case. It is sort of a tear jerker, we might say. And as we all know life is a compromise and we all know who have been around here a long time that politics is certainly a compromise, and this is a compromise measure, and I would like to say that the elderly teachers are going to be very pleased, and I am very pleased with the way this bill is coming out. I don't want to take a lot of time but the three hundred dollars did present quite serious problems. In fact there would be some teachers on the non-contributory pension system that would be getting more than some of the contributory teachers. But by reducing it from three hundred to two hundred instead of being a wide gap it narrowed the gap down very radically. So the Appropriations Committee came to me in good faith and presented the problems to me and asked me if I would be willing to compromise and after discussing it with them a long time I told them I would providing they would permit me to put on an emergency clause on the bill, which they very kindly consented to do, and in that way the teachers will gain about two months, they will begin collecting July 1 instead of probably November 1, if the bill had gone through the other way.

And so, in answer to the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, I wish we could have the three hundred dollars too, but I feel that the elderly teachers and everybody are going to be very happy with the two hundred with the emer-

gency clause, and I am afraid that if we kick the bill around we might lose the whole thing. And I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, does not prevail.

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

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, just one more thing to say. Of course I haven't talked with Mr. Fuller, the gentleman from South Portland, on this bill, but at the time we reviewed this thing, everybody was in accord that three hundred dollars was small enough. And we have a lot of elderly teachers around that are in dire need and need this money, and it seems to me that if the Appropriations Committee can appropriate money to eradicate aquatic weeds they can certainly appropriate money to save the lives of elderly people.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is a very important matter, and our numbers are getting somewhat thinned out. At this time after the eloquent speech of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, I somewhat regret making this motion, but I feel it is only fair to a lot of people that this matter be tabled until Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the matter lie upon the table specially assigned for Tuesday next. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill "An Act Increasing Pensions of Elderly Teachers", House Paper 258, Legislative Document 356, was tabled specially assigned for Tuesday, May 21, pending the adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER EDGAR: The Chair would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, very much for his excellent services.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms conducted the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, to his seat on the Floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Edgar assumed the Chair.

Mr. Davis from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve Appropriating Money for Forest Rehabilitation (H. P. 337) (L. D. 469) 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. 337, L. D. 469, Resolve, Appropriating Money for Forest Rehabilitation.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the words "the Federal Soil Bank Program" in the 2nd and 3rd lines and inserting in place thereof the words 'Federal funds'

Further amend said Resolve by striking out the words and figures "\$100,000" in each of the years 1957-58 and 1958-59 in the 8th line and inserting in place thereof the words and figures 'the sum of \$10,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958 and \$10,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959'

Further amend said Resolve by striking out the words "the purposes of this resolve have been accomplished" in the 14th and 15th lines and inserting in place thereof the words and figures 'June 30th, 1959'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Mr. Duquette from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve Authorizing Research of Cystic Fibrosis, a Disease of Children (H. P. 803) (L. D. 1134) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee.

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: After

seeing my talented young friend, the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, torpedoed, I kind of figured that the silver haired globe trotter from Madison is going to get keel-hauled.

This is a bill that I have been vitally interested in. I understand the objection to the original bill was that other organizations had a right to come before the State Legislature and ask for appropriations. That is so. But I find that most of those other organizations are taken care of by foundations and drives of this sort. Gentlemen, did you ever hear of a Monthers' March for Cystic Fibrosis? In fact you have never heard of cystic fibrosis, I don't believe, until I came here. The only mothers' march for cystic fibrosis, unfortunately, Ladies and Gentlemen, is held in the cemetery.

