

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

Tuesday, May 21, 1957

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

Prayer by Father Burns of Augusta.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to the Visible Indication of Elapsed Time on Parking Meters" (H. P. 361) (L. D. 491) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

DWIGHT BROWN
ORVILLE B. HAUGHN
B. A. TURNER
— Committee on part of House

BENJAMIN BUTLER
ROBERT MARTIN
ALAN WOODCOCK, JR.
— Committee on part of Senate

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Papers from the Senate
Senate Reports of Committees
Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Admittance of and Charges for Patients at State Sanatoriums" (S. P. 395) (L. D. 1091)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Providing Funds for Operation of Educational Television (S. P. 169) (L. D. 448)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Retirements and Pensions, acting by authority of Joint Order (S. P. 318) reporting a Resolve (S. P. 589) (L. D. 1588) under title of "Resolve to

Repeal Certain Special Resolve Pensions" 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 tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Allocate Monies for the Administrative Expenses of the State Liquor Commission for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959" (S. P. 167) (L. D. 446) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 586) (L. D. 1587) 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 tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass in New Draft Amended in Senate

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Guaranteed Loans for Industrial Purposes (S. P. 460) (L. D. 1301) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 580) (L. D. 1581) 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 as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

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

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 580, L. D. 1581, Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Guaranteed Loans for Industrial Purposes.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the first 4 lines of the next to last paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following:

'And the inhabitants of said cities, towns and plantations shall vote by ballot on said question, and shall indicate by a cross or check mark placed against the words "Yes" or "No" their opinion of the same. The ballots shall be received, sorted, counted and de-

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence.

Mr. Bruce of Buxton offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 580, L. D. 1581, Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Guaranteed Loans for Industrial Purposes.

Amend said Resolve by striking out the 3rd line before the question in the Referendum and inserting in place thereof the following: 'and Representatives at a special statewide election to be held on the 2nd Monday of September, 1957, to'

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, this item number 5 seems to me to be a very important item and one which should have very careful consideration, and I wonder whether we should pass over it without discussion, without further clarification of perhaps the implications of this bill. It, of course, would go as a referendum to the people, but I feel that we in this legislature should discuss this very carefully and thoughtfully before we vote to put it out to the people.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would be very glad to briefly, very briefly explain what this bill is. The original bill which was withdrawn some time ago was to authorize the state to participate with the new Department of Economic Development to be able to furnish facilities for these manufacturing interests which might be interested in coming into the state. It was very quickly discovered that the Constitution of the state would need a little amendment in order for us to

participate in this construction program. This is the amendment actually that would be passed by the people, amendment to the Constitution. It authorizes the state to guarantee the credit for these such industries as may come into the state, the bill says up to the extent of twenty million dollars. It actually limits, or would limit the construction of any one building up to five hundred thousand dollars. It actually costs the state nothing and a great many of the states in the Union are offering this service.

A very brief way of putting it would be if an industry was interested in coming to Maine that public development groups in the communities would build the building for them and lease it back to them on an equitable basis. They would pay taxes and the state would guarantee up to ninety per cent of the cost for the building. The very worst thing that could happen under this bill is there might be some circumstances whereby the state would perhaps eventually own the building, but that would be—it is not the experience of other states. The Commission of nine men would look over these companies very carefully and only do it on a very sound economic basis. I am quite certain that there is really not enough to the bill to cause a great deal of debate. In practice, it will probably not cost the state a single penny and it can mean a great many jobs and a great deal of new income which is so sadly needed here in the State of Maine.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that the House adopt House Amendment "A." Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Constructing a Fishway at Aroostook Falls" (S. P. 360) (L. D. 932)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CARPENTER of Somerset
HALL of York
BRIGGS of Aroostook
— of the Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT of Belgrade
Mrs. HARRIMAN of Lovell
Messrs. WHEATON of Princeton
DUDLEY of Enfield
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CARVILLE of Eustis
HARRIS of Greenville
ROSS of Brownville
— of the House.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, as one of the signers of the minority report I would like to explain a little further our reasons for doing so. Everyone knows a fishway is a good thing, we would all like to have them. But the location of this Aroostook Falls Fishway is about five miles across the border into Canada. It calls for an expenditure of \$15,000 by the Fish and Game Department and \$15,000 from Aroostook County, but this \$30,000 would only be a drop in the bucket, as I understand the completed job would cost in the neighborhood of \$150,000 and there is nothing in this bill that I can see where Canada couldn't say, after we have spent our original money in there, well we don't want you boys over here any more; you better go home. We might just as well spend the money in Mexico or in California or some other place, and I feel that if we have this money to spend, there are lots of places and sites in the State of Maine that need fishways, and it would be much better to spend our money in our own state, and for that reason, I move the acceptance of the minority "Ought not to pass" report.

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

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, as you know the Committee went to

Caribou last Monday and Tuesday. We went to the junction of the Tobique River and the St. John's River which is in New Brunswick, and we looked over a fishway that had been constructed by the Department of Fisheries in that Province. This fishway probably cost about \$250,000 and it was a good job. The thing is that the Province of New Brunswick requests and provides for fishways being built on dams constructed on rivers in their province. However, this Aroostook River comes into the St. John and the dam at the Aroostook Falls is constructed about three miles by the way of the river within the boundary of New Brunswick. This dam would have a fishway had it benefited the Province of New Brunswick, but it doesn't benefit the Province of New Brunswick, it would benefit the State of Maine. There is a fishway at the Falls at the present time, but well, a minnow couldn't get up the fishway, much less an Atlantic salmon. The Department of Inland Fisheries and Game is in favor of this construction if the pollution grading of the Aroostook River, the matter of pollution will not downgrade it. However, with the B pollution this would cause no conflict with the bill.

If we don't have to spend more than \$15,000 on a fishway at the Aroostook Falls, and if it will enable the Atlantic salmon to come into the Aroostook River, the amount of money that the northern part of Maine would receive through licenses and the expenditures of sportsmen who would go there to take the Atlantic salmon would greatly exceed the money expended and it would be a good business proposition. However, I am no prophet. I can't say how this would turn out, but one has to agree that it would be a good thing economically for the northern part of the State of Maine if we could get the Atlantic salmon in there, and have it compare to the Miramichi River in Canada. Thank you.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Old Bill Shakespeare said some years ago that "the quality of mer-

cy was not strained, it droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven upon the earth beneath." I wonder. You have seen me here for three months trying to get a bill through for \$10,000 to help twenty of our dying children. We only have seventeen of them left now. I was forced to take \$5,000. I was tickled to death to get it. Now, are we going up into New Brunswick and spend \$30,000 to help the Atlantic salmon get up over the dam and forget about the children who live in Madison, Anson, Bingham, Bar Harbor, Biddeford, Auburn and Rumford? It just does not seem to make sense to me, because I've worked hard for what I've got, and let the Atlantic salmon walk over the dam as far as I'm concerned. I move the acceptance of the minority report, and in my own particular case I feel that a "sadder and a wiser man arose tomorrow morn."

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I look at this as a more or less of a business proposition, and I have always made it a policy any place that I could spend fifty cents and get three dollars back was a good investment. The Fish and Game Department is not opposed to this. As a matter of fact, they think it is a good investment. As there will be a lot of extra licenses sold, this will eventually pay for itself. It absolutely doesn't benefit Canada one bit, but it does benefit the Aroostook River and the people in Aroostook County, and I would like to say that the money doesn't come out of the general fund. It is out of Fish and Game money and the Fish and Game Department is not opposed to its spending it in that place.

Now we spend, \$100,000 is a small figure for a fish hatchery and there have been several built in this state, and in my opinion they do a lot less good than this one fishway will do. The majority of the Committee gave this very careful consideration and felt that it was a very sound investment and Aroostook County was willing, and along with the sportsmen in Aroostook County, to do their very utmost to have this fin-

ished and asked for this small appropriation from the Fish and Game Department which they are very readily willing to spend and feel that it is a very good investment. I see no reason why this House should not go along with the proposition. Thank you.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a two-pronged question of any member of the Fish and Game Department.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JALBERT: Number one, is this fifteen or thirty thousand the initial cost? And is there more cost coming later on pertaining to this project?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member of the Fish and Game Committee who may answer.

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

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce of Caribou has agreed to put up \$15,000. They are asking an appropriation of \$15,000 from the Fish and Game Department, making \$30,000. The idea of the fishway at the Aroostook Falls dam is to build a few pools and rising pools for a short distance and then build what they call a fish ladder at the end of the resting pool at the top of the—part way up the Falls. They think that this can be done by the \$30,000 and they think, they believe that they can raise money enough to make their own future improvements on this. However, as I said, I can't be a seer as to what they're going to do at the next legislature, but that is the problem—the agreement now.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer the question a little more definitely, I think. We were given to understand that this completed fishway would cost from \$125,000 to \$150,000. They showed us the one in the Tobique River which cost a quarter of a million

dollars, and I understand that the one that they want to build in the Aroostook River is approximately the same kind of a fishway. I think that answers your question.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The information that we received is that this can cost a great sum of money later on, also that we are going into some sort of an agreement with a city and with another country. I can recall very definitely, a few years ago, when a bill was before this House that called for a preliminary survey to decide whether or not a full survey of Passamaquoddy Bay should be entered into. It involved \$30,000 supplied by the United States—by the State of Maine and \$30,000 by New Brunswick. After the bill was enacted into law, it was declared unconstitutional because we cannot, as a state, go into a contract with a foreign country. I am fully aware that this is not a contract, but it could well wind up into a contract. The initial tap is \$15,000 from us and \$15,000 from Caribou and the money is spent in Canada. Whether it benefits us or not, it is still spent in Canada. Now comes along other sessions of the next legislature. We don't know what New Brunswick is going to do about their laws. We could well be snuffed out of this program and then we would have to go into a contract and we can't do that, and then I fear that the money we have expended might be, would have been, wrongfully expended. For that purpose I move the indefinite postponement of both reports and its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: Coming from Aroostook County and this area that is involved, I want to speak in favor of this appropriation. I missed some of the earlier discussion on it, so I am somewhat at sea as to what has already been

said, but I have heard this discussed many times in the county and there has been a proposed county appropriation. I can't say now from what I have heard here lately whether that still goes, but some other member may take that up. I feel that in any project of this kind that we do always take an element of chance. I believe along with the proponents of this measure that it is very possible, more than possible, probably very probable, and if by restoring the salmon run to the Aroostook River, one of the still water rivers left in the state, for that very thing, that we might very well develop in the State of Maine and in Aroostook County a million dollar industry. People would come from far and wide if those salmon were restored, to fish them and, of course, they are not going to spend all their money in Aroostook County. They are going to spend it all the way up through the State of Maine. I think this a matter where we should get together where the — I feel that we have a very good case and I want to go on record in favor of it, and I believe the motion is for us to accept the minority report of the Committee and I hope that motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that the motion is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BRAGDON: I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, does not prevail.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope we will not go along and make more business for Canada. I think when we vote against this bill, we drive off our fishing industry further into Canada. We have a very big picture here in the State of Maine and it could be developed and bring in not \$15,000 but close to a million dollars. I see no reason why we would turn down a bill for such a small appropriation and encourage people to drive right by our doors and go fishing in the Miramichi and

certain rivers in Canada. One thing was brought about here this morning that reminded me—Canada is willing to stand \$100,000 on any fishway and here we are bickering whether we will spend a measly \$15,000. This, as I said before, does not come out of the appropriations, it comes out of the Fish and Game, and they have made a careful survey and they feel that it is worthy. I hope that this House will see fit not to indefinitely postpone this measure.

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I find myself at difference with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert. I certainly hope that his motion does not prevail.

It seems to me that a small expenditure of \$15,000, when you know what the income from sport fishing amounts to in the State of Maine, is a small investment. Certainly, a certain amount of chance is taken, and certainly there's a certain gamble in this. We don't know what's going to happen two years from now to anyone of us, let alone happen to any one of the rivers, fishways or anything else, but certainly this is a step in the proper direction and it certainly is a step for good public relations with our good friends and neighbors next door in New Brunswick. Certainly all the people in Aroostook County want it. It is of great benefit and help to them and it seems to me that this small amount of \$15,000 would be one of the best investments that the State of Maine could make. I certainly hope we do not go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. BARTLETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hope we don't go along with the motion of the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross.

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

Mr. JACK: Mr. Speaker, it is due time that we had a little fishing in

Maine. This is one of the most essential spots that we have in the State of Maine. You go into Canada and it costs around \$35 a day to fish. This will bring the people to Maine a great deal faster from Massachusetts and those other states to fish here. We have better conditions for them and everything else, and I do hope this bill passes.

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

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We are not establishing any precedent here, monies have been spent for such things outside the state, also the State of Maine yearly spends money outside of the State of Maine if they think that they can profit by such expenditures. The money is not coming from the Caribou Chamber of Commerce. It is coming from the Aroostook County Chambers of Commerce. It is a multiple effort. It is not a single town. In spending any of the State of Maine's money, we are interested, or we should be, in a return on such expenditures, and we are not always able to show a return other than intangibles. This is an investment for Aroostook and for the State of Maine which will show a dollars and cents return. It will show a dollars and cents return statewide because of the fact which the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, has brought out, the people will be traveling through the state. The Aroostook delegation has discussed this measure, and at the last report was in favor of such an item. I believe that we should go ahead with the development of our natural resources fully as much as we do with our industrial developments, and for those reasons, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would state that I certainly don't feel offended at my friend the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, taking issue with me on this at all. I feel that the time has come on many of these pieces of legislation here that I might take issue with

myself, but I would like to state again that this is not a \$15,000 problem. It is not a \$30,000 problem. It can get us involved into \$150,000 easily. Laws can be changed in Canada, and I assure you that I have been known not to take too much issue with the Canadians. Now this piece of legislation, I would like to repeat myself, this state is prohibited to go into a contract with another country and that is what we might be walking into. I have a great deal of respect for the Chamber of Commerce in Caribou, but are we going into a contract with the Town of Caribou Chamber of Commerce, with New Brunswick, and voting down as the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, stated, a project that he had and many, many other projects here.

Now, certainly Aroostook County is unanimous in this thing. I don't know anything about that. Nobody spoke to me about it until this morning. As a matter of fact, I spoke with at least two of the members from Aroostook County who indicated they were not too strong for this measure. It is not \$15,000 or \$30,000. It can involve \$150,000, plus, and it can involve besides that the repercussions of New Brunswick passing legislation. In so far as the Fish and Game Department being so strong for this thing, they are in the dedicated revenue field. It is only a couple or four years ago that the same Fish and Game Department wanted to tap the general fund for two fish hatcheries at the cost of three hundred thousand dollars, and I am not an expert on appropriation. I am not a king maker. I have nothing against Aroostook County. I love it. I love to visit there. There must be a stop somewhere. We are in our county, as I stated last week, we voted for bond issues on highways for years and years. We are the third largest contributor to the taxation department on any program of taxation in Androscoggin County. The accelerated program for highways gives us nothing, not a penny in my community. We are the thirteenth in recipients in so far as highway funds are concerned, and there are only sixteen counties, so we can only be the sixteenth in so far as fishing is concerned in our county. We must

stop somewhere. I would love a Cad- dy but I can't afford one.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to attempt to answer some of the objections of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert. If there is someone here better qualified than I am and they want to add something after I get through, I would certainly be glad to have them do it. In so far as a contract with Canada is concerned, I know nothing much about any contract. I have been told, and I believe that the information is accurate, that so far as the Canadian officials have been contacted and they are perfectly agreeable to this arrangement to take care of the Aroostook River. Of course, you must bear in mind that the Aroostook River does not flow through Canada where it is going to benefit Canadians, where the restoration of salmon in the river would benefit Canadians; it is benefiting the State of Maine because the river rises and flows through Maine except for a very few miles, and Canada is perfectly agreeable to Maine restoring, attempting to restore, this salmon run. They don't want to spend the money themselves to do it for us, and I don't know as you can blame them. If that explains anything in regard to Canada's position, I understand they are willing, and I see no reason why they shouldn't be.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, this appropriation is not a new thing as far as spending money in Canada is concerned. Past legislatures have appropriated money to build and improve this fishway on the Aroostook River, as far back as twenty years ago, so this is nothing new. It is also my understanding that in the Atlantic salmon survey that was made in the Aroostook River this is the last chance really for an Atlantic salmon run in the United States. I think it is very worthwhile. It is going to improve fishing conditions in the Aroostook River basin, and I hope that the motion of the gentle-

man from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would like to inject a little thought. There are only so many salmon run up the St. John River. Canada values their salmon fishing very greatly. They have expended a quarter of a million dollars almost building a fishway in the Tobique River. The Aroostook River enters the St. John diagonally across the St. John, a little distance north of the Tobique. If, for some reason or other, the salmon decided to run up the Aroostook River instead of the Tobique River if the fishway was built, and did not run up the Tobique so that Canada would have their salmon fishing, how long do you think Canada would stand if for some reason or other the salmon decided they wanted to come into Maine rather than go into New Brunswick? I am afraid they might cut off the fishway in Aroostook Falls.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to oppose the ideas just given by the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris. I think we should have more confidence and faith in our neighbors to the east. They are fine people, and I am sure that they would certainly want to be neighborly and not cut off any fishing in Maine or anything benefiting the people in Maine. Another thing, I would like to point out that this is not an appropriation from the highway fund but from the general fund, and there are no additional taxes needed for it. There is money for it already in the Fish and Game Department and they need just the authority to go ahead with it, and if the Fish and Game Department and the Chambers of Commerce in Aroostook County want to spend some money for this to develop the fishing along the Aroostook River, and not only along the Aroostook, but its tributaries which go far into the woodlands of Maine, it would be a great thing for the state. I have confidence in the people who are interested in it. Another thing,

I believe in fair play. I have opposed the clean waters bill of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, but here is a case of fair play. They have worked hard and have got a good proposition here. It is a sound business proposition I feel, and where we have interested citizens willing to go out and dig up money to match funds with, I think that this sort of thing should be encouraged. I sincerely hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I understand there is already an agreement with the Canadian fisheries to furnish the stock for this job which in itself will amount to more than the \$15,000 which they are asking the state to put in, and as far as the fish going up the Tobique, the salmon that is raised in the Aroostook River won't go up the Tobique. A salmon has a habit of going back to its place of birth. That is the way your salmon runs in all our rivers, and the salmon always seeks back the waters he was raised in, and as far as it is been mentioned here of the people going to Canada for their fishing, we in Maine, to my dissatisfaction at many times, have seemed to build roads and highways to push them right through the State of Maine and push them into Canada, and I think if there is one thing we can do to hold a few of them in the State of Maine to spend some of their money here, we should do it. I hope the motion of the gentleman does not prevail.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, this measure here, although important, is not a major piece of legislation, I do not believe, and I think it has been ably debated. I would now move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, moves the previous question. For the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question it is nec-

essary to have the approval of one third of the members present.

