

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

Monday, May 27, 1957

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Alton E. Maxell of Augusta.

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

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Mr. Ross of Bath was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that unless previous notice is given to the Clerk of the House by some member, of his or her intention to move reconsideration, that the Clerk be authorized to send to the Senate one hour after the House recesses this morning, all matters this morning passed to be engrossed in concurrence, and all matters acted upon this morning that require Senate concurrence. After such matters have been sent to the Senate by the Clerk in accordance with this unanimous consent agreement no motion to reconsider shall be in order.

The SPEAKER: The House has heard the request for unanimous consent made by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross. Does the Chair hear objection to the gentleman's request?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

**Papers from the Senate
Tabled Until Later in
Today's Session**

From the Senate:

Resolve Authorizing the State of Maine to Convey Certain Land in Bangor (S. P. 604) (L. D. 1606)

Came from the Senate received by unanimous consent, given its several readings and passed to be engrossed without reference to a Committee.

In the House, was received by unanimous consent.

(On motion of Mr. Stanley of Bangor, tabled pending reference until later in today's session)

**Senate Reports of Committees
Leave to Withdraw**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve in favor of Animal-Poultry Science Building at University of Maine (S. P. 143) (L. D. 346) reporting "Leave to Withdraw as covered by other legislation"

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Providing for Construction of a Men's Dining Hall at the University of Maine" (S. P. 166) (L. D. 445)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve to Construct Dormitory for Women at Gorham State Teachers College (S. P. 251) (L. D. 690)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Auto Mechanics Shop at Maine Vocational Technical Institute (S. P. 252) (L. D. 689)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of a Physical Education and Athletics Field at Washington State Teachers' College (S. P. 383) (L. D. 1079)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Providing for Changes in Heating Systems for Certain Buildings at Farmington State Teachers' College (S. P. 396) (L. D. 1092)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

**Ought to Pass in New Draft
Amended in Senate**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for Capital Improvements and Construction of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959" (S. P. 65) (L. D. 118) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 598) (L. D. 1603) 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 twice.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 598, L. D. 1603, Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Monies for Capital Improvements and Construction of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959."

Amend said Bill by striking out from the paragraph entitled "UNIVERSITY OF MAINE" the lines:

	1957-58	1958-59
"Completion of Boardman Hall	—	206,700
Steam Line Extension	—	106,600
University Press	—	196,500

Total Section B \$1,660,499 \$1,760,833"

and inserting in place thereof, the lines:

'Steam Line Extension	—	52,800
Men's Dormitory	—	457,000

Total Section B \$1,660,499 \$1,760,833

The University of Maine is authorized to borrow moneys in an amount not to exceed \$616,000 to provide funds to aid in the construction of the Men's Dormitory. Any loans thus made shall not be deemed a pledge of the faith and credit of the State. The authorization to borrow shall expire on July 1, 1959, but any loan may, prior to July 1, 1959, be renewed or extended during a period of 15 years from the date of the original loan.'

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Creating Office of Hearing Examiner un-

der Liquor Law" (S. P. 487) (L. D. 1393) reporting that new draft (S. P. 558) (L. D. 1553) under same title, which had been recommitted, "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. WOODCOCK of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Messrs. WALKER of Auburn
TEVANIAN of Portland
BRODERICK of Portland
HANCOCK of York
BROWNE of Bangor
NEEDHAM of Orono
EARLES of South Portland
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. SILSBY of Hancock
BUTLER of Franklin
— of the Senate.

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

In the House: Reports were read, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the New Draft read twice.

Mr. Browne of Bangor offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 558, L. D. 1553, Bill, "An Act Creating Office of Hearing Examiner under Liquor Law."

Amend said Bill in the 6th line by inserting after the underlined words "Liquor Commission" the underlined punctuation and words ' such Hearing Examiner'

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Registration Fees for Farm Trucks" (S. P. 349) (L. D. 929)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HALL of York
COLE of Waldo
— of the Senate.

Messrs. BEYER of Cape Elizabeth
 JACQUES of Lewiston
 KELLY of Rumford
 TOTMAN of Bangor
 — of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. ROGERSON of Aroostook
 — of the Senate.