This is one of the most deadly diseases known to medical science at the present day—there is no known cure for it whatever. I have done a lot of work on this, I have made several trips to Boston, I have discussed it with people, and I am very happy to see by the amendment, that I do not have to go back to that family in Madison, the one in Anson, the one in Bingham, the one in Bar Harbor, Biddeford, Auburn and Rumford, and say to them that we are only mildly interested in the welfare of your children, we know they are going to die. They know that, they have been told that. I have sought information from all sources, and being somewhat of an intelligent gentleman in my own right, I turned to the female of the sex for information, the very glamorous, bashful and blushing young lady from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks, the very capable, staid and responsible lady from Rumford, Miss Cormier, I most humbly bow. Their help has been wonderful to me. Although I didn't get as much response as I had hoped for, I also will take this time to thank each and every member of the House for the help that they have given me on this matter.

Now, this is a terrific situation and we must crawl before we walk. You will understand, I believe that, when any man takes upon himself the idea or the privilege of champ-

ioning the cause of the small, the unjustly treated, those who are sick, is going to be in for rough treatment to a certain extent. I submit to you gentlemen that I thrive on rough treatment. It was rough during he battle of Britain, I was there. It was tougher in the South Pacific, I was there. I can take a little more rough treatment, and I am very happy to see that I didn't get treated as nearly as rough as I thought I might be. And with that thought in mind gentlemen, and from what I have found out, that with the passage of this bill as amended, it will give me an incentive and a possible clue to go out and get some more money to carry this thing through to its full execution, because in this I cannot fail and neither can you.

We only hope that this does not hit in any one of our families, of course it won't in mine, my children have grown up and gone away, but there are others who have young children. There is no knowing where the disease comes from, very little is known about it, all we know is that the children who have it up to the present day, have no hope of survival. The expense involved is very heavy and unfortunately each and every family that I know that is afflicted with this disease are in the low paid bracket.

We heard at the Committee hearing testimony from young couples who came in there and bared their souls to that Committee and told that they had spent everything they had, mortgaged everything that was possible and still lost their children. Now, I picked up the cudgel from there, and I intend to hold right onto it to see that this thing is carried through to its full execution. Some day we hope that it may be here in Maine that a cure to this dread killer can be found.

On my second trip to Boston I was taken around and shown the children they have down there, at that time there was thirty-eight in all. Some of those children are going to die, some of them are going to be able to be kept alive for some number of years, they don't know how long. I was very delighted to meet Doctor Swartzman, a man who has devoted his life to the study of

this disease, fifteen and sixteen hours a day seven days a week. I have heard from Doctor Alvarez in New York. I have heard from the Governor of Connecticut, and I have heard from people who I never hope to see but I hope someday possibly I may meet them, complimenting me on what I have brought out here.

Now, I stumbled on this but I am not going to stumble over it. And with your help, Ladies and Gentlemen, and anything that you can do to help us along the way with your encouragement will be greatly appreciated, and I now move that this Bill receive passage as amended.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, that the House accept the "Ought to pass" as amended Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Resolve was given its first reading.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 803, L. D. 1134, Resolve Authorizing Research of Cystic Fibrosis, a Disease of Children.

Amend said Resolve by inserting after the word "study" in the 2nd line thereof, the words 'and to aid in the relief and treatment of'

Further amend said Resolve by striking out the figure "10,000" in the 7th line and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$5,000'; and by striking out the figure "\$10,000" in the 8th line and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$5,000'

Further amend said Resolve by striking out the words "the purposes of this resolve have been accomplished" in the 11th and 12th lines and inserting in place thereof the words and figures 'June 30, 1959'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Mr. Edwards from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve Authorizing Funds for Medical and Dental Education for New England Board of Higher Education (H. P. 581) (L. D. 830) 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. 581, L. D. 830, Resolve, Authorizing Funds for Medical and Dental Education for New England Board of Higher Education.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the words and figure "annually on June 30" in the last line and inserting in place thereof the words and figure 'on or before October 1st annually'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Edwards from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey (H. P. 1066) (L. D. 1524) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarification of this piece of legislation I would like to ask a question through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask of Mr. Bean of Winterport, the purpose of Committee Amendment "A"?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Carey, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Bean, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. BEAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In answer to the question of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Carey, I would state that the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, after due consideration of this Bill, considered that they had placed in the balanced budget the full amount of money for the Aeronautics Commission that we felt that we

could possibly do. We therefore presented this bill as amended for that reason, which does carry the approval of the Committee for the survey but leave it up to them to secure the funds out of the present money in the balanced budget.