Will those who favor the Chair entertaining the previous question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third having arisen the previous question is authorized. The question now before the House is shall the main question be put now.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. The question before the House is shall the main question be put now.

Will those who favor putting the main question now please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalburt, that both committee reports on Bill "An Act relating to Constructing a Fishway at Aroostook Falls", Senate Paper 360, Legislative Document 932, be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

Will those who favor indefinitely postponing both reports please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Thirty-seven having voted in the affirmative and eighty-one having voted in the negative the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross, that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

Will those who favor accepting the "Ought not to pass" Report please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill given its first and second readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of forty-five eighth grade pupils from Pennell Institute in the Town of Gray, accompanied by their teacher, Miss Smith, and seven of the class mothers. On behalf of the House the Chair extends to you ladies and gentlemen a most cordial welcome and we hope that you will enjoy yourselves and profit by your visit today. (Applause)

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

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled

Bill "An Act relating to Sales Financing of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 993) (L. D. 1421) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 14.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, this is the measure that this House indefinitely postponed last week. Subsequent to that I have had an opportunity to talk with proponents of the bill and also the Department. It seemed to be the general consensus that the amount which we objected to was the 15 per cent which was somewhat high. The general consensus seemed to be that 13 per cent would be a much more realistic figure, and also the same figure that is being used in the majority of the states who have passed legislation regulating automobile financing. I noticed it was back to us from the other branch with a Senate amendment on it dropping it from 15 to 13 per cent, so I therefore move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House recede.

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker, if you read this bill through, you will find that 13 per cent here comes to 26 per cent. If you go to borrow in a bank today, they will charge you 13 per cent on a three-year old automobile, and they charge it to you immediately. This becomes 26 per cent because if you finance your automobile over a period of twelve months, which means that six months after you have owned the car, you have already paid half of it, but you are still paying 13 per cent which doubles itself. Then there is another clause in this bill in Section 256 that states that should a few days later you decide to pay for your car, you will pay \$25 withholding. I mean this \$25 you will have to pay regardless if the amount is large enough that you financed. I think that the rates are high enough now in the banks the way they are charging you. The banks are going into this automobile financing business because they find it more profitable to lend to suckers who buy automobiles on time than to go out and lend it at a straight 6 per cent.

I think that competition will take care of itself, and if we go along with this measure here we are only putting the break at 13 per cent. Thirteen per cent doesn't sound too very big when you mention it in a hurry, but if you finance a \$500 automobile and you pay 13 per cent right away, as I said a few minutes ago, you will have paid 26 per cent by the time that you get paid up. I think that this bill, if a person, and I have read this bill several times and I talked with people of the small loan companies, they can do a lot better in lending their money than the banks would at this rate. The finance companies or the so-called high priced finance companies are charging 3 per cent on a small loan, but mind you, they are charging you 3 per cent on the unpaid balance, but the banks in this bill here are charging you 13 per cent, period. That's from the beginning, and I think that this bill is a real bad bill. It is without doubt something that they wanted to put in to stop what was tried a few

years ago, but whoever drew it up certainly made a monstrosity out of it.

Then, you have a clause here that they are charging every dealer \$10 if he sells for \$25,000's worth of paper which makes him a co-partner in the small loan agency or a loan agency. You also have here that you may call up your insurance company to insure, but I ask anyone of you here if you have ever been into a bank to finance an automobile, when you walk up to the man's desk to finance the car, he grabs the telephone and he says, this is bank so and so calling, which means right off that he's getting his kickback on that insurance. This is a good deal worse than any small loan company has ever thought of doing. They have 7 per cent on brand new automobiles. They have also gone out now and most of these banks if you want to get a small loan, say \$100 or \$200 for thirty days, they have a minimum charge. They are going into this business and they are taking only the preferred risks. They wouldn't gamble with a lot of people that I sell cars to because the only ones that will handle some of the jalopies that I sell are the small loan companies, but if you buy from a bank, you have to be 100 per cent or you don't get a dime.

So, I move that we adhere to our position that we have taken before, and I could speak longer on this bill because this is a thing that I know plenty about. In this instance here, there are kickbacks, there are everything, and this clause of \$25.00 is a real bad thing for anyone, and I know that everyone of us at one time or another will go into a bank to finance an automobile, and if we do, you will pay and pay and pay. So, I move that we adhere to our former action.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, to recede takes precedence over a motion to adhere.

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker, well, I move the indefinite postponement of the bill and all its papers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that a motion to in-

definitely postpone does not apply in this case because we are dealing with a non-concurrent matter. The only motions that would apply would be to recede, concur, insist or adhere in that order.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, has told you that he is an automobile dealer, and he has raised the question as to who prepared this bill. I would like to tell him that this bill was prepared by a group of people and one of them was a lawyer who represents the Maine Automobile Investment Dealers and that it has the approbation of the Maine Automobile Investment Dealers.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, is certainly correct when he talks about interest rates. I certainly didn't think that was any secret when they are charging 15 per cent or 11 per cent or 12 per cent. It is off the top. It is almost a double figure when it comes down to true interest. That is a situation which is taking place now and has taken place for a good many years. I don't know of any place you can go and finance automobiles at 6 per cent true interest. We have been above true interest for a long time.

Now, as far as the bill is concerned, let me give you the history of how this came about. Two years ago there was a bill in to regulate automobile financing. At that time the bill was some twenty-seven or eight pages long. The bill was drawn up from the laws of about fifteen other states. It was a very incumbent detailed matter, and the Committee could not, as a matter of fact, couldn't even make sense out of it and the thing finally died during the legislature. At that time the Banking Department and the people who are in the legitimate finance business saw fit they should certainly draw up some kind of a bill regulating financing. This bill has a lot of good and protects the public, because at the present time

there is nothing protecting the public.

My only objection to this bill was the high rate of interest for cars over three years old, which was 15 per cent. Having talked with the Banking Commissioner and to the proponents of the bill and finding out what the interest rates were in other states, it was dropped down to a much more realistic figure. Now, the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, said this bill was set up so there would be kickbacks. The way I read the bill, the bill was set up to prevent kickbacks and it is now compulsory and mandatory that when your car is turned in or repossessed and so forth that you automatically get back your rebate on insurance, which is not being done in many cases. I hope my motion prevails.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I am a member of the Business Legislation Committee and at the time this bill was heard it was gone over carefully, paragraph by paragraph, and when it was reported out, we reported it out unanimous "Ought to pass." We found things in the bill that spell things out controlling this industry better than any other law that has been on the books, and after careful deliberation that was our decision on it, and I wish to support the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I have had, and I think a great many of you people who deal in automobiles and insurance, have had a great deal to do with things of this kind. I can see many good features of this bill and I can see several very bad features, as the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, brought forth.

Now, there are banks that are financing cars for 6 per cent. We have a setup in the bank that I do business with that does it. We have a setup in another bank that

is doing this for 10 per cent, that is 10 per cent right across instead of 13. Now, they are very happy to do it. And some of the banks are going into the 10 per cent because in Boston some of the banks up there had started it and they had agents down in my area and they did it, so the banks in my area began doing it too.

Now, I think 13 per cent is too much and I move that we table this for an amendment to put this down to 10 per cent and then I think we would have a lot of the bugs out of it, and it would be pretty fair. In fact it would be what a great many of the progressive banks are doing now, and probably on an old car that is just about all they can do. On a new car, the banks that I am doing business with, some do it right straight across the board, in other words, they hire it for six months at 6 per cent and then you renew your note. That is your straight 6 per cent. And the other banks that I am doing business with are financing new cars at 6 per cent right across the board for two years or whatever it may be.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis—the Chair must remind the gentleman from Kennebunk that the tabling motion is not debatable.

The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, that Bill "An Act relating to Sales Financing of Motor Vehicles", House Paper 993, Legislative Document 1421, be tabled unassigned pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House recede.

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

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

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, a question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. CHILDS: Will the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, please inform me of the bank where you can finance cars at 6 per cent now?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. CURTIS: I would be very happy to after the session. I don't want to get them into it.

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in this discussion it has been a discussion wholly of the 13 or 15 per cent rate. I would like to point out that there are three different classifications here, that for new cars the rate is seven dollars per hundred per year, which actually works out on a twelve months basis of about 12.9 per cent. On a twenty-four months basis 13.44. Your eleven dollars per hundred works out on a basis of about 20 per cent, your thirteen per hundred works out on a basis for twelve months of 24 per cent a year and that is with a straight interest rate. That means just those smaller and cheaper cars.

The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, suggested that 3 per cent by the small loan companies is lower, but 3 per cent a month is a rate of 36 per cent a year.

Actually your finance companies are not controlled in any way now, they can charge any rate they wish, and what this does is at least start some control. It seems to me that in many ways this is a good bill, particularly as the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, suggests, in that you have to get your insurance rebate, there is also provision that every item of your finance charge or any additional charges for insurance or anything else be listed very definitely, which they do not have to do now.

As long ago as 1921, '22, '23 and '24 they were charging a rate of 6 per cent, but that was actually 11.2 per cent per annum, and for used cars they were charging a rate of 18 per cent, so you are not going too far out of the way on

this bill, and it certainly is a start at definitely regulating the finance companies.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill here charges, as the gentleman says, 24—I didn't figure the point. But also, if you have to go to a finance company and borrow \$500, which is what you would finance possibly on a 1953 small car, they would be glad to lend you the money, tickled pink to lend you the money at one and a half per cent on the unpaid balance. The three per cent for the small loan companies that they have been using has been somewhat for the \$100 and \$200 loans, this is where they base their rate of three per cent. Then you go into the insurance business. This is probably a step towards establishing something, but a pretty high step. The credit unions in this state now charge one per cent a month on the unpaid balance. The banks who can borrow, who are getting the money from we the people at two and a half per cent, are turning around and letting this money out again, and some of us are not even getting two and a half per cent when we have a checking account, we are getting peanuts for it, we are paying them to keep our money in the bank. They are lending this money out at 24 something per cent. The credit unions will pay you three and four per cent, and they are letting it out on a smaller margin.

You are getting insurance—as far as getting insurance back, on any small loan company where you have an insurance, you have part of that policy and you always can turn it back in, you will get some credit. Over here in Section 256 it states plainly, that should you decide or should your car be repossessed, or should you decide to go out four or five days later after you bought this car and you have figured it out that you have been clipped pretty badly, that you are going to pay them off, you are going to borrow from Tom, Dick or Harry. You walk into the place and right away they say to you, "Well, the law says \$25." So if it cost you a hundred

dollars to finance the automobile you are hooked for \$25 anyway, so you might as well continue and give back the money to Tom, Dick or Harry, and keep on paying them.

I have never seen a case yet where if I sold a man a car and he came back to me and realized that he got clipped pretty bad by the finance company that I couldn't get him a rebate on the insurance and on the finance charge. But this law here goes a little too far to begin with. This law goes out and it really hits you right on the head to begin with. Money is available and the banks are in a position where they can get all the money they want from the Federal Department at four or four and a quarter, and here they want twenty-four. I think it is a little abnormal. You talk about financing automobiles for six per cent, the banks haven't been doing it, and I don't know as there are many people who do it. Certainly the credit unions have gone out and done it at one per cent on the unpaid balance. And I don't think that the banks should get any more than the credit unions. And therefore, I would like to table this bill myself, if it is humanly possible, and I will put an amendment on it that will be a dandy. I so move, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that Bill "An Act relating to Sales Financing of Motor Vehicles", House Paper 993, Legislative Document 1421, be tabled unassigned pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House recede.

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

A viva voce vote being taken the motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Negligently Operating a Motor Vehicle so as to Cause Death" (H. P. 1078) (L. D. 1548) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 3.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Hancock of York, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Increase Salaries of Justices of Supreme Judicial Court and Superior Court" (H. P. 310) (L. D. 427) which was recalled to the Senate from the Legislative Files by Joint Order (S. P. 581)

Came from the Senate recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to reconsider its action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report.

On motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve in favor of Mabelle K. Toole of Bangor (H. P. 389) (L. D. 520) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 3.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Quinn of Bangor, the House voted to insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Tabled until Later in Today's Session

Bill "An Act relating to Portland University" (H. P. 1026) (L. D. 1458) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on April 16.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Childs of Portland, the Bill was tabled until later in today's session pending further consideration.

Orders

Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, re-

quested to study the desirability of establishing State Vocational Educational Institutes in various locations in the State in order to promote specialized training for those who give evidence of special aptitude or need and who desire specialized training designed specifically to train for service in trade, industry or commerce; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee report the results of its findings to the 99th Legislature. (H. P. 1096)

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, in 1947 a bill was introduced in this legislature to ask for the setting up of a Maine Vocational Technical Institute. As well as others I worked very diligently trying to get the passage of this measure.

The school is in South Portland, it is an excellent school, and this order is no way an attempt to curb the program there. I think it should be accelerated. There were three bills presented to this body asking for auxiliary schools, one in our area, another in Piscataquis County or that area, and another in Aroostook County.

Should the Research Committee study the program with the cooperation of the Department of Maine Vocational Technical Institute it might well be that these schools that are badly needed might come to pass to help those who have skills in their fingers but are not necessarily part and parcel of becoming members of the medical profession or legal profession or other professions. Also the expenditure of funds and money used in living in Portland, particularly if they come from the far areas of Aroostook or other areas far away from South Portland, would help them further their education. That time could well be spent earning a living on a part time basis to enable them to further their studies. For that reason I hope that the order has passage.

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

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have no particular feelings at this time on the Order of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, but I would point out that we will probably see in the last week of our session the usual pattern of numerous orders, joint orders requesting the Legislative Research Committee to do various things.

I think, to take a more responsible position, rather than asking the other end of the corridor to screen the worthwhile versus the non-worthy requests, the House could better act if some of these orders were at least printed and distributed.

I repeat, I have no particular feeling on this particular order, but I would suggest as a matter of procedure that on these orders of which there has been no warning, that they at least be printed, distributed and held for later in the day. I suspect once that is done there will be no objection, and I would like to move that this particular order be tabled until later in the day and request that it be printed and distributed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that with respect to the Order introduced by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, this Order be tabled and specially assigned for later in the day pending the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that it receive passage, and that the Order be reproduced and distributed to the members' desks. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Order was so tabled.

At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of students from the Pettingill School of Rumford, Maine accompanied by Mrs. Marjory Bannis and Mr. Gerard Richards. On behalf of the House the Chair extends to you ladies and gentlemen a most cordial welcome, and we are sorry we are so late in recognizing your presence. (Applause)

On motion of Mrs. Smith of Fal-mouth, it was:

ORDERED, that Mr. Bean of Winterport be excused from attendance because of business.

Mr. Ross of Bath presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that permission be granted for the recording of a silent film of the House while in action this afternoon for the purpose of a television broadcast and when shown to be accompanied by comments of a narrator.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This request was made in order for a photographer from the Kennebec Journal to take a four minute silent film. It will be shown on television WGAN as part of an educational series, and it will depict our legislature in action. No one will be quoted. A narrator will explain the proceedings, and no legislators' remarks will be included whatsoever.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, even though I knew nothing about this Order until it was read just now, even though it was not reproduced, I hope it is not tabled and I hope it has passage.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that the Order just read shall receive passage. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Order was passed.