Messrs. ALLEN of Chelsea
 HERSEY of Fort Fairfield
 STILPHEN of Rockland
 — of the House.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I move we accept the minority report as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Although I was one of the four House members who signed the "Ought not to pass" Report, I would like to second the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, by pointing out that the amendment adopted by the other branch is in effect changing the bill so much that we have almost a new bill now in front of the House. In fairness to those members of the Transportation Committee, of which I was one, who opposed the bill in its original form, I think it is only fair to say that at least I feel justified in changing my position because the amendment is a compromise amongst two or three bills before the Legislature, and therefore I do not think that I am inconsistent in changing my position on the present bill with the amendment number 544, and I move that we do accept the minority "Ought to pass" Report as amended.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House accept the minority "Ought to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 349, L. D. 929, Bill, "An Act Relating to Registration Fees for Farm Trucks."

Amend said Bill by inserting in the 5th line, after the word and punctuation "trucks," the underlined words and punctuation 'having 2 axles only,'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the 13th and 14th lines thereof, both of which lines are underlined.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the 15th line thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

'The term "agricultural commodities" shall not include logs, or lumber and pulp wood.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the 20th, 21st and 22nd lines thereof, and inserting in place thereof the following:

'the permit table contained in this section. Farm trucks so registered shall be operated on the public highways only within a radius of 15 65 miles from the main entrance of the farm where such vehicle is customarily kept. The'.

Further amend said Bill by adding before the word "The" in the 22nd line the following underlined sentence:

'Farm trucks so registered shall have the name of the town in which the excise tax has been paid printed in letters not less than 4 inches in height on the door on the left side of the cab of the truck.'

Further amend said Bill by inserting before the 15th line the following underlined sentence: 'Trucks which are used on a substantially daily delivery schedule on established routes are not included as "farm trucks".'

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Disqualifications for Benefits under Employment Security Law" (H. P. 781) (L. D. 1114) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on May 10.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a labor bill whereby a man collecting unemployment compensation would not be penalized when ill. It had the original approval of the Labor Committee and also of labor and industry. The new Senate Amendment is a further clarification that has the same approval. I now move we recede and concur.

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

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to the Licensing and Distribution of Trading Stamps" (H. P. 831) (L. D. 1187) on which the House accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Business Legislation on April 25.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. MORRILL: Mr. Speaker, as this bill is an agreement between the stamp companies and the sponsors of trading stamp bills, I hope that the House will go along and accept the amended bill as is, and I move that we recede in this matter.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Morrill, moves that the House recede. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the Bill was substituted for the Report and given its first and second readings.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 831, L. D. 1187, Bill "An Act Relating to the Licensing and Distribution of Trading Stamps."

Amend said Bill by striking out the words "and Distribution" in the Title.

Further amend said Bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

"R. S., c. 16, §§282 and 283, additional. Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto 2 new sections to be numbered 282 and 283, to read as follows:

'Licensing of Trading Stamp Companies.

Sec. 282. License fee. Each trading stamp company or agency doing the business of issuing trading stamps or like devices in this State shall secure a license from the State Tax Assessor before engaging in such business and shall pay a per annum fee of \$10 to the State Tax Assessor. The State Tax Assessor shall pay over all fees to the Treasurer of State daily. Each license shall expire on the first day of July next following its issuance.

Sec. 283. Reports. Each such trading stamp company or agency shall file an annual report with the State Tax Assessor showing its principal place of business, owner or owners, or in the case of a corporation, the principal officers thereof, and proof, by means of bank references, that it has the means to fulfill its contracts. If the State Tax Assessor is not satisfied with said references, he may require such company to post a performance bond, with sufficient sureties, satisfactory to him, in such amount as he deems necessary up to, but not exceeding \$10,000, guaranteeing that it will perform said contracts in accordance with their terms. This report shall be filed before a license is issued.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 831, L. D. 1187 Bill, "An Act Relating to the Licensing and Distribution of Trading Stamps."

Amend said Amendment by striking out the 5th, 6th and 7th lines and inserting in place thereof the following:

" R. S., c. 16, § § 282-284, additional. Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto 3 new sections to be numbered 282 to 284, inclusive, to read as follows:'

Further amend said Amendment by striking out the single quotation mark at the end and inserting in place thereof the following underlined section:

"Sec. 284. Limitation. The provisions of sections 282 and 283 shall not apply to any coupon, ticket, certificate, card or other similar device, issued or distributed by a manufacturer or packer, which is redeemable for or to be used in connection with the redemption of any goods, wares or merchandise, either by the manufacturer or packer or their agents, or any independent contractor acting for redemption.'"

Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was adopted. Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Employment of Certain Persons" (H. P. 782) (L. D. 1115) on which the House accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Labor on April 16.

Came from the Senate with the Bill substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the

gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that the House recede.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to explain the Labor Committee's feeling about this bill. It came out unanimous "Ought not to pass". The bill says it shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to refuse to employ or dismiss from employment any person between the ages of thirty-five and sixty-five because of the age of such person. Now that might sound alright, but it is not a workable thing because if a personnel director or if a person who is in charge of hiring other people are now saying that, I think that it is certainly not very tactful, and I believe that if these people do not want to hire anyone, why they certainly will find plenty of reasons and valid ones, such as lack of experience, not the proper qualifications or there is no work at that time within their line. This law if it became law in effect would accomplish nothing and I move that we insist.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the previous speaker has overlooked the fact of what the bill was intended to accomplish. The bill was intended to accomplish just one thing, that when a man asks for a job and he is past thirty-five years old it will be unlawful for them to say "You are too old". There are many other things that are more polite that you can say as has already been said, we don't need a man today, you are too short or you are too tall or many other reasons, but I think the time has come when we should show one little bit of respect for age and say we don't need a man or we will let you know if we can use you later. If this House will go along with receding and concurring with the Senate, I have an amendment which I would like to offer that makes it acceptable to — removes most of the objections to the bill.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that the House recede. Will those who favor the motion to recede please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed, the Bill was substituted for the Report and given its first and second readings.

Mr. Dudley of Enfield offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 782, L. D. 1115, Bill, "An Act Relating to Employment of Certain Persons."

Amend said Bill by adding after the underlined words and punctuation "**such person.**" in the 7th line the following underlined sentence:

'This act shall not apply to termination of employment because of the terms or conditions of any retirement or pension plan.'

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Use of Trawls in Waters of Washington County" (H. P. 514) (L. D. 724) on which the House accepted the Minority "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries and passed the Bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" on May 23.

Came from the Senate with the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. SHEPARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is disappointing to me to learn that the action taken by this House did not meet with approval in the higher legislative body. It could be argued that in principle I was wrong in asking the House to support the amended bill. By wrong in principle I mean due to the fact that as a resident of Hancock County I had attempted to amend a law which protects lobster fishermen of Washington County for

the benefit of trawler fishermen of Hancock and Knox Counties. Had the amended bill received passage, it would increase the annual earnings for twenty-eight to thirty trawler fishermen from five to eight hundred dollars annually. For many years resident fishermen of Washington County who seined for herring have fished the coastal waters of Hancock and Knox Counties without restriction. The amendment was offered in the spirit of fair play or application of the golden rule and did not seem unreasonable to the sponsors. However, in an effort to expedite the final adjournment date, I now move that we adhere.

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

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Minimum Wages" (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1583) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" in non-concurrence in the House on May 23.

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

Messrs. HILLMAN of Penobscot
DOW of Lincoln
SILSBY of Hancock

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

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled

Until Later in Today's Session

Bill "An Act relating to Superintending School Committee of City of Portland" (H. P. 835) (L. D. 1191) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendments "A" and "B" in non-concurrence in the House on May 24.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was indefi-

nately postponed, and asking for a Committee of Conference.

In the House:

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Generally speaking when one body requests a committee of conference the courteous thing to do is join, but seeing that the session has now progressed so long and I am of the opinion that a committee of conference would serve no useful purpose, I shall now move that we adhere.

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

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, whereas the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, who sponsored this bill is not now here, I would move that this item lay upon the table until later in the day.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that Bill "An Act relating to Superintending School Committee of City of Portland" be tabled and specially assigned for later in the day pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House adhere.

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

A viva voce vote being doubted by the Chair,

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-four having voted in the affirmative and sixteen having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Increasing Pensions of Elderly Teachers" (H. P. 258) (L. D. 356) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 22.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Hathaway of Columbia Falls, 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 Repossession of Property Subject to Conditional Sales Agreement" (H. P. 418) (L. D. 595) which was recalled to the Senate from the Engrossing Department by Joint Order, and which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" on May 23.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, I have not had time to familiarize myself with this last Senate Amendment and it still looks a little questionable to me as to whether or not it can be integrated, and I wonder if I could possibly table this until later on in today's session, and I would make the motion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, that this matter be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session pending further consideration. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Certain Beverages to Minors" (H. P. 381) (L. D. 510) on which the House accepted the Minority "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee on Liquor Control and passed the Bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" on May 24.