The SPEAKER: Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. CAREY: I thank the gentleman from Winterport for his explanation, and I now move that Legislative Document 1524 be tabled and specially assigned for Wednesday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Carey, that with respect to Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey, House Paper 1066, Legislative Document 1524, the Committee Report be tabled and specially assigned for Wednesday next pending acceptance. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report was so tabled.

Mr. Browne from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Revising the General Laws Relating to Municipalities" (H. P. 320) (L. D. 437) 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. 320, L. D. 437, Bill, "An Act Revising the General Laws Relating to Municipalities."

Amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 12" of section 1 by adding at the end of subsection I a new underlined paragraph H, to read as follows:

'H. Obtaining the services of municipal advisory organizations.'

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 12" of section 1 by striking out the underlined word "medical" in the first line of paragraph E of subsection IV.

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 16" of section 1 by adding at the end of subsection II the following underlined sentence: **'It does not pledge the credit of nor create a lien against any other property of the municipality.'**; by

striking out all of subsection III, and by renumbering subsections IV, V and VI to be subsections III, IV and V.

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 26" of section 1 by inserting the underlined word 'departmental' before the underlined word "operations" in subparagraph 5 of paragraph A of subsection III.

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 35" of section 1 by adding at the end thereof the following underlined sentence: **'A town official may not be elected on a motion to cast one ballot.'**

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 40" of section 1 by striking out all of paragraph D of subsection IV and inserting in place thereof the following underlined paragraph:

'D. Statement of departmental operations.'

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 43" of section 1 by inserting after the underlined word "may" in the first line of subsection III the underlined words 'vote to'

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 50" of section 1 by striking out the underlined words "and clerk" in the first line and inserting in place thereof the underlined punctuation and words ' , clerk and collector'

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 50" of section 1 by striking out the underlined Roman numeral "VI" in the 2nd line of subsection I and inserting in place thereof the underlined Roman numeral 'VII'

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 51" of section 1 by striking out the underlined Roman numeral "VI" in the 2nd line of subsection I and inserting in place thereof the underlined Roman numeral 'VII'

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 61" of section 1 by striking out all of subparagraph 2 of paragraph E of subsection II and by striking out all of paragraph "G" of subsection II and inserting in place thereof the following underlined paragraph G:

'G. County and municipal governments shall abide by a zoning ordinance enacted by a municipality.'

A zoning ordinance is advisory with respect to the State Government.'

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 130-A" of section 18 by striking out all of the last sentence.

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof a new section 20, to read as follows:

'Sec. 20. State Tax Assessor may print and distribute copies of chapter 90-A. The State Tax Assessor is specifically authorized, upon receipt of payment therefor by the Maine Municipal Association, to reproduce and distribute printed copies of Chapter 90-A of the Revised Statutes as part of the laws printed and distributed by the State Bureau of Taxation.'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Mr. Hancock from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Acknowledgment and Validation of Certain Instruments" (H. P. 369) (L. D. 499) 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. 369, L. D. 499, Bill "An Act Relating to Acknowledgment and Validation of Certain Instruments."

Amend said Bill by inserting before the period at the end of "Sec. 1" the following underlined words: **'as to acknowledgment and authenticity'**

Further amend said Bill by striking out the 5th line of "Sec. 2" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'cluding powers of attorney, heretofore made between April 15, 1927 and January 1, 1957,'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the first 5 sentences of that part of "Sec. 3" designated "Sec. 41" and inserting in place thereof the following sentences:

'All deeds and other instruments, including powers of attorney heretofore made between April 15, 1927 and January 1, 1957, for the conveyance of real property in this State or any interest therein, and

otherwise valid except that the same omitted to state any consideration therefor or that the same were not sealed by the grantors or any of them, are validated. Every duly recorded satisfaction piece or instrument heretofore executed between April 15, 1927 and January 1, 1957, with intent to cancel and discharge or assign a mortgage of real estate, fully identifying the mortgage so intended to be canceled and discharged or assigned, but not drawn in formal accordance with statutory requirements, shall be held a valid discharge or assignment of such mortgage and a release or assignment of the mortgage interest in such real estate. All corporations organized or attempted to be organized under and by virtue of any of the statutes of this State more than 20 years prior to April 15, 1927 January 1, 1957, and not heretofore, between April 15, 1927 and January 1, 1957, declared to be invalid, shall be held to all intents and purposes as if the same had in all respects been properly and rightfully organized and existing as lawful corporations, and the deeds or other instruments of such corporations organized or attempted to be organized, given in their corporate names, affecting real estate in this State or conveying the same, and heretofore between April 15, 1927 and January 1, 1957 recorded, or written out at length upon the books of record in the registry of deeds in the county in which such real estate lies, shall not be held invalid by reason of any lack of authority or informality for or in their execution or delivery, if taken bona fide from the acting officers of such corporation or attempted organization as such, which such taking shall be presumed, but such corporations, attempted organizations as such, with such deeds and their records made as aforesaid, are validated. Any deed or other instrument made for the purpose of conveying real property in this State or any interest therein, and heretofore recorded or spread at length in the books of record in the registry of deeds for the county in which said real property lies, between April 15, 1927 and January 1, 1957, which said deed or other in-

strument or said records fail to disclose authority by such corporation for the conveyance of such real estate, or which deed or other instrument fails to bear the corporate seal, or is executed or acknowledged by the person executing such deed in his individual capacity, or which fails to disclose the official capacity of the person executing such deed, or which was not signed by the officer duly authorized to sign such deed, with its record made as aforesaid, is validated. All deeds and other instruments heretofore made **between April 15, 1927 and January 1, 1957** for the conveyance of real property in this State, or any interest therein and executed by a person or persons purporting to act as the agent or attorney of the grantors, their spouses, or any of them, which such deeds have been recorded or written at length in the books of record in the registry of deeds for the county in which said real property lies more than 40 years prior to **April 15, 1927 January 1, 1957**, but no power of attorney authorizing and empowering such agent or attorney to make such conveyance or execute and deliver such deed, appears of record, but such real estate has in the meantime been occupied, claimed or treated by the grantees and those claiming by, through or under them as other property of like kind and similarly situated would be held or claimed by the owners thereof, shall be held to all intents and purposes as if executed and delivered under and by virtue of proper power of attorney duly recorded and given for the purpose, and the records thereof are validated.'

Committee Amendment A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Out of Order

Mr. Beane of Augusta presented the following Order out of order and under suspension of the rules:

WHEREAS, the members of the House have learned that today is the birthday of Mr. ALLEN of Chelsea,

BE IT ORDERED, that the members of the House extend to Mr.

Allen their congratulations and their best wishes not only for today but for the entire year.

The Order received passage.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Powers of State Board of Education" (S. P. 479) (L. D. 1384)

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

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

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the opposition is very interested to debate this Bill and is not prepared to do so today. Therefore, I would move that it be tabled and specially assigned for next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Powers of State Board of Education", this Bill be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday next pending third reading.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the lady from Rumford, Miss Cormier?

The SPEAKER: If the question pertains only to the time of assignment.

Mr. TOTMAN: Would the lady from Rumford reconsider her date for assignment and withdraw that date for assignment and let the bill be passed to be engrossed, if she knew that there would be no debate.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, the lady from Rumford would be delighted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the lady from Rumford, Miss Cormier, moves third reading of the Bill.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Pari-Mutuel Horse Racing and the Stipend Fund" (H. P. 748) (L. D. 1062)

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

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

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer House Amendment "B", move its passage and speak just before.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox, offers House Amendment "B" to Bill "An Act Relating to Pari Mutuel Horse Racing and the Stipend Fund", and moves its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" 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 all of section 1 thereof.