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Warren from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions on Resolve Providing for State Pension for Clarence Ramdell of Lubec (H. P. 145) (L. D. 183) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Mr. Porell from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act to Authorize Washington County to Procure Loans and Issue Bonds to Construct an Airport" (H. P. 1030) (L. D. 1462)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Amend the Amount of Supplement Loans by Maine School Building Authority" (S. P. 153) (L. D. 400)

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

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Confidential Character of State Tax Assessor's Records under Blueberry Tax Law" (S. P. 439) (L. D. 1236)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

(On motion of Mr. Browne of Bangor, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Bill "An Act Permitting Governor and Council to Purchase Real Estate Adjacent to State House" (S. P. 585) (L. D. 1584)

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

Bill "An Act to Provide Special Disability Compensation for Members of Police Departments" (H. P. 1095) (L. D. 1592)

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

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

Mr. RANCOURT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask through the Chair any member of this Committee just what this bill does now that was not done before through our laws of the State of Maine.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Rancourt, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member of the Committee on Labor who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the gentleman from Lewiston,

Mr. Rancourt, if I recall this particular bill, I believe there is an amendment added to it now whereby it gives the police department, heart and cardiac disease as occupational compensation for their activity in the police department; if I am not mistaken, I believe this is the bill on that particular issue.

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I can answer the question of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Rancourt, but this is a bill which does as the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, says, adds a matter of pulmonary and cardiac diseases, excluding common colds, for the benefit of the police department, and two years ago the fire department received those same benefits, and this adds the police department to that fire department bill.

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

Mr. RANCOURT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have had no answer whatever that I can not read on this bill. This bill definitely states that it includes the fire department and the police department, that was not what my question was. The answers I got were not intended for the question I had in mind.

It says here, fire department and police department, any heart condition developing after six months, I presume in the case of the police department it probably means that if you have an arrest or anything you go through in the line of duty and six months after that you develop a heart condition you can claim that it is due to your action in the line of duty, and that goes for the fire department also, within six months of any response to any fire if you develop a heart attack you can claim that it was caused by that engagement at the fire.

We have such cases happening now. You have hearings that are allowed in cases like this, and unfortunately or fortunately Lewiston has lost a couple of those cases not long ago. So there are ample pro-

visions in the law today to take care of that. Now, by this bill the cities and towns that you people here represent have no alternative except pleading guilty to this heart condition. No fire department in any town or any city in the State of Maine is without some call to some fire during the year, and if this develops within six months from the fire the city is practically responsible. If not they can appeal and have the same hearing that they are having now. So what is the sense of the bill? And that happens in the police department also. Therefore, I believe, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that there is absolutely no need for this bill. I can't see that anyone will derive any benefit from it, and it is hamstringing the cities and towns so they have practically no ground to stand on. This bill practically says that they are responsible for any heart condition that develops within six months of any particular engagement at a fire or on police duty.

Now, we have thousands of citizens in the state who have heart trouble, they don't claim their work did it, they have it the year round, it may be the condition of their system, there is no way of determining what is the cause of it, even doctors cannot determine that, only on a guess basis. So why should a bill be presented to make the cities and towns directly responsible? I move you, Mr. Speaker, that this bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Under Workmens' Compensation spelled out in the law there are certain occupational hazards. The type of things that those cover are persons who work in foundaries from silicosis, in tanneries from certain conditions working with leather, around certain vats of acid and so forth.

At the last session of the legislature we had a suggestion made that firemen had as an occupational hazard because of their line of duty, things that would promote pulmonary and cardiac diseases much

more so than the average working person. The Legislature was a little bit dubious about enacting this law, but finally it was enacted as the law you see before you now under L. D. 1592 for organized fire departments.

I personally wondered at that time if there was not going to be some difficulty, but I understand that there has been no difficulty with the firemen, we have had certainly no complaints before the Labor Committee, and so when it was suggested that the police might have the same provisions in the law to take care of them as a specific occupational hazard the Labor Committee felt that they would certainly go along since the police and the firemen as far as their duties go, probably would fall in the same classification. They are not included in the present law now, this would include them as an occupational hazard to be specifically covered for pulmonary and cardiac diseases excluding the common cold. I do not believe that it should be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I noticed this bill yesterday and I meant to ask some questions between sessions of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. I didn't get the opportunity and I would like now possibly to ask some of those questions. As I understood this bill, as originally written it applied only to the City of Portland, and if I could have the answer to that question, if I am wrong I won't proceed.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, the bill as originally written did apply just to the City of Portland. That bill was not heard by the Labor Committee, it was heard by another committee, I believe it was Legal Affairs, and it was recalled and re-referred to the Labor Committee.

Mr. BRAGDON: That answers my question. I have heard nothing from any of the municipalities in our

area in regard to whether they were for or against this, but inasmuch as this might appear to be something that they have not had very much opportunity to consider I think I might feel like going along with the—I did not oppose it in the first place feeling that it applied only to the City of Portland, but inasmuch as the change was made at a late hour in the session, and these other areas of the State have not had an opportunity to express themselves either for or against the measure, and perhaps are not even aware of what has transpired, I feel that I would like to go along at this time with the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill is an amendment of our present chapter on Workmens' Compensation and Occupational Disease Law, and the heading which you don't have in this particular bill, the heading of Section 69 reads as follows: "When arising out of and in the course of employment compensation shall be payable for disabilities sustained or death incurred by an employee resulting from the following occupational diseases:" and then it lists a whole lot of occupational diseases and then this one here 16. And this one here would add to the fire department, the police department, and would cover any accident or disease or death that happened within six months of a given incident. Now, what it does is this: When a fireman or policeman in the course of his duty does something that is hazardous and he suffers an injury thereby, which is a matter of historical fact and becomes a matter of record in his department, then he can petition under the Workmens' Compensation, and if he can convince the Industrial Accident Commission that this injury that he has sustained within six months of this given incident comes within the provisions of this law then he will receive compensation for that injury.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to

concur with all the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. He has given you a true and accurate picture, and I think that we had quite a controversy on this two years ago because Mr. Ross took one stand and I took the other on behalf of the fire department, and we both seem to be in agreement now, it has caused no hardship. The insurance companies of course lobbied very hard on this bill two years ago, this year they do not seem to be interested to the extent of lobbying because they feel there has been no harm done, and the few cases that have been cited in the State of Maine have been so small, and the cost of them has been nil, therefore, I hope that this motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Rancourt, does not prevail because you will just be giving the same opportunity to the police department you are now giving under the statutes to the fire department.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope that we as members of this legislature will not go to the extremes to disallow our policemen the privilege of coming under this new bill. I will say this, that when a policeman joins the Portland Police Department, which was mentioned here, he has to be in perfectly good health. He passes a rigid examination, and I believe this would occur in other cities and towns too who have police departments, they must take a rigid examination, and if they are passed and submitted to be physically fit and go to work for that department, if they should develop heart trouble after that then we should be sure that they come under the protection of the laws of the State of Maine, and I hope that the motion for indefinite postponement does not carry.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I did just want to extend my previous remarks to the effect that most of the municipalities carry workmen's compensation insurance to cover

their employees, and that that eventually would pay the bill.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of this measure I believe I owe an explanation to the House and particularly the gentleman who has raised the issue, Mr. Bragdon of Perham. Originally I drafted this bill so that it would be as it now reads, but it was done at the last minute, about five minutes before cloture and somehow it came out only as an amendment to the charter of the City of Portland. It is a good trick if you can do it. But when the mistake was discovered I then moved that it be referred to Labor and it got shuffled in Committee and came out "Ought not to pass" and later was recalled from the Senate and came out in this form. But there was nothing meant to pull any fast ones on anybody, it was an honest legitimate mistake in the original instance on my part.

I think it is a good bill, I don't think it is going to be costly to any municipalities, as you well know there are only one or two municipalities that are self insurers anyway. Most of them buy their insurance. And I think that the police officers of our state, statewide, are entitled to the same protection that the fire departments get, and that is while being injured on duty.

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

Mr. RANCOURT: Mr. Speaker, many remarks have been made, but not one of the remarks included the fact that they can petition now for a hearing whether you have this law or not. They can still petition for a hearing, and if their ailment is service-connected they do get compensation through the courts or through that hearing. So if you already have this, what is the purpose of putting this in writing in this bill? It is already there. We had cases in Lewiston. I would be the last one, believe me, I would be the last one to try to exclude any public service department, public safety department from any help whatever, any compensation that they are entitled to, but I honestly do not see

any need for this bill because the laws of the State already protect these people, and they are already eligible to petition for a hearing in their particular case if they so desire. But no one has brought that up. I am also convinced that I am right in this, I could be wrong, but right now I am convinced that I am right because no arguments brought forth have proven that I am wrong. And when this motion is put to a vote, Mr. Speaker, I move a division.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The gentleman has spoken twice.

The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, was granted unanimous consent to speak a third time to the question.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Rancourt, is mistaken if he says there is adequate present law to cover the situation. There is none such. Now, in Lewiston he may have by ordinance some sort of a retirement or pension plan that covers that kind of a situation, but statewide there is none such and that is the purpose of including this in that particular section of the Workmen's Compensation Law.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Rancourt, that Bill "An Act to Provide Special Disability Compensation for Members of Police Departments", House Paper 1095, Legislative Document 1592, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

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.

Two having voted in the affirmative and eighty-eight 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.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the

presence in the gallery of the House of a group of students from St. Joseph High School of Biddeford accompanied by Sister Gertrude, Sister St. Paul and Sister Aimee. On behalf of the House the Chair extends to you all a very cordial welcome and we hope that you will enjoy your visit here today. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair will request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, to the rostrum for the purpose of presiding 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.

**Amended Bills
Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act Directing Review of Election Laws" (S. P. 23) (L. D. 14)

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

(On motion of Mr. Elwell of Brooks, tabled pending third reading and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

**Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act to Correct Inconsistencies in State Highway Laws" (S. P. 66) (L. D. 113)

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

(On motion of Mr. Edwards of Raymond, tabled pending third reading and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Bill "An Act relating to Citizens Committee on Survey of State Government" (S. P. 321) (L. D. 817)

Resolve Establishing a Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission of Maine (S. P. 62) (L. D. 112)

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

Bill "An Act Reestablishing the State Museum" (S. P. 144) (L. D. 342)

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

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I realize that we voted on this matter yesterday and we were soundly trounced, but all night, most of the evening I have been thinking of the remarks of the gentlewoman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham, and I think they were essentially sound, I think that she has sound arguments, I am definitely in favor of having the state museum but I am a little fearful that we might be wasting a lot of money by locating the museum in the State House. And I would suggest that this item be referred to the next legislature where more effective steps could be taken to create a museum rather than waste this money and afterwards run into the necessity of having a separate building for the museum. And I would move to indefinitely postpone this item to be referred to the 99th Legislature Research Committee for further study.

The SPEAKER pro tem: For the benefit of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, and for the benefit of the House, the Chair is informed that there is a legal official motion to refer a bill to the next session of the legislature in addition to the usual motion to indefinitely postpone. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman which motion he prefers to make?

Mr. TEVANIAN: I prefer to refer this matter to the 99th Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that this bill be referred to the 99th Legislature.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, as we said, this was a start. We don't have the funds now to have a special building for our museum, and I for one am not ashamed to have it at the State House. I am not ashamed of my State House, and I believe we should have the museum as we voted to go along with it yesterday.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Yesterday when I arose in favor of the motion of the gentlewoman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham, I have to frankly admit that I was doing it only as a courtesy because I didn't want her to stand alone, but after the evening went on I thought over her remarks. I truthfully believe now that she couldn't be any more correct, and I think that this should be given a lot of consideration, and I certainly think if we could possibly do it we should not locate the museum in this building.

When the new building came into effect and this building was renovated, at that time all the space here was supposed to be used for hearing rooms during the legislative sessions. I think that it would be a good idea, I can't go along with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, in having this matter referred to the next session of legislature because I am a little afraid that nothing would ever be done. But I certainly think that it would be a good idea if we could indefinitely postpone this matter and then somebody put an order in directing the Legislative Research Committee to make a study of this and for them to determine where the museum should be and how much money should be expended for it. So I shall move that this matter be indefinitely postponed if the motion takes precedence over the other, I understand that it does.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Inasmuch as the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, has now withdrawn his motion, the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, is in order, does take precedence and is before the House to indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. VAUGHAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This museum was killed as we all

know through an executive order to make hearing rooms back in, I believe, it was 1943, and it was done at the pleasure of the governor and council. Now to say that we need more study and a great deal more work needs to go into this measure, I think if the people who say this were to acquaint themselves with the amount of work that has gone into the study of this measure that is before you, you would realize that what you are proposing is practically duplication of what has already happened.

The proponents of this measure realize that possibly the space that will be available in the State House is not adequate for what we would like to have as a museum for the State of Maine. But before we can secure a proper building and a proper amount of money, you might say, to set up proper exhibits to be considered in a permanent museum we should start and reactivate the museum on a small basis to try out and see what type of exhibits we are going to have, whether we are going to have a catchall, which we certainly hope we won't, have an exhibit of the nature of the State, the industry, the history and something that we can all be proud of. Now, we can be just as proud of a small museum as we can a big museum if it is done right. And I think the planning that is going into this measure has been very thorough and very complete, and the plans that the bill calls for will give us a good and adequate museum to start with. Thank you.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to speak on this matter again, whereas I have spoken a great many times today, but this is a new development to me and I still have to defend the position I took on the Appropriations Committee. I would have been glad to go along with double the appropriation for a museum in the State House that we went along with, but I went along with the appropriation which you have, feeling it was a beginning. And of course it might develop later that we would think of a museum outside the State

House, but somehow or other the thought appeals to me to set up something similar to what we had in the past where people visiting the State House saw the museum and the State House all in one building, and I still feel that it might develop that that might be the desirable approach to the thing yet, and the amount of \$25,000 is not excessive to get the thing started, and I certainly hope that it isn't delayed another two years.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Beane.

Mr. BEANE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to highly endorse the sensible remarks made by the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Vaughan. I know my constituents are very strongly in support of our establishing a state museum now. I should like to point out that the State House is right now in the process of being reconstructed, and I feel if we take some steps toward establishing a museum now, while the building is being torn up here and there, instead of waiting until some other alterations have been made and the room set aside for this purpose, involving eventually more expense and jeopardizing the possibility of ever getting a state museum if the money shouldn't become available for a long time for a separate building.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman's motion does not prevail because I feel that it would be impossible to measure the benefits of a museum as far as its educational value is concerned. These youngsters come in here from all over the state and they have something that they can take back with them and study and look forward to. And I believe that even though it costs a lot of money it is something that we could be proud of and the educational value would be tremendous. And as the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, has said, this is not a lot of money and we won't establish the museum right way, but it is a start, and I believe it is a start in the right direction, and even though it may be here in this present State House,

some day we may be able to build a separate building.

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

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from any member of the Appropriations Committee how much money has already been expended in this particular area for the purpose of renovating these particular rooms for hearing rooms?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, raises a question through the Chair to any member of the Appropriations Committee who may answer if they wish.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: The exact amount of money I cannot give you but we did ask that they leave the room essentially as it is now until we find out whether the museum is going in there or not. We thought that the preparation that they had made down there should not go any further until we had made arrangements for the museum so they could have their water lines, electricity and so forth as they would want it for the museum. No money has been spent making hearings rooms, if that is what your question was.

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

Mr. CHILDS: It does. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In the bill itself you will note it also says that money will be expended for the south wing section of the capitol providing no other building or property is acquired for this purpose. Certainly when the proponents of this measure drew this up it was in the back of their minds that it might be a good idea if some other building were used. Now, another thought I would like to leave with you is this: That here we are spending a rather small amount for a museum in the south wing. Now, I am certainly in favor of the museum, but if we create a museum in the south wing I feel quite sure it will never go any further. As far as a museum in the south wing is concerned it would only be a token

anyway. Now, there is a building right across from us which was formerly the Highway Building, I don't know for what purpose it is being used now, but if it is possible it may be a good idea in the near future to move whatever offices that are there into the new state office building or even downstairs here, and use that building itself or most of that building for a museum. I think if the Research Committee gave the thing a very thorough study they could come up with a very much better program.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to go on record as being in favor of the state museum, but I am also not in accord with the move that is underway now. I don't think we are going to accomplish anything, I think we are going to be wasting money and that the proper job isn't going to be done. I have here in my hand a copy of the Bangor Daily News, and within that paper there is an editorial, and I am going to read a couple of excerpts which might apply to this particular case.

"Simply bringing the old exhibits out of mothballs will not be enough. The museum was a rather drab affair, nothing to thrill either out-of-state visitors or Maine residents. It fell far short of telling the Maine story. Imaginative planning is needed and the advice of experts should be sought. The State abounds with historians, artists, writers, naturalists and others who could contribute ideas. Certainly Klir Beck, creator of Maine's famous portrait exhibits, should be consulted. Perhaps officials of the Museum of Natural History in Boston would lend a hand. This museum has become a popular and exciting place to visit, thanks to the progressive work of its staff.

"Now, the Maine story is a fascinating one from mountain tops down to the seas, from potatoes to pulpwood, its history dates back to the visits of early explorers from Europe. The story should be told well. As to expansion, we mean having more than one state museum. And it goes on to say that

Bangor would like to build one too, but I believe that this does require much research and that it should be postponed to the 99th Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair would like to interrupt at this time to recognize in the gallery the presence of three classes of students who are visiting us today. The first group is a Government Class under the direction of Mr. Lemke from Warren High School, fourteen students. The second group, twenty-three pupils in grade seven from the new Virginia School accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Churchill, from Rumford. The third group, another group from Rumford from the Bisbee School, twenty-one pupils from grade seven accompanied by Mr. Welch, their teacher.

The Chair is pleased to have you with us today and certainly hopes that you will profit from the remarks you will hear on the floor of the House, and hope that you will see fit to return again to observe our proceedings. (Applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The House is proceeding with item nine. Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was my impression, the thinking of the Appropriations Committee on this item was that the bill asked for fifty thousand the first year and twenty-five thousand the second year, so we cut that down to twenty-five the first year and ten the second year. And we would set aside this space in the south wing for this museum. We also cut out of the bill the appointment of a curator and assistant as we thought that this being under the Department of Economic Development that they go ahead and pick up items. It also states in here that they could accept gifts from individuals and societies.

I think if we waited another two years the Research Committee might come up with some very good ideas, but if we go ahead now with this small plan that we have, maybe the next session of the legislature would have a great deal more to work on knowing a lot of things

that might be available to the state or already here. I think that was the thinking primarily of the Committee.

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

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Yesterday we voted on this bill and we are grown men and women, and I hope we stand by our decision of yesterday.

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

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that Bill "An Act Reestablishing the State Museum", Senate Paper 144, Legislative Document 342, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. There has been a division requested.

Will all those in favor of 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 ninety-eight having voted in the negative the motion did not prevail.

(Off record remarks)

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

Third Reader

Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Registration of Dealers in Boat Trailers and Temporary Registration Plates" (S. P. 391) (L. D. 1087)

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

(On motion of Mr. Rollins of Belfast, tabled pending third reading and specially assigned for tomorrow.)

Bill "An Act relating to Cost of Relocating Facilities in Federal-Aid Interstate Highway Projects" (S. P. 385) (L. D. 1081)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Princeton, Mr. Wheaton.

Mr. WHEATON: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House reconsider Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Paper 385, Legislative Document 1081, for the purpose of adding House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the Chair understand the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment which has been prepared?

The Chair understands the amendment has been prepared and has been distributed and may be offered, but the gentleman must make the motion that the House reconsider its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendment "A" to L. D. 1510.

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair now understands the gentleman presents House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" and moves its adoption.

The Clerk will read House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A".

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to Senate Amendment "A" to S. P. 385, L. D. 1081, Bill, "An Act Relating to Cost of Relocating Facilities in Federal-Aid Interstate Highway Projects" (L. D. 1510)

Amend said Amendment by adding to the end of the third underlined paragraph the following underlined words:

"and also any Rural Electrification Cooperative which is subject to the provisions of Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes."

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Princeton, Mr. Wheaton, if I may. I am not sure in my own mind what a Rural Electrification Cooperative is. If he could briefly explain it to me I would feel more at ease.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Broderick, directs a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Prince-

ton, Mr. Wheaton, who may answer if he wishes.

Mr. WHEATON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: The Rural Electrification is made up of several small electric companies located in the State of Maine. They are not under the Public Utilities. They are financed by Government funds and furnish electricity in the State to areas where the regular power companies are not able and it is not feasible to put the power to them.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Yes it does, thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Princeton, Mr. Wheaton, moves that we adopt House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" under filing 474. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, through the Chair I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Princeton, Mr. Wheaton, should we now alter our Senate Amendment as far as the price tag is now concerned? Will this have any effect on the \$12,500 price tag?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, asks a question through the Chair and the gentleman from Princeton, Mr. Wheaton, may answer if he so wishes.

Mr. WHEATON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: There is only one of these Rural Electrification Cooperatives that this might possibly affect. As the interstate highway progresses up through the northern part of Penobscot County into Aroostook County there is the Patten Cooperative where it may, I do not know, there is just the possible chance that the interstate highway system may cross through their area. It would be a very small item if it did. I don't believe that it would be necessary to make any changes.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it now the pleasure of the House to

accept House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A"?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it now the pleasure of the House to adopt Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A"?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Bill "An Act relating to Board of Pupils Attending School Away from Home" (S. P. 297) (L. D. 794)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Municipal Court and Trial Justice Court Costs and Fines" (H. P. 1000) (L. D. 1428)

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

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER EDGAR: The Chair wishes to thank the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, for his excellent help as Speaker pro tem.

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.

Finally Passed Constitutional Amendment

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Tenure of Office of the Governor to Four-Year Terms (H. P. 157) (L. D. 204)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being a Constitutional Amendment and a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a division was had. 101 voted in favor of same and 22 against, and accordingly the Re-

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

Enactor
Emergency Measure
Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Expending Aroostook County Funds for Ricker College (S. P. 224) (L. D. 567)

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

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

Mr. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If you vote for the passage of this Bill, you are voting to expend public funds for private institutions. I think you all know that I am very strongly for education, but I think it is a wrong precedent to hand over public funds to private schools. There are many areas in this state that have public schools that need this money, in this particular area I could point out several. I can point out very easily the Teachers College that so far we have voted to keep open.

I might add there is some talk of Ricker College becoming a public junior college or perhaps an adjunct to the University of Maine in the future. And it seems that we could well let this matter rest and I hereby, because of the stand I take, being opposed to public funds for private institutions, I move that this Bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, I might acquaint the House a little bit with the facts about Ricker College. The Committee on Towns and Counties reported this bill out unanimously "Ought to pass." The delegation from the County approves of this particular piece of legislation. It has been included in the County budget, and the taxes have already been assessed to take care of this amount, \$10,000 a year for the next biennium. It has the approval of the County Commissioners. It has the approval of a large majority of the people of the County of Aroostook. True, there are some people who are opposed, it

is not one hundred per cent I will admit. Generally Ricker has done a very good job and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, does not prevail.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: Inasmuch as I understand these funds are coming from Aroostook County and this school has been for years doing a great job for Aroostook County. In fact, years ago pupils who wanted to go to high school from Littleton always went to Ricker, and now Monticello, the town where I was born and raised for a number of years, has done away with their high school and they go to Ricker. And I don't see why anyone should be offended by this money being spent there inasmuch as it is going for education entirely. If the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, is so much interested in education as he says he is I can't understand his thinking.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly this body rejected an appropriation to assist Higgins Classical Institute. Now, I would like to know the difference between Ricker College or the reasons why we should not be consistent in voting against any appropriation of public funds for private institutions. That is, what is the difference between Higgins Classical Institute receiving public assistance or Ricker College receiving public assistance?

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I must speak in favor of this matter for Aroostook County, and I want to clear up the point the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, has just made in comparing Penobscot County, Higgins Classical Institute with Ricker College in Aroostook County. The point as I see it there is that there was opposition in the County of Penobscot to furnishing these Penobscot County

funds to Higgins Classical Institute. I feel that there is very little opposition, if any, in the Aroostook County group to providing Aroostook County funds for Ricker College. I am heartily in accord with this measure and I hope you will go along with the motion to provide these funds.

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

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the impression that the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach got in regard to the fate of the Higgins Classical Institute Resolve. It did pass this House by a vote of fifty-one to thirty-nine and it is now on the table in the Senate. And while I am on my feet I would like to say that I am heartily in favor of this enabling act to allow the Aroostook County funds to be spent for this very worthy cause of education in Aroostook County.

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

Mr. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I should like to point out that I do not favor one county over another when it comes to public education. I believe we should vote for the State of Maine in this matter. You have heard how hard it is to get money, for instance for the superintendents' raise in pay. Many other things, the University of Maine for example, teachers colleges. What is to prevent any private institution of learning from coming to this legislature and demanding an appropriation to help it for one excuse or another? I can see no reason why we should fail to give money to any private institution if we allow this bill to go through. We haven't a leg to stand on.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm.

Mr. STORM: Mr. Speaker, I want to again point out that this is strictly a county matter, and the County delegation is in accord with it. Someone has expressed the fear that we were establishing a precedent. I want to point out that that precedent was established two sessions ago. This is the third time that this matter has come up before the legisla-

ture and it still is strictly a county matter.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I find it difficult to disagree with my colleague from Portland, Mr. Maynard, but I feel that any institution of education whether it be public or private does serve a benefit and a useful purpose to the community at large. I don't feel that we are setting any precedent, this legislature and legislatures past have long contributed money to private institutions, and I wouldn't consider voting against the measure unless there was someone in Aroostook County in opposition to it.

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

Mr. HERSEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to point out that this bill is a demand, it isn't written to say that the Aroostook County Commissioners may, but the Aroostook County Commissioners shall, pay the sum of \$10,000 a year for the next two years. I also would like to point out that this is for Ricker College and not Ricker Classical Institute. The Ricker Classical Institute does take care of the high school and secondary pupils from the surrounding area. For two years, two sessions past now over a four year period this House and Senate has permitted Aroostook County to spend \$40,000 for the four year period. And I would like to point out what Aroostook County has received for that \$40,000. An average graduating class of slightly over eleven students for a total of forty-six for the four year period. That figures roughly at \$910 per year for the graduating class over that four year period, which oddly enough is the amount that the Ricker Classical Institute Catalogue specifies as the cost of one year's education at the College, and that compares with a \$907 cost at the University of Maine.

Out of the enrollment, the present enrollment, the latest figures available to me, there are eighty-eight students, of the eighty-eight students better than fifty per cent of them

are from with a twenty mile radius of Houlton, and out of the graduating class I believe the percentage is even greater than that. The college is accredited as a junior college, which means a two year college only, it is not accredited any more than that, and it is surprisingly true in looking at the catalogue and the enrollment at the present time there is a great drop between the second and third year of the junior college level and the senior college level. I for one, and practically the only one I guess in the delegation who was opposed to it, I know the County Commissioners aren't unanimous on this proposition, it was passed originally two sessions ago over the objection of the Aroostook County Town Managers Association, and I believe they still are of the same opinion that they were at that time.

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

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you know I was opposed to the request made by Higgins Classical Institute for public funds. My question is, how far are we going to carry this matter if we are continuing to come here and to recognize the requests from private institutions? It would seem somewhat inconsistent in our thinking if we have spent a considerable portion of our time this year in attempting to work out a district bill because we recognize that some of the smaller communities and some of the smaller schools it was not economically feasible to support them on an individual basis, but we have to get them into a larger area or a larger district. It would seem inconsistent to do that and then go on and continue to make contributions to private institutions based upon their requests from year to year. It would seem to me that if this is going to be our policy then we are going to have to readjust our tax basis on the county levels if the State is going to continually direct us from time to time to make additional contributions.

I am opposed to this measure because I think it is one hundred per cent wrong in principle, you are

opening the door wide open to many and varied requests and if you recognize that one is entitled to a contribution then all requests should be honored alike. And I think it is a dangerous precedent to get into.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As I was a member of the 97th Legislature I remember distinctly this body voted \$25,000 for Ricker College last session. I believe the precedent has already been made and I don't think there is anything new in the matter at all. The question is whether we want to continue with it. As I said before, I am now repeating myself, this body voted \$25,000 to Ricker College last session.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this item until tomorrow for the purpose of making an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, that Bill "An Act relating to Expending Aroostook County Funds for Ricker College", Senate Paper 224, Legislative Document 567, be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, that the Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

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

The SPEAKER: Will those who favor the tabling motion please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative and forty-three having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve Authorizing Study of Proposed Road from Millinocket to

Grindstone (H. P. 768) (L. D. 1101) the Speaker appointed the following Conference on the part of the House: Messrs. EMERSON of Millinocket
TURNER of Auburn
BROCKWAY of Milo

(Off record remarks)

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor,

Recessed until two o'clock this afternoon.

After Recess
2:00 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Enactors. Item number three.

Enactor
Emergency Measure
Tabled Until Later
in Today's Session

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

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

(On motion of Mr. Farmer of Wiscasset, tabled until later in today's session)

Passed to Be Enacted
Emergency Measure

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

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

Enactor Requiring
Two-Thirds Vote

An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-

four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose of Building State Highways (H. P. 1056) (L. D. 1504)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer.

Mr. FARMER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise in opposition to this measure now before us, this \$24,000,000 bond issue.

Although I am not opposed to bond issues as such, I am opposed to this particular bond issue at this particular time. This particular bond issue is not even claimed by the sponsors to solve any problem except for the next four years. I believe that the sponsors themselves will admit that four years from now the 100th legislature will probably be confronted with the very same problem that we are now confronted with even though we should pass this legislation.

However, if we O.K. this bond issue now they will have no choice but to solve their problems with another bond issue. The State of Maine is already committed to the payment of over \$3,000,000 a year for the next eleven years to serve its past bond issues. If this bond issue is made the legislature four years from now will be already committed to the payment of \$5,000,000 a year to service bond retirement schedules, and what possible choice could they have to approach a pay as you go program? We are the legislature that has that choice. It is not an easy choice I admit, but it is still a possible choice. I believe that if this bond issue is passed I will never in my life see the State of Maine come near a pay as you go program again. Our highway financing will be just one bond issue on top of another from now on.

In the second place, I believe that this is not the time for any major deficit financing. This country has been in an inflationary spiral for the past twenty-five years, and we are presently in the greatest period of prosperity the country has ever known. I ask you now, if we cannot pay our way in the height of prosperity what are we going to do if

times become really tough again? Suppose for a minute we had another crash like we had in '29 or we have another depression like we did in the early '30's, where would we be then if we pass this bond issue now? We are presently deriving about \$20,000,000 annually from our principal source of highway funds, the gasoline tax. This source of funds could possibly be reduced by fifty or even seventy-five per cent. If this should happen we would very possibly find ourselves with barely enough revenue from the gasoline tax to meet bond retirement schedules. Then, I presume, we would find ourselves issuing new bonds to meet payments on old bonds. This would be a situation that I am sure none of us would ever want to see the State of Maine in.

In the past several months we have had warnings of a possible depression from such men as Secretary Humphrey of the Treasury, ex-President Hoover and ex-President Truman, a depression that would curl your hair and make the previous depression look like a picnic in comparison. Now, I don't know whether these dire predictions will ever materialize in the near future or not and I am certainly not a prophet of gloom and doom, I do believe that somewhere in the future there is a depression waiting for us. I believe that what goes up must come down, whether it be a mountain or a tree, the Roman Empire or the economy of the United States. If it goes up sometime it must come down, and the farther up it goes usually the farther it falls.

Hindsight tells us that our economy rises and falls every twenty or thirty years. Perhaps this will not be true in the future. I certainly hope it will not be. However, we must admit that it is a very real possibility and if we do suffer a depression in this country I certainly hope the State of Maine will enter into it with a minimum of bonded debt because that would be the time for deficit financing. That would be the time that there would be tremendous pressure to reduce taxes and a great need for spending beyond revenues both by the Federal and State Governments. At that time, whenever it might be, I

would be in favor of a bond issue and approve deficit financing. I am not against the highway program and I am not trying to advocate a cut in the finances given to this department, however I am against the method suggested.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you realize, this bill before you now will automatically force item nine if you favor passage at this time. So I would like to lay this item on the table until later in the day's session to take up item nine first before we get to this bond issue and I so move.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose of Building State Highways", House Paper 1056, Legislative Document 1504, be tabled and assigned for later in today's session pending final passage for enactment.

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

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

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

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to this bond issue. I realize that I am opposing the leadership of both parties, but I sincerely believe that we can find ways to finance all the necessary expenditures of the State without resorting to a bond issue.

I am conscious of the fact that additional taxes will be unpopular and that a bond issue is the easy way out. However, I have never been in favor of taking the easy way.

The State of Maine now has bonds outstanding of \$35,000,000. If we issue these additional bonds we will owe approximately \$60,000,000. The total bonded indebtedness of our neighboring states, New Hampshire,

Vermont, Rhode Island and Connecticut combined is only \$26,000,000. Should we plunge ourselves into debt to the tune of more than twice that of these other four New England States? Or should we emulate the State of Massachusetts which now has bond issues of more than \$600,000,000, and it has been rumored that they are even considering a bond issue to pay the interest on their outstanding bonds.

If we authorize this bond issue we will have to pay this \$24,000,000 with interest, or a total of more than \$30,000,000. This money will only help match the Federal funds for the next four years. Where will we get the money to match Federal funds for the rest of the thirteen years of the program? We are opening the doors for bond issue after bond issue until we have piled up a debt which might embarrass future legislatures for many years to come. A debt which our children and grandchildren will inherit, and I do not believe that they will thank us for such action.

I do not propose that we should fail to match the Federal funds available but I do believe that ways can be found to finance the roads without resorting to a bond issue.

It was stated here last week by the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, that we derive three and a half millions yearly from the sales tax on automobiles, trucks, construction equipment, etc. If we increase our sales tax to three cents this revenue will amount to more than five million annually. I believe that some part of this five million could be rightfully turned over to the Highway Department. There are other possible solutions of financing our highway program without a bond issue.

I hope that we may have at least fifty members in this House who still have enough Yankee thrift and courage to oppose this bond issue. Thank you.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly respect the position which my good friend from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, and the gentleman from Charleston,

Mr. Rich, have taken, however, there are three pertinent questions which should be answered, and I wish that they would attempt to answer them very clearly. One, what do the opponents offer as an alternative? I would like to have a specific answer. Two, where will they get the money? I would also like to have another specific answer. Three, are they against the State participating in the Interstate Highway Program? Again I ask for a specific answer and then I would like to refute.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach put his questions one at a time?