Further amend said Bill by renumbering sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 to be sections 1, 2, 3 and 4.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The amendment to the Bill only gives the smaller fairs a chance to come in on the increase of the one-half per cent of the stipend fund which the Bill 1062 provides. Under this Bill as written now it all goes to the fairs that have the pari mutuel windows. And certainly in Hancock County, the Blue Hill fair, if you look them over they are in pretty bad circumstances in their buildings. And I was told last year if we didn't do something at this legislature the fair would have to close. I think the same thing applies to Washington County.

Of course I have been told that the smaller fairs didn't oppose this legislation, I don't know whether they oppose it or not but it seems to me that legally I was entitled to receive a hundred dollars I don't think that I would just turn around and give it to somebody else if I was in the same situation as they are in. So I move the passage of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox, that the House adopt House Amendment "B".

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

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hate to keep rising to object to the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox, but as he has so stated that these fairs do not object I want to remind you again that this Bill is the result of the members of the Maine State Association of Agricultural Fairs, which includes these fairs. I want to point out that these smaller agricultural fairs that don't have the pari mutuel racing, we pay in toward the stipend to them, so the more help we get the more chance they have to survive, and they understand that. In fact I talked to the manager of the Blue Hill Fair in particular on this and he understands it, so I would like to move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I really feel sorry for my friend, and when I say friend, my particular friend, the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox. He presented an amendment here yesterday and it would hurt the bill very much, and today he again presented House Amendment "B". As my good friend the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, has just told you, there are twenty-four county fairs in the state, and twelve of them, if my figure is right, are pari mutuels. And the pari mutuel is an added expense to all small fairs and this will help them to defray the expenses.

Like in my own little fair there, we laid out around thirty-six thousand dollars for certain things like the grandstand and cattle shed, horse races, and the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox, knows, and I have talked with him, and I don't want to keep repeating what the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, has said, that the fairs all receive something from this pari mutuel betting, and if they want to get this other money they can very easily themselves set up a pari mutuel race track. And I am not going to take any more time unless I have to through rebuttal. I hope you will go along with the motion of the gen-

tleman from Union, Mr. Heald, in the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, because I know that there is another motion pending to indefinitely postpone the entire bill, and in order that we may get through as many of these third readers as possible today so the engrossing department can work on them over the weekend, I ask that this controversial item be laid on the table until Monday.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that Bill "An Act relating to Pari Mutuel Horse Racing and the Stipend Fund", House Paper 748, Legislative Document 1062, be tabled pending the motion of the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, that House Amendment "B" be indefinitely postponed.

Will all 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 before the House is the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "B".

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

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You just heard from my good friend, the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, saying what a bad situation Cumberland is in, I believe, but I visited there last year and they certainly are a lot better off than fairs like Blue Hill and down in Cherryfield, the fairs down to the east of us. And every one of the ones that have the pari mutuel windows if they are not making money they should get rid of the gambling things and get out of it altogether if it doesn't help. So where we are so poor that we can't afford to go into that I think we should have a little assistance from some of the ones who are wealthy enough to have the gambling. I hope the motion for indefinite postponement does not prevail.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, by the amendment that the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox, put on it is going to completely destroy the intent of the bill. The actual intent of this bill is to help the associations on ground improvements and repairs and so forth, but by repealing this section you are going to throw the whole thing into the stipend fund, and that part of it is used for 4-H purposes and so forth and not to be used for the associations themselves. So therefore I certainly hope this House will go along with the indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the 4-H was more important than the gambling but maybe it isn't. I move a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "B". The gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Tarbox, has requested a division.

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

A division of the House was had. Eighty-nine having voted in the affirmative and three having voted in the negative the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill and all its accompanying papers, if any, be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I really must regret to take your time and get up here again. It isn't only about three hours and a half ago that the gentleman who just asked you, my good friend from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, to indefinitely postpone this Bill just a min-

ute ago, three and a half hours ago I was talking to him and he has never been to a country fair by his own admission, and he has not bet for the last five or six years, and I hope that his motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that Bill "An Act relating to Pari Mutuel Horse Racing and the Stipend Fund", House Paper 748, Legislative Document 1062, be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman has requested a division.