Mr. PLANTE: I would be glad to. The first question is, what do the opponents offer as an alternative program?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, has addressed a question through the Chair to either the gentleman from Wiscasset or the gentleman from Charleston, either of whom may answer if he chooses.

Mr. FARMER: Mr. Speaker, there are many methods that are possible, there are at least several. I will give you what I would choose. I would first enact a weight distance tax and we would derive some two and a half million dollars from that. From the increased drivers' fees we would have another \$420,000. Increasing the passenger cars fees would give us another \$248,000. I would take ninety per cent of the State Police costs from the General Fund and only ten per cent from the Highway Fund. This would free \$1,445,000 for the Highway Department. I would reduce the unappropriated surplus of the Highway Fund \$500,000 each year for the current biennium, this would give us a total of \$5,115,000 that would either be additional revenue or freed revenue in the Highway Fund for each of the two years of the current biennium. This would be a very small amount of dollars short of what is currently being considered by the issuance of this bond issue. That is my suggestion. There are other ways, there is a lot of money in the General Fund, which no doubt anyone has a good argument to say that belongs to the Highway Fund.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach may state his second question.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer has answered, I believe, the three questions. However, there is another question which I have in mind. He speaks of taking money from the General Fund. Would we be preproposing that his program would also include an increase in the sales tax for this General Fund money?

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

Mr. FARMER: Briefly no. I do not propose dipping into the General Fund at will. I propose increasing our State Police share from the proposed fifty per cent to a proposed ninety per cent in the General Fund. I believe that this could be done either way but it certainly could with the supposition that the three per cent sales tax came into effect.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The problem of highway financing in Maine is and always will be an acute problem. I feel that it is a bipartisan problem as has been indicated through the feelings of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich. Since it is a bipartisan problem I think that we have a bipartisan responsibility to contribute toward a solution to the problem. As a member of the minority party I was happy to join with the members of the Highway Committee when they unanimously endorsed the new draft of this bill as a means of solving the problem. I know that all the members of the House feel the same responsibility to support some program of highway financing as I do.

Item three, item four, item five and item nine together provide a sound, well rounded adequately financed program of highway construction. It maintains our town road improvement fund and our special State aid programs at our

present levels, and at the same time allows for an increased cost of highway maintenance and snow removal. It further provides the funds to contribute the state's share to a projected \$163,929,000 construction program over the next four years. All of this at a very modest increase in taxes to the traveling public. I think the program is sound and merits your support. And Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I ask for a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. JACK: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I am just wondering where we are going. I represent five towns, there is only one of them, that is my own town, that has anything to help them, they have no manufacturing of any kind. Two of those towns are practically in the red at the present time, not only that but there are a lot of them over the State that are in the same category. I am wondering what would happen if we keep on raising the taxes on the towns. The county tax is higher than the towns and the State tax is higher. And they are advocating continuously to these small towns to revalue.

I want to cite just one case that occurred to me in one of my districts. I went into this gentleman's house, he is eighty-six and his wife is eighty-five. I call about three times a year to have a talk with them. His brother was a senator here, a representative and a senator. I was talking with him and he started to cry. I said, "What is the trouble, don't you feel well?" He said, "Mr. Jack, I do not know where we are going to get off." He said, "My wife is a cripple here as you know, and has been for years. I only pray that I will outlive her so that I will know she is properly taken care of." He said, "The poll tax payers and the people who pay rent in my town outvoted us and had a revaluation in my town. When I decided to quit working I had a large amount of money which I considered would carry us through. Today I do not know where we are going to get off. Last May the re-

valuation on my home here was \$196." And that is just what is going to happen to a lot of old people in our towns, the people have got to sell out and go to some home to live, and I hope this bill doesn't pass.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I just can't go along with the thinking of my good friends sitting near by. It appears to me that the Federal Government has taken ninety per cent by different means, gas tax and income tax and there is nothing we can do about it but pay it. Now they come back to us and say here is nine cents back if you will just match it with ten cents. Now, we do need these roads. If we are going to progress we must have roads, and we must maintain the roads that we do have. Now, we are in a very enviable position for credit, we are one of the six states who have a triple A credit. And \$24,000,000 of idle money to help us take advantage of this 90-10 proposition I think should pass.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not going to debate the issue on this bill here presently but I would like to state that I am amazed to the extent that a minority group would go to protect their own selfish interests as far as this matter is concerned. That group, we know who they are. Someone is bound to be hurt by this Interstate Highway Program, but if we are shortsighted enough here today to overlook the general good that will be derived from this Interstate Highway System for the protection of this minority group then I have lost faith in this legislative body.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I very honestly had not planned to speak on this issue for one reason only, that I feel that the majority of people in this room have made their minds

up, and I am certain at this late date debate will not change their opinion. However, rightly or wrongly I have always prided myself the four terms I have served here in respecting other people's judgment and respecting other people's convictions and trying to courteously go along with their convictions. The gentleman who just spoke I regret referred to what in his opinion were selfish convictions of other people, minority groups. Time may prove that he is right, but at this particular moment although I am on the opposite side to those in the minority groups who have their own convictions, I certainly respect their convictions and I admire them for fighting to the last ditch for something they believe in, and I can assure you, and I think they can assure you that I have not spoken one word to try and urge them to stray from those convictions, and despite the fact that we will vote on the opposite side, I repeat, I think they are entitled to those convictions and I admire them for those convictions.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the House that remarks about and discussions of the motives of members of the House are definitely unparliamentary and out of order and will be ruled such in the future.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to apologize to any member of this House to whom any of those remarks perhaps might have been aimed, not by me aimed at any member of this House knowing that they are speaking their convictions. My reference to the selfish minority is not to any member of this House as such, but rather the selfish interests and perhaps from the localities that they represent.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I only rise to go on record as opposed to the bond issue for one reason only. At any time the bond issue is lost in this House, at any time any restrictions can be placed upon the Highway Commission, so that a stop and look program can be had, I

will gladly change my vote. I have no wish to destroy the road program of this state. I do believe, and the only thing that we have ever asked is for this stop and look. The gentleman who previously spoke has as much interest in this as I have, and if he will talk with me after this vote is taken I will prove to him just what trouble Portland would be in if the other two lanes are not built, and only four lanes completed. I shall be happy if the Commission will furnish two lanes and then build the interstate system, then we will not have lost Portland and Falmouth and them, because their traffic situation will be taken care of, but the State of Maine will have lost the money for four lanes of road.

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

Mr. BLANCHARD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to go on record as being opposed to this bond issue unless some method has been adopted to retire the same.

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

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to convey to you the thoughts of my people in Yarmouth. I am going against the bond issue for the fact that I feel we have fallen down on the other issue. As I understand, the State Highway Commission intends to take the turnpike as their interstate road, and also make this loop down through Yarmouth, Falmouth and Cumberland as a loop. My people are very much dissatisfied about this. I am not against good roads but I shall vote against the bond issue until there is a pattern given us to go with it.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I too believe that debate is not going to change anybody's mind on this issue and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, has moved the previous question. For the Chair to entertain that motion the Chair must have the approval of one-third of the House.

Will those who favor the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third having arisen the Chair is authorized to entertain the motion for the previous question. The question now before the House is shall the main question be put now?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, but must remind the gentleman that his remarks must be confined to that motion.

Mr. FARMER: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very small of this House on this most important issue that we have got here now, to cut off debate. This, to my mind, is the most important issue that we will be faced with in this whole session, and have been, and I don't think it behooves us to cut off debate.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is shall the main question be put now?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham.

Mrs. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to second the remarks that the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, has made. We have spent almost two days here arguing over a one cent increase in the cost of milk, we have spent days discussing fish problems, clams and so forth, now we propose to saddle the State of Maine with a \$24,000,000 bond issue after less than an hour of debate. I am against it.

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

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am inclined to agree that there may be a lot left unsaid on this matter, and inasmuch as it is no doubt the key to the whole highway program I would concur that debate should not be stopped at this time.

The SPEAKER: The question 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 motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to concur wholeheartedly in the remarks of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, in opposition to this proposed bill. I cannot and will not go along with this unwarranted type of deficit financing. If and when any bond issue is proposed in this House while I am a member and it is an emergency requirement or the issue is real, and I wish to emphasize this, and if there is accompanying it a sound and definite proposal to pay it off, I will support it; otherwise not.

I am not a devotee of new-dealish deficit financing or attempting to lift oneself by their bootstraps. I have never yet seen any indication whatever that this state can spend itself into prosperity. If this bond issue passes we will be, four years hence, in nearly exactly the same position as regards the proposals for spending for roads as we are today, only we will then owe nearly \$50,000,000 in road bonds and no end in sight.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise to support the bill. I represent four small towns up in the central part of our state, only one of those towns has what we would consider a first class road. The town I live in we have had to resort to the same old condition that Benedict Arnold started when he wandered all around the Kennebec River and we have been doing it ever since. I feel that this will accelerate our highway program.

Now, being a frequent visitor to the Commonwealth and a former native of Massachusetts, I have observed their workings down there on the bond issues along with the construction of highways. They did float bond issues, they built many, many miles of high class roads, and if we stop and putter around, try to get a little here and a little there, I am afraid our roads are going to

be just about the same as they are now.

Bond issues are, we know, quite a burden, but they also are the answer. I will refer you to that new turnpike opened in Massachusetts last Thursday, the one hundred and twenty-three miles of one of the finest roads that there is in this country anywhere, and that was built by a bond issue. Now, if they had resorted to the tactics of dribble and drabble they probably wouldn't even have had the ground broken for that road. But with that thought in mind, and hoping to accelerate that program whereby we who live up in the central part of this state and have been practically ignored, hope to come under this program somewhat so that we can revise some of these cowpaths that we have to drive over every day.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I repeat I had not planned to discuss the issue, however, the House has gone on record and some members have so stated that they felt as one of the major issues before us it should be fully debated. And so I would like to present certainly some comments in favor of the bond issue. There must be somebody in favor of the issue here in the House. I would try to point out that while a major portion of the bond issue need arises from something our United States Congress has done, it is not wholly money that is going to be spent on the Interstate Highway System.

At the expense of repeating some information that was given last week on the measure, I would like to answer one comment that is heard often—that the bond issue advocated to finance mainly federal interstate construction, is the purpose of this \$24,000,000. These figures I am going to cite are my own investigation. They are not figures handed to me by the Highway Commission or any group. And if I am interpreting figures correctly, the next two years out of \$23,000,000 that we would spend under the highway allocation act, only \$4,000,000 is going on the Federal Interstate Highway, which apparently is such

a bone of contention in the House at this time.

You have all been handed the same sheet that I have so I am not quoting from any particular figures that give me an advantage. You were handed a sheet that showed the highway construction allocation for the next four years, to 1961. Again, out of the state dollars that are to be spent in the next four years, out of one hundred per cent of the state dollars only twenty-one per cent will go on this so-called Federal Interstate Super Highway System. What is the conclusion? The conclusion is that if you defeat the bond issue, number one, that you are defeating about eighty per cent of the funds that are going on non-Federal Interstate roads or roads that we have already got with us and have had session after session without this new highway network system.

Now, the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, would answer me probably and say, "You don't need the bond issue, you can accomplish the same thing by following the plan I propose by the certain measures I propose." If there is one thing I don't advocate that is trying to kid ourselves into believing that maybe certain measures will pass which are obviously, in my personal opinion, have very little chance of passing. And I might as well be blunt and to the point. I can't conceive at this early date of the State of Maine being one of the first three states out of forty-eight, or four states, adopting the so-called weight distance or ton mile tax. I realize that that may be construed as a very rash prediction. But knowing where Maine lies on the map of the United States, knowing that that tax will be passed mainly on to the business of the State of Maine and not absorbed by the truckers, I just don't believe that a state as poor, both economically and poor geographically as Maine would buy that measure which is the main backbone of the proposal of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer.

What are we talking about? We are talking about killing the bond issue and then find ourselves in the position of trying to take money out of the General Fund and other stop-gap measures and patchwork tax

measures to replace it. I don't think that is realistic, and I don't think you deep down in your hearts believe it either. I don't think you really believe that we will end up this session taking money out of the General Fund to replace the \$26,000,000 bond issue.

Now, I would like to go back to the beginning of my comments. Why are we in this present dilemma? Why are we facing the bond issue that we didn't have at the last four sessions? I think the simple answer is this article I read from today about the Congressional action of providing billions of dollars for a new Federal Interstate Highway Network. I would like to read you a few statements of where we stand in relation to the rest of the United States. Sometimes this legislature becomes so concerned with what is happening within the borders of this state that it doesn't realize what is happening outside those borders. I would like to quote a few paragraphs, I think it is interesting reading.

It says of the 41,000 mile Interstate System officials figure roughly twenty-five per cent will be built over existing roads, the rest will go on completely new locations. Few existing roads measure up to the System's high standards. That incidentally is in answer to those who feel that we could get along with building an extra lane over the nine mile Falmouth-Yarmouth area. Most of those will have to be rebuilt, widened or otherwise improved. Now, here is a paragraph that I think points up why on the twenty-first of May you are being asked to kill the bond issue. By and large the states which have done the most planning before the big highway bill was passed last summer in Congress are the ones that have moved ahead most quickly. Among these, Maryland arranged to spend all \$12,000,000 of its share of Federal funds for this fiscal year as well as ninety-five per cent of its money for next year. Rhode Island is eighty-seven per cent into its fiscal 1958 funds. California seventy-seven per cent. But West Virginia has at this time got eight per cent of its money for the fiscal year, Nebraska only nine per

cent and Maine eleven per cent. Once again Maine receives National recognition for being at the bottom of the list. Now, I know the answer will be that we don't care what any other state does, we will do as we please.

I think it is unfortunate that the Federal Government has seen fit to offer an opportunity for us to accelerate our highway building. Many of you may feel that we don't have to do it now, wait until next session. Here is the second reason why I think this House will be very delinquent if we don't pass the bond issue at this session rather than next session. I quote from the same Wall Street Journal article. "With the program barely ten months old it is becoming more and more obvious that the original twenty-seven and a half billion cost label is growing outdated. Federal officials even now are putting together a new cost estimate. While they won't predict what their study will show they will admit that it might well be over thirty billion. Just about every item that goes into roads, cement, gravel and steel and the like, as well as the service of road workers, has climbed in cost since the twenty-seven and a half billion estimate was made about four years ago. On the one hundred odd projects completed since last July expenses have run about six per cent above the engineers' preliminary calculations. With the cost of structural steel leading the way the Bureau of Public Roads Index of Bid Prices on Federal Aid Highways climbed seven per cent from the last quarter of 1955 to the like months last year."

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, if we procrastinate, put this off two years it is going to cost more come next session. That is one very serious reason why I think we are saving the State money to get this 90-10 road building program under way now. And I can't imagine a vacation state, such as we claim to be and advertize on our license plates, saying no, we don't want to improve our main arterial highways, the ones that bring tourists into this state. I realize the facts of life are that there are certain groups who have, as I said earlier, their own convic-

tions. I realize that my feelings won't change your feelings. But I certainly do believe that we are just going to have to face the issue up sooner or later—are we or aren't we going to take advantage of being given ninety cents of every dollar? As the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, said, you won't get a rebate on your income taxes, you won't get a rebate on the Federal Gas Tax, you will still pay it. Therefore, I sincerely hope that we will face up today this issue in front of us and not procrastinate another week and walk out of this legislature having accomplished absolutely nothing and be as the Wall Street Journal has said, one of the bottom states in the Nation to take advantage of this Federal money.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am going along with this bond issue and I don't like bond issues. The gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, has appealed to our courage to oppose this bond issue. I am going to say that it takes courage to pass the bond issue. And while I am talking about courage I want to allay the fears of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, a little by getting off the subject perhaps for a moment, to review the events of my lifetime.

When I first started paying attention it was around 1912. World War I was in the offing. Kaiser Wilhelm was beginning to shake the sword, we were thrown into the first World War. After 1918 we had a depression. 1921 was a real depression. By the time we got over that we got into a stock market boom. We had a crash in '29. We had the depression years of 1933. By 1937 we had quite a boom but we could see that we were getting into trouble because Mussolini and Hitler were getting ready to shake the world, and before we knew it we were in World War II. Then we had the demobilization period after the war and the problems of reconstruction. Then the Korean situation.

And now we have a rather difficult world situation in the middle

east, but despite all those things, despite the fact that during my lifetime we have gone on from crises to crises, each one more terrible than the last, despite, I say, all those things, we are today living in the greatest country that the world has ever seen and we are the most favored people that the world has ever known. And I believe, as I said, we must exercise some courage and go along with this program in the same spirit that this country has gone on in previous years. I repeat, it takes some courage to pass the bond program, but I still believe it is the right answer.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am in favor of the bond issue because only about four million dollars is going into the accelerated highway system. The rest of it is going into your town and my town which we will all benefit through eventually. I remember some years ago in the little town of Freeport, when the WPA was in existence, we all remember that—that was some of our lean years. We had an opportunity to get a sewer system in our town under the WPA for \$60,000. Oh no, they wouldn't accept it, that was tainted money. But what did they do a few years afterwards? They went out and built a sewer system in my town that cost \$260,000 and the taxpayers are paying for it now, where they could have got it for a very little money at that time.

The same thing happened to our school. We could have got a school, called the Morse Street School, for a very little money. What happened? We had to spend over \$120,000 for the school at a cost we could have got it for about \$30,000. Therefore, I don't want to stop progress for the State of Maine. We have people, and it has been said here this afternoon, coming into the state - - they want good roads, they demand good roads, they should have good roads. And now we have an opportunity to get them for them, let's go out and pass the bond issue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer.

Mr. FARMER: Mr. Speaker, I am directing my comments to the Republican members of this House because on previous important issues I have seen the signals called and we have seen that block of Democratic votes rise, as if somebody was up there pulling them all by one string, and I know they will do the same this time. However, I have a feeling for the Republicans in this House, if the people will vote their conscience and not simply what they are told, and I would like to clear one thing up now, it is my motive behind this, it is nothing except that I am against deficit financing, and if that be a sin then I plead guilty.

My proposal, the weight distance tax has been attacked, and I don't think this is the time to defend that. It would take too long. However, there are other things we could do. We could even put on a gas tax. Inasmuch as I would hate the sound of it I would certainly be for it instead of this deficit financing. And there is something to be said for increasing the gas tax even. That would put us the highest state in the Union in the gasoline tax. There are thirty-one states in this country who have a gasoline tax of six cents or over, and there are ten of them who have a seven cent gas tax. Those figures are as of last January of this year. How many of those other states have changed, or are changing, their gas tax, I don't know, but I would imagine there would be a few. Other states have the same problem that we have, for this interstate money.

Supposing we did have the highest gas tax in the country? We in the State of Maine, we have the most number of miles of roads per person of practically any other state in the country, and we are in the hardest geographical position to build and maintain roads. We know that. We are far north, but still are on the coast where we continually freeze and thaw. There is the State of Montana where it is colder than we are, they freeze up in the winter and they thaw out in the summer. Now I am not an engineer but it

seems to me that it would cost much more to maintain a road that is continually freezing and thawing such as we have; and that fact alone coupled with the fact that we are one of the highest amount of roads per capita of any state in the country, demand that we are going to have the highest taxes to pay for these roads, if we are going to have roads compared to the rest of our states nothing can ever get away from that. And no bond issue will ever solve that problem. It has been said that this is a bipartisan problem. Well, I certainly go along with that and think it is everyone's problem. However, this bond issue is not a bipartisan solution. We have just gone through a twenty-year period of democratic rule on the federal level, a period of democratic rule and deficit financing. These two terms are synonymous with me, when I think of deficit financing I immediately think of democratic rule. And I don't think this is a republican method of solving a problem. I say, thank God for the republican administration on the federal level at least, where they attempt to put an end to this deficit financing. And I think perhaps we could take a page from their books and not begin on it at this time. I think this is the same old democratic gimmick of giving the people something without making them realize that they have got to pay for it. Or at this time we have it wrapped in the partial cloak of republicanism.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should perhaps just say a few words in defense of the way I am going to vote on this thing. The other afternoon we had considerable discussion here and it was quarter of nine that night before I got home to supper. And in the meantime I decided that it was such a long way from Wiscasset to Rockland, and such a long way from Rockland to Bucksport, and such a long way from Bucksport to Eastport, that I figured I would have to change my vote and vote for the bond issue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh.

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There has been reference made to the minority party. I merely want to say this in behalf of the minority party. We are expressing to the people of the State of Maine our willingness to shoulder responsibility and face the issue. They had trouble building a highway program in this state the last session and the session before that. They will have it the next session and in coming sessions, so long as we remain so large an area, small in population. Our fairly low per capita income is going to take the best brains we can muster together in this entire state regardless of party affiliation to come up to try and meet the needs of our highways and our institutions. I think the members of the minority party vote their convictions. We are merely expressing our confidence in the judgment of the people of the State of Maine. We are trying to take steps forward. They are costly steps we know, but they are progressive steps, and upon that we rest.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I ask you when you are voting to consider that each and every year five per cent more automobiles are being added on our highways. If we are still in the vacation business we will probably get our share of them. We need these highways and we have got to have the bond issue, any patchwork measures won't work. But to the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, I refer him to the present budget submitted by the President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Beyer.

Mr. BEYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe perhaps some of us are now called to defend our positions as republicans and still voting for this bond issue. I do agree with the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, that the only other alternative is either the weight distance tax or an increase in the gas tax. Without going into the merits of one of

those now, I do feel that either of them would be a major catastrophe to this state at this time. And it is for this reason only, because I am definitely opposed to deficit financing in any ordinary situation where there was another feasible alternative, for this reason I feel that I am a true republican, and I don't feel that it takes a special amount of courage either, to vote my convictions when—of the alternatives put before us here today, I am proud to be a republican and to vote for the bond issue.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I too stand here as a republican. I stood here as a republican the other day and voted right down the line on the Constitution issues to go to the people and I figured I was voting for the good of my party when I voted that way. And I as a republican am going to vote for this bond issue. I will tell you one reason why. Some few years ago, I don't know as I should mention this, the University of Maine is almost as sacred as mentioning the other body, but I put up quite a fight on building dormitories at the University of Maine, at least I scared them off a million dollars. And I made a mistake. Because when they built that next dormitory a couple of years afterwards it cost a lot more money. So therefore I back up the argument of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that as the prices are rising we should go ahead and take advantage now. We have been looking for this depression for the last five years and we haven't seen it yet, and if it should come, why alright, if we can't get the revenue everything would stop anyway, so I say, give us the bond issue.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, I admire and respect very much the views of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, and others who oppose the bond issue. I too am in favor of the pay as you go basis, but in this case what is the pay as you go basis? To me, if we issue

bonds to do this accelerated highway program, the interstate system, and the users of that system pay for it even though they are using it some twenty years hence, to me that is a pay as you go basis. I don't see any reason why we shouldn't be in fair condition at that time. I notice in some of the papers that we are paying off about three million dollars a year on current bond issues. At the end of thirteen years that would be lessening our debt by that amount, by some thirty-nine million dollars.

So at the end of this program we will have paid off probably entirely all of our old debts and really be facing only the current debt at that time for constructing the interstate system. Especially if we provide some method in this legislature for retiring the bonds, then I think that is a fair and equitable way to build the interstate system. So therefore I must go along with this bond issue.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the passage for enactment of Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose of Building State Highways." House Paper 1056, Legislative Document 1504.

The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell, has requested a roll call vote. For the Chair to order a roll call vote the Chair must have the approval of at least one-fifth of the House. Will those who desire a roll call vote please rise and remain standing. Obviously more than one-fifth of the members having expressed a desire for a roll call vote, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I just have a question, whether or not it is two-thirds of the elected members of this House or two-thirds of those present today?

The SPEAKER: Two-thirds of the members present.

The question before the House is the passage for enactment of Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty-four Million Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for the Purpose

of Building State Highways, House Paper 1056, Legislative Document 1504.

Those who favor the passage for enactment of this bill will say yes when their name is called; those who oppose the passage for enactment will say no. The Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call

YEA—Allen, Andrews, Babineau, Baird, Bartlett, Beane, Augusta; Beyer, Brewster, Broderick, Browne, Bangor; Bruce, Carter, Etna; Carville, Caswell, Childs, Cole, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Bath; Couture, Lewiston; Coyne, Crockett, Curtis, Cyr, Davis, Calais; Davis, Westbrook; Day, Desmarais, Dostie, Dudley, Dumais, Duquette, Earles, Edgerly, Edwards, Elwell, Emerson, Emery, Emmons, Flynn, Frazier, Frost, Fuller, Gallant, Graves, Hancock, Hanscomb, Hanson, Harriman, Harrington, Harris, Hatch, Hathaway, Haughn, Heald, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hersey, Hickey, Higgins, Hilton, Hughes, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Jones, Karkos, Kelly, Kinch, LaCasce, Lane, Latno, Leathers, Letourneau, Libby, Mann, Mathieson, Maxwell, Maynard, Needham, Pierce, Plante, Porell, Prue, Quinn, Rancourt, Rollins, Ross, Bath; Ross, Brownville; Rowe, Madawaska; Roy, Sanborn, Shaw, Smith, Portland; Stanley, Stilphen, Tevanian, Thackeray, Totman, Vaughan, Violette, Wade, Walsh, Walter, Warren, Wheaton, Whiting, Winchenpaw.

NAY—Besse, Blanchard, Bragdon, Brockway, Brown, Ellsworth; Burnham, Christie, Ervin, Farmer, Foss, Hatfield, Hutchinson, Jack, Jewell, Knapp, Lindsay, Morrill, Rankin, Rich, Roberts, Shepard, Smith, Falmouth; Storm, Tarbox, Turner, Walker, Webber, Wood.

ABSENT—Anthoine, Bean, Winterport; Brewer, Call, Carey, Carter, Newport; Denbow, Hoyt, Miller, Morway, Nadeau, Rowe, Limerick; Saunders, Williams.

Yes: 108. No: 28. Absent: 14.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and eight having voted in the affirmative, twenty-eight in the negative, with fourteen absentees, the Bill is passed to be enacted.

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

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. The Chair now lays before the House item number three under enactors, which was tabled earlier today and especially assigned for consideration after the House had acted on item number five. This was done on motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

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

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 132 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Mr. Totman of Bangor was granted unanimous consent to briefly address the House.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can speak only for myself, but I listened with a great deal of admiration to the opponents of the bond issue, and I personally want to compliment them on their broad-minded and cooperative spirit in not taking the same stand as the last issue and join together, which they could well have blocked, to go along with this highway act. I think it shows a great deal of spirit to be complimented and I personally thank them. (Applause)

Passed to Be Enacted

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

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

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be en-

acted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

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

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

Mr. LaCASCE: Mr. Speaker, on item eight, An Act relating to Property Tax Exemption for Benevolent and Charitable Institutions, I don't know how many of you people have read this but it says,—“No such institution shall be entitled to tax exemption if it is in fact conducted or operated principally for the benefit of persons who are not residents of Maine and if stipends or charges for its services, benefits or advantages in excess of \$10 per week”.

Personally, it seems to me that where we are a vacation state and you are saying here that if it is conducted for the benefit of persons who are not residents of Maine, it is discriminating against the people who come to our state. Personally I can see no good in the bill and move for its indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. LaCasce, with respect to item number eight, Bill “An Act relating to Property Tax Exemption for Benevolent and Charitable Institutions, moves that this bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would respectfully call the attention of the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. LaCasce, to amendment under filing number, I don't recall the number, but it amends the bill to change the \$10 to \$15. Now this bill has been before the Taxation Committee, it has been approved by both chairmen of the Taxation Committee and either all of the members have approved it, or those who perhaps had misgivings about it, which perhaps could be one or two, have

agreed to let it operate for two years and see what happens.

But the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. LaCasce, says he sees no reason for the bill. I think that the most important reason for the bill is approximately seven hundred thousand dollars spent all over the State of Maine on taxes to the towns, and I don't think that that is unimportant. I would also want him to know, and the members of the House, that this bill has had a great deal of study by the Taxation Department, it has been approved in essence by a great many of the camps that are operating, to my personal knowledge, and I know there are others who have approved it.

It is a very important bill and I certainly hope that the motion does not prevail after the amount of study and work that has gone into this over the years, not only in this session. It was before the Research Committee in 1953, a great study was made, the problem is a very important one and the bill was written actually by a member of the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine. I am sure that I don't need to debate the question further and I hope that the motion of the gentleman does not prevail.

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

Mr. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, for a matter of information, I would like to know what this bill means. Could someone tell me?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, has addressed a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he chooses. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Hancock.

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the bill before me but I can tell you the reasons for the bill. Throughout the State of Maine there are many incorporations of charitable and benevolent institutions. There is in the town of York alone at the present time one such institution that is considered charitable, benevolent, that has been a profit-making organization for quite a few years, and that is the York Harbor Osteopathic Hospital recently incorporated as a non-profit

benevolent institution. We have a school in York which is under a little bit different section of our law but relates to the same subject and in the same manner.

In the town of Eliot there is a religious organization. All these organizations are formed and it is not difficult at all to incorporate as a non-profit benevolent institution, or you can call yourself an educational scientific institution, and be tax-exempt by the towns. This particular bill frankly does not help, I don't believe, my particular town, but it does help in some manner over the state. The idea being that those, — there are camps and homes that are incorporated as non-profit organizations that are done so by persons outside the State of Maine who come here, where it is a simple matter to incorporate, set up a summer camp and they call themselves a charitable institution. The only recourse of the towns in such cases is to demand an accounting to see whether or not it is such, profitable or not. And thus far that particular method has been unworkable in a sense. And the decisions of our law court have been most unfavorable with regard to the towns as to what shall be considered charitable and benevolent, to the extent that the particular Eliot case that I mentioned has been to the law court and they found against the town. It means I believe approximately twenty-five hundred dollars in taxes each year to the town of Eliot, that they do not receive.

Mr. Bruce, the gentleman from Buxton, could best explain this particular bill, although it is for those institutions that are set up within the State of Maine by out-of-state people for out-of-state people. That is the main goal of this particular bill. But there is a problem within the State of Maine and I understand the Maine Municipal Association is going to study it with regards to the whole. In other words, with regards to charitable and benevolent and educational and scientific and so forth, to try to divide those who are actually educational and scientific such as are some of our schools, and charitable and benevolent as are many of our hospitals.

But it is not too difficult to set up for some particular sham a tax-free organization in the State of Maine and the towns are stuck by it.

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

Mr. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, then as I understand it, this bill would help the State, help the towns collect taxes which are due them, is that correct?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, addresses a second question through the Chair to the gentleman from York, Mr. Hancock, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HANCOCK: That is the intent of the bill.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is with relation to item number eight, Bill "An Act relating to Property Tax Exemption for Benevolent and Charitable Institutions." The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. LaCasce.

Mr. LACASCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The way this is written, could this apply to schools as it is now?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. LaCasce, addresses a question through the Chair to anyone who wishes to answer. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh.

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was one of those members of the Taxation Committee who questioned this measure when it came up. I was perhaps one individual on the Taxation Committee who caused the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, as much work and effort as he has put into this thing. I withdrew my objections not with the conviction that this is a perfect answer to replace what we have in the present statutes, but in the firm conviction after having a conference with leaders of all faiths, with people operating many different camps, with the highest court authority we could get in the State of Maine, that this is not going to harm any schools, that it is not going to create any great injustice of any nature on anyone

in camps. And while it may not be the perfect answer, it is better than the one we have on the books at the present time, and that is the reason upon the authority and the word of those people that I withdrew my objections. Does that answer your question?

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, in 1953 we had a question in that legislature, in that session, and also in 1955, that came under Chapter 50. Under Chapter 50 benevolent or charitable institutions were exempted up until 1955 up to five hundred thousand dollars in each locality. Now there was a group who came into Richmond and Dresden and those bordering towns and bought a lot of property and planned to build a lot of farms and houses and planned to start factories and they came up to the Secretary of State and got a charter saying that they were a charitable institution, and they were White Russians. And then after the cloture rule had gone on, they went to the people of Richmond and the Selectmen and said they were exempt under taxes for the taxes under this Chapter 50. There wasn't anything we could do about it at that time. Although I tried to get an order in here to cut it down to ten per cent of the valuation of the towns, but I was unable to do it, but we did put it into the Legislative Research, and in 1955 that was adopted. Now what I am wondering, are we just doing this thing all over again. And as you can see the town of Richmond only had eleven hundred population and they had bought a great deal of property, and if they were to be exempt, you can see what would happen to a town if someone started out to do this thing. I just wonder what this is. Unless someone can tell me I would like to table it until tomorrow until I can find out more about it, and I so move.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, moves that Bill "An Act relating to Property Tax Exemptions for Benevolent and Charitable Institutions" be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending passage for en-

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

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

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh. There was opposition at first in the Taxation Committee and after this amendment which is under filing number 279 was introduced by the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, it was with the consent of the Chairman and myself after talking with other members, that we felt that this was a fair bill, possibly would be workable and at the present time there are a great many hardships that are caused on some of the municipalities by the exemption of taxes. I don't believe that this will affect any business that is in the State run by anybody that is in this State. I have talked with — like the gentleman who runs the Y.M.C.A. Camp and other members, and they appear to be in favor of the bill with no opposition.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Fryeburg, Mr. LaCasce, that Bill "An Act relating to Property Tax Exemption for Benevolent and Charitable Institutions", House Paper 1036, Legislative Document 1467, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

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

**Enactor
Tabled**

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

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

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In good faith with the members of the House who were told last week that it would be better and wiser to attempt to finance the bond issue from the supplemental budget rather than the balanced budget, and with the possibility that that amendment will probably be tested, it does not seem wise at this time to enact the measure before us.