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

A division of the House was had.

Four having voted in the affirmative and ninety-five having voted 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.

Bill "An Act relating to Cutting of Christmas Trees" (H. P. 1091) (L. D. 1585)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak on this bill yesterday but it got by me. And as most of you know this came out in a new draft, the first draft was quite obnoxious to some of the farmers and the Christmas tree cutters in my area, and there is quite a bit of opposition to it. But in order to speed up the legislative process I will not make a motion at this time, I will let the Bill go on for third reading and I will have a chance to check it over the weekend and if it is necessary when it comes up for enactment I will move indefinite postponement of it at that time.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw,

for his very considerate move. I wish that the rest of the members of the House would heed the words that he has said, that if you allow us to get through the calendar, you will still have an opportunity if you are opposed to these bills, to move indefinite postponement at the enactment stage, and incidentally to help our reporter who I think has had rather a long day, rather than have more lengthy debate.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Voluntary Admissions and Discharges at Pine-land Hospital and Training Center" (H. P. 1092) (L. D. 1586)

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 Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Calhoun Vaccination" (H. P. 579) (L. D. 828)

Bill "An Act to Reactivate a State Committee on Aging" (H. P. 767) (L. D. 1100)

Bill "An Act Directing Revision of Sea and Shore Fisheries Laws" (H. P. 830) (L. D. 1186)

Resolve in favor of Maple Grove Cemetery Association of Randolph (H. P. 635) (L. D. 902)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Lights on Rear of Trucks" (S. P. 546) (L. D. 1532)

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

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I am certain that there was a thought in the mind of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, when he said

he hoped that we would allow the bills to go on through and have their third reading not to make any motions on them for indefinite postponement or otherwise at this time as a matter of expediency, but I am also certain after conferring with him that he wants every member of this House, as I do, if you have any desire to amend any one of these bills, have your amendments prepared over the weekend and you can so do because you want to remember that that cannot be done after it reaches the enactment stage. I believe he will concur with these remarks.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: I request unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TOTMAN: I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh. I would have to add one remark that if any of you have a desire to amend any of these bills, they should be tabled until they are passed to be engrossed to save reconsidering, so if you do wish to amend it would help out if you would make the motion to table until the next legislative day, or if you wish to move indefinite postponement, as I suggested earlier we can do that at the enactment stage.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Weight of Commercial Vehicles (S. P. 352) (L. D. 930)

An Act relating to Tenure of Office of Members of Highway Commission (S. P. 540) (L. D. 1519)

An Act relating to Fees to Town Clerks or Certified Copies of Election Check Lists (H. P. 249) (L. D. 310)

An Act to Revise Certain Motor Vehicle Laws (H. P. 403) (L. D. 533)

An Act relating to Methods of Taking Clams and Marine Worms (H. P. 689) (L. D. 957)

An Act relating to Sale of Pasteurized Milk Only to Certain Institutions (H. P. 738) (L. D. 1052)

An Act Revising the Maine Milk Commission Law (H. P. 851) (L. D. 1214)

An Act relating to Exemptions from Excise Tax of Motor Buses Used for Transportation of Passengers for Hire (H. P. 848) (L. D. 1252)

An Act relating to Licensed Dog Training Areas and Permits Therefor (H. P. 1082) (L. D. 1556)

Finally Passed

Resolve Authorizing Franklin T. Kurt of Huntington, New York to Sue the State of Maine (S. P. 242) (L. D. 643)

Resolve Authorizing the State Highway Commission to Make a Study of the Public Ways of the State (S. P. 545) (L. D. 1531)

Resolve in favor of Willis L. Cushing of Portland, Maine (H. P. 301) (L. D. 396)

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.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to Services of State Police on Maine Turnpike" (H. P. 106) (L. D. 144) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. CROCKETT of Freeport
HAUGHN of Bridgton
JALBERT of Lewiston

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor,

Adjourned until Monday, May 20, at one o'clock in the afternoon.