Therefore, I would move that this item be tabled unassigned, and I will personally assure the House it will be taken from the table as soon as we have decided the alternative method.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that Bill "An Act Increasing Registration Fees for Motor Vehicles and Operators' Licenses" be tabled unassigned pending passage to be enacted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Orders of the Day

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act to Repeal the Westbrook Sewerage District" (H. P. 668) (L. D. 949) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. PORELL of Westbrook
COTE of Lewiston
RANKIN of Southport

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve in favor of Mabelle K. Toole of Bangor (H. P. 389) (L. D. 520) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. QUINN of Bangor
NEEDHAM of Orono
WALSH of Brunswick

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort to the rostrum the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, to serve as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Earles 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 now lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Investments of Moneys in State Special Revenue Fund", House Paper 739, Legislative Document 1053, tabled on May 16 by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, pending acceptance of the Report.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Wade of Auburn, the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair now lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and the Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Creating the Maine Motor Vehicle Financial Security Act", House Paper 987, Legislative Document 1411, tabled on May 16 by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, pending acceptance of either Report.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Stilphen of Rockland, the majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair now lays before the House the third tabled and assigned matter, Bill "An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law", Senate Paper 419, Legislative Document 1178, tabled on May 17 by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, pending the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, to indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A".

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The next three items on your calendar all came out of the Labor Committee. As the Labor Commit-

tee House Chairman, when I first reported on the money bills, which are the bills under workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation, I said that the Labor Committee had tried to get together with labor and industry to reach an equitable agreement. We came very close though we didn't quite get them together. So the Labor Committee came out with its own recommendations.

Now there may be some who feel that notwithstanding the state-wide labor and industry groups, the legislature in our right, should enact any labor legislation which we desire. Now of course that is our right, but I don't believe personally that it would be wise to antagonize either one of these factors if it would be possible to avoid it, and personally I am happy to report that just today an agreement has been reached between labor and industry which is almost identical to the Committee recommendations. They both now agree under unemployment compensation to go from \$30 to \$33 and from twenty-three to twenty-six weeks. They agree on retirement exclusions. They agree on disqualification clarifications. They agree on exemptions for holiday pay. Under workmen's compensation they agree to go from \$30 to \$35. They agree that specifics should be increased, and on L. D. 1178, which is the bill in question now, the department clarification bill, they both agree that it should be adopted with three amendments.

Now the first amendment is the one that is before you now and the motion has been made by the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, that this amendment be indefinitely postponed. I certainly do hope that this motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker, the talented young gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, has said they all agree. I agree. I am very happy to withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, withdraws his motion to indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A".

Committee Amendment "A" was then adopted.

Mr. Ross of Bath offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

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

Amend said Bill in "Sec. 15" by inserting after paragraph B thereof the following underlined paragraph:

'C. Retirement pay or a pension paid, excluding a pension paid under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, directly by the employer or paid indirectly by the employer through a trust fund, insurance or other media in the manner set forth in paragraph B of subsection XIX of section 3.'

Further amend said Bill in "Sec. 15" by striking out the underlined word and letter "paragraph A" in the 9th line and inserting in place thereof the underlined words and letters 'paragraphs A and C'

House Amendment "A" was adopted.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment "B", which has been reproduced as filing 476. This amendment concerns a date in a bill that we have already passed and that is all that it does—it just takes care of dating a bill that the House has already passed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, offers House Amendment "B". The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

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

Amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof a new section to be numbered 'Sec. 25.' to read as follows:

"Sec. 25. R. S., c. 29, § 17, sub-§ IV, ¶B, amended. The 2nd paragraph of paragraph B of subsection IV of section 17 of chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by chapter 268 of the public laws of

1957, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows:

'The contribution rates provided by this paragraph shall be retroactive to July 1, 1957.'"

House Amendment "B" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Weekly Benefits for Total Employment Under Social Security Law", House Paper 1089, Legislative Document 1573, tabled on May 17 by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, pending further consideration (Engrossed in House) (Engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A", filing No. 447 in Senate).

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House: This is the bill under Unemployment Compensation increasing from thirty to thirty-three dollars and from twenty-three weeks to twenty-six weeks, and I believe the motion in order is to adopt Senate Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER pro tem: Under the situation existing I have been informed that the House may recede and concur, may insist or may adhere.

Mr. ROSS: I would request that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, moves that the House recede and concur. Is that the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Benefit Eligibility and Definition of Unemployment Under Employment Security Law", House Paper 780, Legislative Document 1113, tabled on May 17 by the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, pending motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, to reconsider indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Last week I voted for the indefinite postponement of L. D. 1113, and after arriving at home in the evening I received calls from my constituents that I had voted the wrong way, so therefore I found myself in rather an embarrassing position. We have two factories there, one of them has organized their own independent union and associated with the plant in Brockton, Massachusetts. Therefore, I move to reconsider our action on L. D. 1113.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending motion before the House is that of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, to reconsider indefinite postponement of both reports.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, this L. D. 1113 is the L. D. relating to holiday pay as an exclusion that is part of the agreement. I certainly hope that the motion to reconsider does receive passage.

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

Mr. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker, I didn't think I would have to go through this thing over again but it seems as though I will. I never agreed to the passage of this bill, and when in Committee I so stated, I made myself very clear that I would oppose the passage of this bill, and that is the reason that I voted for the indefinite postponement.

In regards to the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, I think he is a little confused as to the meaning of this bill. He was going to check with people, I was under the impression that he was going to try to table it to get more information, because from what I can gather we are both interested in the same thing, and I think that when he finds out more about it he will agree with me.

As I said before I never agreed to this because as far as Sanford is concerned we have lost most of our industries in Sanford, all we have left that is any good are two

shoe factories that employ approximately 800 or 900 persons.

Four years ago we had this bill introduced and got it passed and enacted. Our people over there are very interested in this bill. As I stated last Thursday they can't see any reason why they should lose this holiday pay if they are unemployed, not working that particular week, and they go to receive unemployment and they deduct their holiday pay from their unemployment check.

Now, it has been stated here that a lot of small employees are affected by this, a lot of small employers. I don't know how it can be, my understanding is that it is only with organized labor, between management and labor where they do pay holiday pay. Holiday pay, by them at least, it is not considered wages, it is a bonus to try to retain their good employees, to keep good relations between management and labor. And if you reconsider and you pass this bill you deprive these people of their holiday pay, with which they have contracted with management to receive. I know that the management in the Sanford Shoe Shop have no objection to this bill, they have made agreements to pay, they want to pay this holiday pay. They have made a contract with labor to that effect, and if you pass this bill you just take it away from them in one form, instead of giving it to them in this language this remains in the Unemployment Security Fund. And as I stated last Thursday it is not a very enormous amount, it only amounts to about \$5,000, I don't think it will do any damage to the fund, so I would move against reconsideration and I would like to ask for a division.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As I understand this bill, this bill only affects those people, those unions, or that labor which has contracted with management to receive holiday pay. If during the layoff period a holiday falls in that week, under our present existing statutes they would be entitled to receive unemployment compensation without any consideration

whatsoever to the holiday pay. This bill seeks to have that holiday pay considered and deducted from the unemployment benefits. And in order for us to be consistent, as the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, has suggested the other day, as to a railroad bill, if this worked any hardship whatsoever on management, I submit to you that it is proper to take this to the bargaining table and negotiate it as he suggested the other day on a railroad bill. This is a matter of collective bargaining and it is not a matter for the legislature to decide. We have set forth certain rules and if someone is getting hurt by it, which I doubt, with only \$5,000 involved, I think that it should be negotiated on the bargaining table and it shouldn't be a matter of legislation here.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Sometimes it is a little bit difficult to explain these things. I don't know how you could negotiate this. This does not take away a holiday of course, it just says that if a man is unemployed and collecting unemployment compensation, and a holiday falls in that week, that that holiday, which is being paid for anyhow, is deducted from his pay that he gets from unemployment compensation. For instance if his day's pay is \$10 and if he receives the maximum of \$33 per week for unemployment compensation then you would deduct that \$10 from the \$33 and give him \$23. That might happen a few times during the year to a few people. But remember that under the other bill increasing the \$3 a week for twenty-six weeks you are there giving the employee \$78 a year when he is unemployed, so I think that you have got to consider the two of them together and not either one separately, and I certainly hope the motion to reconsider prevails.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I went along with the previous labor bills and the increase in unemployment benefits

with the understanding that there had been an agreement arrived at, and that this was in the agreement that we would pass this bill. Now, if we are going to oppose that then we have thrown that agreement out the window.

This particular bill is of interest to the people in my district, my area here, both to management and to labor. Now, the working man in my area is an honorable man, and where there has been an agreement reached he will stand by it, and I certainly believe that where this legislation has gone along on these other items we should certainly reconsider and pass this bill. And furthermore, I believe there has been a lot of confusion on this issue, in that if a man is interested in keeping the two remaining industries in his town he should certainly vote for this bill, for the passage of this bill and not try to kill it.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Rancourt.

Mr. RANCOURT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Rancourt, may inquire, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, may reply if he so desires.

Mr. RANCOURT: I heard the word railroad bill, does that actually mean a railroad bill or a railroaded bill?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Rancourt, has made an inquiry of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, who may reply if he so desires.

Mr. TEVANIAN: The only answer I can give is—take your choice.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I just cannot get the thinking that is presented by my good friend, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. Now to me this was an agreement entered into of an employer with their employees that they were to receive so much compensation per day and then when a holiday came they were to be paid for that holiday.

Now, if something comes up in the business and the man is laid off, and he is going to get this benefit from the fund, but the holiday comes along and he is supposed to give up that money that he would get for the holiday. I just don't see how that fits in, in other words, if he had been working he would have got it, but the fellow is laid off and he is getting a part of his pay through the Social Security Benefits, and he is losing enough already, now he is supposed to take it off from this Social Security, it just looks to me like double talk.

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of confusion on this particular bill. The town that I represent, one of them, Madawaska, we have located there a major industry in the state, the Frazier Paper Mill. Annually the four unions representing the workers working for Frazier Incorporated bargain collectively with management, and they have bargained for one item that they call holiday pay. Between management and labor they have agreed in their union contract that when a worker is temporarily laid off that they would be paid and that the worker would pick up his holiday pay. This bill here interferes with the collective bargaining of management, there is no two ways about it, it is simple and clear.

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

Mr. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: True, we only have one good industry left in Sanford, and we are proud of it and we are getting along fine with them. Now, as I said before, through collective bargaining they have agreed to give this holiday pay, and they are perfectly satisfied with it, they are not raising any fuss. But the workers in the shoe factories hate to lose this holiday pay. Right now there is a slack period in these factories, they are not working very much, but fortunately right now there is no holiday, and they are not due for holiday pay under their bargaining contract, so it really doesn't affect anything. But in the fall when two

holidays will come up then they might be affected.

I realize that perhaps industry and labor here has agreed on the major money bills, I figured that was the way it would come out, three weeks extra and three dollars more a week, that is the way we have been going for years, but as far as we are concerned in Sanford, we would rather see that as it is and not lose this holiday pay. That is how important it is to these workers. And I feel like the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, he wanted to go back home with something. I certainly don't want to go back home and lose this bill and face all these workers only four years after its passage and see it repealed while I am here. I move against the reconsideration.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture.

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, I for one voted along with the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, but at this time, as a labor representative in the City of Lewiston, and I have taken the item up with most of them, certainly I think there is a misunderstanding on this bill in some instances. Some of them have brought out the fact of losing their holidays, which they are not. As it was brought out, supposing the person happened to be unemployed and receiving unemployment compensation that a holiday falls on that week, as they say, it is deducted on his unemployment compensation amount. But he is not disqualified for that amount of \$10 or whatever a day's pay is. If this person draws a period of twenty-six weeks he will also be entitled to that \$10 or \$12 for that holiday pay at the end of it. I for one have taken the matter up with quite a few people in the City of Lewiston, and certainly feel that they prefer to be on the basis of \$33 a week and twenty-six weeks a year than be on twenty-three weeks and \$30 a week compensation and get that holiday. Again if a person is unemployed for a period of twenty-six weeks he automatically gets that week's pay anyway. And I certainly wish to go along on the reconsideration of this act.

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

The motion is for reconsideration of the House's action whereby it voted to indefinitely postponed Bill "An Act relating to Benefit Eligibility and Definition of Unemployment Under Employment Security Law", House Paper 780, Legislative Document 1113. A division has been requested.

Will all those in favor of reconsideration please rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count?

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-six having voted in the affirmative and forty-two having voted in the negative the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen, moves the acceptance of the "Ought to pass" Report. Is that the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was given its first and second readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

Speaker EDGAR: The Chair would like to thank the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, very much for his excellent services as Speaker pro tem.

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

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Examinations for Certain Persons to Practice Barbering", Senate Paper 539, Legislative Document 1511, table on May 17 by the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Smith, to reconsider indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. BARTLETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to thank the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, for tabling this bill for me on May 17. This bill, for some particular reason, has received more consideration than many major and probably a good deal more important bills, it having been debated twice here in the House, and both times indefinitely postponed by an overwhelming majority. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Smith, 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. Smith, that the House reconsider indefinite postponement of Bill "An Act relating to Examinations for Certain Persons to Practice Barbering", Senate Paper 539, Legislative Document 1511.

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

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

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Increasing Pensions of Elderly Teachers", House Paper 258, Legislative Document 356, tabled on May 17 by the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, pending the motion of the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, to indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A".

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

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When this bill came up last Friday with Committee Amendment 437, I was a little bit surprised and disappointed, and I moved to indefinitely postpone that amendment and put the bill back to its original figure of \$300. Finally the bill was tabled until today. The thing that concerns me is, in the Appropriations Committee they have bills like, for instance, the Atlantic Salmon Commission that asks for considerable thousands of dollars to give to the

biologists to spend on Atlantic salmon. So, I am not against that, in fact at the hearing I spoke in favor of it, but what does bother me is the fact that a bill like that would come out of Committee allowing a hundred per cent of the appropriation, and such a deserving bill as this one be cut down.

Many, many reasons for it have been given, and over the weekend, yesterday and today, some of us have done a lot of studying and checking on things, and we can't find any reason or anything that would harm anybody else or any other pensioners by allowing the \$300. It is just a matter of cutting it back, and these people who are fast leaving us anyway, so that this amount would grow smaller rapidly, feel, and I think there is a lot of members here feel, that this amendment should be indefinitely postponed and the bill returned to its original figure. I think there are a few others who would like to speak on it, and I am not going to take up too much of your time but I hope my motion prevails.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Speaker, I arise to support the motion of the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, and I hope his motion does prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I arise to support the motion of the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, when we can raise money, as he said, for Atlantic salmon as we did this morning for \$15,000 which might lead to half a million without a question, we should be able to afford \$300 a year for teachers pensions.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me that there is no more worthy group than this group of retired teachers. They worked for very small pay, many of them, most of them in fact, and they are now get-

ting along in years and what they receive as pension is inadequate to supply their needs.

I have had a letter from one who was a teacher in high school when I was in high school, and after her children had grown she went back to teaching again and so was qualified for the higher pension, but that still is not more than half as much as she would need to live on, and so I am very much in favor of this bill and I hope it is enacted.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to concur with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway. I received numerous letters and replies from various people who are really concerned over the aged people in this profession, and they certainly are deserving, with the low pay that they received to come up somewhere within living reason or decency of today's pattern.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wish to support the motion of the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway. These teachers that we are referring to in this matter are teachers who in their teaching days worked for a matter of \$5, \$6 or \$7 a week, and they worked at a time when teachers were not able to be married and teach school also. The result is that in their old age they find themselves alone, they were not able to be married and have children who would now take care of them in their old age, and they are entirely dependent upon thee, you might say, generosity of the State of Maine in many instances. Now, I spoke before this Committee when they had the original hearing some two and half or three months ago, and because of the age and the need of these teachers I urged an emergency be put on it so it would become effective immediately.

One of the many letters I received was from an old third grade teacher of mine who is ninety-six years

old. She wrote me, not in her behalf but in behalf of other teachers in her age bracket who are old teachers, saying in her letter that she doubted very much that she would survive to get any benefit from the bill if it was passed. She passed away last week. Now, as I understand this there are only about, last July there were four hundred and seventeen teachers in this group. They are now reduced in number to something like three hundred and eighty-five.

If this amendment is dropped and the original bill goes through, they would only get about a matter of \$5.77 a week, and in their old age they have illnesses and they need medicine and they need medical attention, and they certainly need this little help to last them through their remaining days.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Early in the session I received many letters from these teachers in my community. I wrote back to them and told them I would heartily support this bill. I say now and I want to go on record as supporting the bill in its original form, therefore I would like to go along with the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway.

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

Mr. RANCOURT: Mr. Speaker, if I did not get up in support of this bill I would feel guilty. I have appeared before this Committee when the teachers were there fighting their case. I served as a member of the Board of Education in the City of Lewiston in the early 1930's, twenty odd years ago. I have seen teachers come and go. I remember teachers when they were out in the country on \$500 a year and had to support their mothers and in some cases their fathers and part of the family on a salary of \$500 a year. They went up to six and seven, they certainly never reached the prosperous teachers wages of today. These teachers have not had a chance to save any money. They would practically be pauperized if they had to keep on living on what

they are getting today. Pensions then were not what they are now. They deserve everything they can get and this state owes it to them. In those days teachers were not only teachers, they were dedicated to their profession, they had to be under the hardships they had to work. I only find one trouble with this bill, if I had a chance to amend a bill such as this, I would amend it upwards. We have to be satisfied with the way it is. They certainly deserve all of that and a lot more and I stand very much in favor of it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: It certainly is rather foolish for me to stand up here and tell you why the Committee came out with this amendment. I am sure that the sentiment is not on our side. These people who we, somebody has requested that they get an increase in pension, certainly are deserving of it. When the Committee at the beginning of our executive sessions thought that we should increase the pay of each one of them up to the maximum that you are giving to those who have worked thirty-five years, and I think probably that would be justified, that they all would be getting the same amount even though some of them had worked thirty-five years and some of them twenty-five. The reason that we came out with the amendment was the fact that some of these people who already contribute to their own pension fund would be getting less than some of these people who did not contribute to the pension fund. We have all had several letters, probably we have all had letters from the same people asking that we grant this increase in the pension, and I have letters in my desk which say "Anything you can do for us will certainly be appreciated."

We feel that there is justice in giving them more than they have asked for and certainly if the gentleman from Lewiston would like to make such an amendment I think probably the House would let him

make that amendment I think that we have done something which is fair, the Committee felt that it was fair and we have brought it in to you for your decision.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, that Committee Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act Increasing Pensions of Elderly Teachers", House Paper 258, Legislative Document 356, be indefinitely postponed.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A" please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and Committee Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair lays before the House the eighth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Creating a State Administered Probation and Parole Law", Senate Paper 552, Legislative Document 1542, tabled on May 20 by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, pending passage to be engrossed.

On motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, the Bill was retabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, May 23.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the ninth tabled and today assigned matter, Senate Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Limited Even-Year Budget Sessions of the Legislature, Senate Paper 427, Legislative Document 1210, tabled on May 20 by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" as amended Report.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and

Members of the House: Much could be said concerning this piece of legislation. I listened to the debate in the unmentionable branch, many argument pro and con were presented. I think that possibly studies will be made later on to decide whether this program is feasible in view of the four year term for governor proposal that is going to go before the people. Studies, if this is not feasible, will be made to find methods or manners whereby the sessions could be shortened. The hour is late, the date is late, I have heard all sorts of strategy discussed pertaining to this thing, now I will move the indefinite postponement of both reports.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that with respect to Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Limited Even-Year Budget Sessions of the Legislature, Senate Paper 427, Legislative Document 1210, both Reports be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and both Reports were indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number eleven on page two of the calendar which was tabled earlier today by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, and assigned for this afternoon. The matter referred to is Bill "An Act relating to Portland University", House Paper 1026, Legislative Document 1458, which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on April 16 and now comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House insist upon its former action and requests a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House a House Order (H. P. 1096) that was tabled earlier today and specially assigned for this afternoon.

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, requested to study the desirability of establishing State Vocational Educational Institutes in various locations in the State in order to promote specialized training for those who give evidence of special aptitude or need and who desire specialized training, designed specifically to train for service in trade, industry or commerce; and be it further

ORDERED that the Legislative Research Committee report the results of its finding to the 99th Legislature.

Is it the pleasure of the House that this Order shall now receive passage? Will those who favor the passage of this Order please say aye; those opposed, no.

The motion prevailed and the Order received passage.

On motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, the House voted to take from the table the eighth tabled and unassigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Appeal on the Taking of Land for School Purposes", House Paper 471, Legislative Document 664, tabled on April 17 by the same gentleman pending acceptance of the Report of the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

Thereupon, the Report of the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading was accepted, the Bill given its third reading, and passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

On motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, the House voted to take from the table the twenty-fourth tabled and unassigned matter, Bill "An Act Amending the Law Permitting Municipal Employees to Receive Federal Social Security Benefits", House Paper 1086, Legislative Document 1565, tabled on May 9 by that gentleman pending passage to be engrossed.

On further motion of the same gentleman, the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

On motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Beyer, the House voted to take from the table the thirty-first tabled and unassigned matter, Senate Report, Majority "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Minority "Ought not to pass", of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to License Plates for Motor Vehicle Owners Who Operate Amateur Radio Stations", Senate Paper 139, Legislative Document 276, tabled on May 13 by that gentleman pending acceptance of either report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Beyer.

Mr. BEYER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: By now most of you have heard that the initial license plate bill which we passed yesterday has received unfavorable passage at the end of the corridor. And as promised then I would now take this from the table, and although I was one of the signers of the "Ought not to pass" Report on this bill, I will not debate it further but I will vote against it because I do feel that it is class legislation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will entertain a motion relative to either report.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I now move we accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" Report.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to support the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, on the "Ought to pass" Report, although I was a signer originally of the "Ought not to pass" report. I would like to explain my position very briefly.

As I told you the other day on the initial plate bill, it did not appear to be consistent to be in favor of both bills inasmuch as the initial bill would have covered this group. But

inasmuch as the initial bill now apparently is dead and since I am very strongly in favor of this particular group, after four legislative tries, be recognized as they have requested, I am glad and most anxious that the "Ought to pass" Report will receive passage.

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

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as in favor of the "Ought to pass" Report of this bill. The ham radio operators do a big service to the state in time of civil defense maneuvers and things like that, and I think that we do owe them this privilege of having their call letters placed on their license plates.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me that it is only fair for us to go along with this bill. I am in favor of the "Ought to pass" Report. I am in favor of it for one reason because we as legislators have special license plates and I don't know why we should have special plates and deprive these important people like ham operators of having the same privilege.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. DUMAIS: I am opposed to this, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and I have reasons to be. We have now a bill that was passed here yesterday that will put the initials on the plates of the ham operators and the initials on the plates of all the cowboys that will be fighting to get these initials, C A L, and D I P, going down the road and looking at whose plate is this, is this Dick or is this Harry, and the first thing it will wind up with will be everybody crashing into each other and everything like that.

Now, in this state here we have a plate that we give to our disabled veterans. They are the ones that made the supreme sacrifice, they have either lost both legs or both arms, and they are recognized by the Veterans Administration and all the veterans organizations, when

you issued them a plate like this thinking that was just about good enough for them, now we are going to go forward to some ham operators, and I mean hams, they will go out, and we have no means of getting in touch with them, they are not registered anywhere, and they are supposed to do such an awful lot for so many people. How come then that they are not recognized anywhere? If we go out and issue plates to the Sheriff's Department, the County Commissioners, everybody wants plates, not only the legislators but everybody wants a special plate, they all want to be recognized. And I know that I have been approached by half a dozen young fellows in my town who want to put Dick, another one would like to have Vic on there, and they want this and that, we are going to have plates, worse than Connecticut, where everybody stands around to look at everybody's plate and the first thing they know they wind up into a tree or into a forest or into another man's yard.

I don't think that any legislation like this is needed at this time. The hams have gone out, they have campaigned, they have lobbied this, they have tried to everything possible, but I do think that the men who have made the supreme sacrifice, are satisfied to obtain a little plate like this, I certainly don't think that we should go out and mar our nice plates now and put ham and ham and ham on them.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, I am under the same impression now as I was when I appeared before the Transportation Committee on the so-called ham amateur plates. I know that there are thirty-three states in this great United States today that allows them a special number on their plate and letters and so on. God forbid, I hope we never see the time when our telephones are knocked out, our power radio and so on, those would be the only people that we could go to for help. It has been shown in the past, and I hope that we will never have to use them, but if we do I am in favor of letting the public know who they are so they can help us in case of an emergency.

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the hams are lobbying this bill. It won't be the first time this legislature has been lobbied, and if they succeed it won't be the first time a lobby has succeeded in 1957. It has also been said that this is class legislation. Well, we have passed more than one bill that has been class legislation; in fact, no bill that we work on cannot help but help one group and hurt another.

Now, the radio amateurs are asking a very small favor from the legislature. They have succeeded, as the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, has told you, in thirty-three other states. They are willing to pay a fee of \$5. It is true that in spite of all the money we have spent for defenses, we may some day in time of national emergency have to depend upon the mobile transmitter in the ham's automobile. I don't think for a group of people who spend thousands of dollars each year on their own equipment, and it was sent up here time and time again, that we are going to hurt anyone or be accused of class legislation or be accused of yielding to lobbying if we accept the "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. HERSEY: Mr. Speaker, I too was a signer of the Minority "Ought not to pass" Report on this bill principally because there are about a thousand quasi amateur radio operators in the state and out of that thousand there are only about a hundred who have mobile transmitter receivers that they use in their automobile. At the time of the hearing they were offered by the Deputy Secretary of State a special plate at no cost to them which they flatly refused. As a former amateur operator myself, some day I hope to renew the license, I can see no great advantage of having your call letters on a special plate, particularly where they refused the additional plate to affix to the number plates they now receive at no cost to them. If they want this one for five dollars and are willing to pay for it

that is up to them, but I can see absolutely no reason for it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't want to go into a long lengthy debate on this, I don't think it is necessary, but I would like to clarify a few points which seem to be, at least in my mind, a little misunderstood.

In reply to my colleague, the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, I will say that these ham operators, and they are not hams, they are real professionals, in an amateur way of course, but they are professionals in their field, but they are qualified, they have to qualify in order to receive a license to be in the profession. Secondly, in answer to my colleague, the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey, his interpretation of the amount involved, I think, who would apply for plates is wrong. I do know that these people do provide a service to the state at no cost to the taxpayers, the reason for the plate would be to get them inside emergency zones where there would be no question of who they may be or their purpose of going behind the so-called fire lines or dangerous lines where the police would stop the motoring public or any individual from going into, and another reason for the plate is whereby it will identify who the man is, in case of an emergency a man who does not have a plate could fill in providing he shows his operators license which would be call letters which may not comply with the plate but would serve the same purpose and allow him behind the emergency lines. There are many reasons and there could be an all day debate, but I would rather not go into that. And I request a division when the vote is taken.

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

Mr. PIERCE, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I sincerely believe that these hobbyists would merely be a start to clutter up the plates and mess up the bookkeeping

and accounting in the Bureau of Registration for motor vehicles.

Much has been said about their value in a national emergency. It has been brought out and was brought out at the hearing that there were 1,195 operators of radios. Of those only 125 are mobile. The only purpose of this bill would be to get those mobile units inside the so-called emergency lines, which could easily be done by the plates which the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, has stated.

Now, if we say that these 125 would be of great assistance, I sincerely believe that we can take care of any national emergency or state emergency with our prevailing mobile units. I will quote you just a few, the State Highway has 125, State Police 174, Inland Fish 112, Sea and Shore 11, Fire Inspectors 14, Forestry Conservation 117. The whole thing totals up to actual mobile units in the State of Maine 2,966.

I can easily visualize all these holders of mobile units at the next session coming in for special plates. Very frankly I can see no value to issuing special number plates to these hobbyists who in all sincerity try to assist in an emergency. At the hearing much was said about their extreme value at the Bar Harbor catastrophe. I was on the business end of a fire nozzle four days and nights and I didn't see one of these gentlemen even at the fire, no doubt they were there, but they were not where we were operating.

Very frankly I am opposed to the passage of this bill and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, does not prevail.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Speaker, I have to take issue with the remarks of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, in that in the case of an emergency the mobile units would be passing a given point and would need to be recognized. I think that the ham operators would want to be passed along as well as be serving as relief operators and experts in the field in which the the mobile units because they would mobile units were performing. I attended the public hearing on this bill and from my recollection there

was a tremendous amount of support and not any opposition to it.

As a former member of this group for several years and being cognizant of their many humanitarian services, I am heartily in favor of it. It is Senate Paper 139 and I hope we send it back to that body with our approval.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, if this bill passes on an emergency basis, I confidently predict that next session there will be a bill introduced to enable everyone who has passed a course in first aid to have a special license plate.

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker, I can go back to May 17, 1940, and I remember very clearly after we landed in London that the Germans were over the city. I was with the Ferry Command Service. At that time they had designated a plate in England with V on it. And these people who had V on it had access to everything including the shelters that we were supposed to get into. So they took their families. And I hope this never happens here, but if it should, rest assured that the hams will be nowhere around to be found. Furthermore, on this civil defense that we have now, we have ample protection from them. The cars are clearly marked, the ambulance and so forth. And I think that they could take care of the situation very well. And furthermore at Limestone and other bases that I visited over the weekend and in Canada, we have interceptors up in the air all the time. I hope that we will never have a situation where we will have to depend on civilians who have never been under fire to protect us.

Now, when I point out to you this law, that to the disabled veterans has been issued this little plate that I showed you, these are people that if a lion was trying to get in or a bear trying to get in their car, they couldn't get out, and they gladly took it. Now, these hams can run and these hams can get somewheres, and they are demanding a plate even more so than a poor disabled veteran who is stuck on the road

and cannot do anything. They were glad to accept what we offered them for nothing. We offered the hams at the same time, I remember distinctly, the same plate or something equivalent to this, and they just thumbed their nose at us at that time thinking that wasn't good enough, that if we were legislators, and I was told this by a man in my home town, and we were good enough to have plates on our cars, they were good enough to have some on theirs. Therefore, I hope that the motion does not prevail, and I would like to move at this time that the bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, this subject has been so ably debated that I don't feel like saying much on it any more than to concur with our able representative from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais. I would like to add these remarks and display this plate once more, so that everyone in the House could see. This is the plate that they give the amputee veterans so that you can distinguish them on the highway, and I think this should be satisfactory, or a similar one, to these particular people that are making such a time about a number plate. I am afraid too that if we give it to them, we have some able doctors, nurses and many other people, that has already been stated, and I am certain that they will want a special number plate. Thank you.

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

Mr. JACQUES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct one of my colleagues, from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, that there are only twenty-six states that have similar plates right now. I don't know where he got the figures.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a signer

of the "Ought to pass" Report on this bill which came out of the Transportation Committee, I feel I should defend my position and tell you a little about it. The only opposition to this bill at the time of the hearing was from the Secretary of State's office. I believe that the Secretary of State's office should appear before hearings and I believe they should appear before committees when they are invited to. Now there is something that has been said about a bill that has been lobbied very strongly. The ham or radio operators appeared there in great numbers to give their side of the picture. Since that time, since the time of the hearing, I have not seen one in the corridors, nor have I seen a paid lobbyist, knowing him to be such, lobbying this bill for the ham radio operators.

However, I believe that the Secretary of State's office has, I have seen them in the corridors talking about this bill much. And as able administrators as they are, and as good a job as I think that they do in their capacity as Secretary of State in handling the Motor Vehicle Division, I do not think it is their position to try to kill a bill here. This legislative branch is ours, and I think the administrative branch should stay in their place, and I can see the only opposition to this bill coming from that one source.

I hope that you will seriously consider this, and it is a just bill, the other one would have been better I admit; I wish that it would have received passage in the other end of the building, but since it hasn't I urge you to favor this bill and vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I too want to concur with the remarks of my colleague from Chelsea, Mr. Allen, but I want to go one step farther, and to say that this bill has been lobbied against the hams for one other purpose and intent, by a group of interested people from Lewiston, who have relayed to the Chief of Police of that city through — these are comments made to me, through

other interested people would come in here and try to kill this bill for the sake of one man. And I do not believe legislation is intended here for one man's interests, but when you consider the welfare and protection and the health of the state, then I think we should give favorable passage to this bill and not indefinitely postpone it.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't know whom the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, is talking about. I know the Chief of Police extremely well, he is a personal and social friend of mine. He has never spoken to me about this bill nor has anybody else. The only thing I ever heard about this bill is the lobbying activity via the airways of the ham operators. And I don't care which way it goes.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I didn't intend to take any part in this debate until my good friend across the aisle, and he is my good friend said that it was lobbied for the Secretary of State, those that were against it. Now I am against the bill, and have been since 1953. Of course at that time I was on the Transportation Committee and we offered these people the same sort of a plate that has been offered to the others and they just wouldn't have it. They said if they couldn't have the whole shooting match they wouldn't have any. And I think that is just going a little too far. And I have not been lobbied by anybody in regard to this, I think they are selfish and if they don't want to go along with other people I don't think we should make a special provision for them.

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

Mr. JACQUES: Mr. Speaker, about a month ago I happened to go to the Radio Supply, which is a wholesale house in the City of Lewiston, and I happened to have a

friend of mine that was over there. He said "Did you listen to the radio the other night?" I said, "What do you mean the radio?" He said, "The ham operator ban." I said, "No, I don't have a ham radio." Well he said they were saying "You grab Jalbert and I will grab Jacques and we will see if we can change their minds."

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to License Plates for Motor Vehicle Owners Who Operate Amateur Radio Stations", Senate Paper 139, Legislative Document 276, both reports be indefinitely postponed. I believe a division has been asked for.

Will those who favor indefinitely postponing both reports please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-five having voted in the affirmative and thirty-nine having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we reconsider our action whereby we indefinitely postponed this measure, and when you vote, vote against me.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House reconsider its action whereby it indefinitely postponed both reports on the bill just under discussion.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion to reconsider lay on the table until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen, that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending further consideration.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House reconsider its action whereby it indefinitely postponed both reports.

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

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

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor,

Adjourned until nine-thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.