Came from the Senate with the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mrs. Burnham of Kittery, the House voted to insist on its former action and request a Committee of Conference.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Authorize the Construction of a Causeway, Connecting Cousins Island with Littlejohns Island, and a Bridge and Causeway Connecting Littlejohns with Chebeague Island" (H. P. 19) (L. D. 24) on which the House accepted the Minority "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee on Highways and passed the Bill to be engrossed on May 10.

Came from the Senate with the Reports and Bill indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

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

Ought Not to Pass

Indefinitely Postponed in Senate Resolve Substituted for Report

Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Authorizing Survey and Plans for a Maine-Quebec Highway (S. P. 235) (L. D. 635)

Came from the Senate with the Report read and indefinitely postponed.

In the House, the Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ashland, Mr. Prue.

Mr. PRUE: Mr. Speaker, I have a motion I want to make, but may I speak on it first?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his motion.

Mr. PRUE: Mr. Speaker, there are many people in Aroostook County that feel that this resolve should be passed by this legislature, and here are some of the following reasons: First, it would give us the only highway directly west from the County to the Province of Quebec where the possible travel of out of state vehicles entering Maine from the South which might continue their tour through northern Maine west to Quebec, Montreal or points mid-west. The highway could be used by commercial trucking firms and owners of trucks who might haul their farm products to the seaway and return with the products from the seaway on their return through. . . There is a privately owned gravel road now existing in the area. There are trucks hauling lumber

and pulpwood, and most of these trucks are not licensed, it is a private road and the state is losing money there, they don't haul on a public way a lot of them. It is known that many feel there is desirability of the highway for the defense of the north east. This area could be the number one target area and the highways could be used for the rapid evacuation of all civilians in the event of a sudden attack which would give them more roads to get out of the County, and I have worked with the various committees on this highway, and due to the closeness of the vote in the upper body, I would like to substitute the resolve for the report.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Ashland, Mr. Prue, that the House substitute the Resolve for the "Ought not to pass" Report in non-concurrence. Will those who favor substituting the Resolve for the Report, please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted by the Chair,

A division of the House was had.

Forty-seven having voted in the affirmative and forty-three having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed, the Resolve was given its first reading and tomorrow assigned.

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

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Reports of Decisions" (S. P. 381) (L. D. 1077)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought to Pass Consolidated Bill

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties on the following Bills:

Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Attorney and Assistant County Attorney of Penobscot County" (S. P. 288) (L. D. 747)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of County Attorney of Knox County" (H. P. 797) (L. D. 1149)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Attorney and Assistant County Attorney of Cumberland County" (H. P. 955) (L. D. 1356) acting by authority of Joint Order (S. P. 526), reporting a Consolidated Bill (S. P. 572) (L. D. 1575) under title of "An Act relating to Salaries of County Attorneys and Assistant County Attorneys" and that it "Ought to pass".

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

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

**Ought to Pass
Consolidated Bill
Amended in Senate
Tabled Until Later
in Today's Session**

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties on the following Bills:

Bill "An Act Increasing Clerk Hire and Salaries of County Officers of Cumberland County" (S. P. 80) (L. D. 137)

Bill "An Act to Increase Certain County Salaries in Hancock County" (S. P. 138) (L. D. 281)

Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of County Officers of Aroostook County" (S. P. 228) (L. D. 571)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Certain Officers of Penobscot County" (S. P. 348) (L. D. 928)

Bill "An Act to Increase Salaries of Clerk of Courts, Register of Deeds and Register of Probate of Waldo County" (S. P. 429) (L. D. 1212)

Bill "An Act to Increase Certain County Salaries in Somerset County" (H. P. 27) (L. D. 32)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Officers and Clerk Hire in Piscataquis County" (H. P. 245) (L. D. 306)

Bill "An Act to Increase Salary of Clerk of Courts of York County" (H. P. 295) (L. D. 391)

Bill "An Act to Increase Certain Salaries of Washington County Officials" (H. P. 447) (L. D. 623)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Sheriff of Knox County" (H. P. 450) (L. D. 625)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of Register of Deeds of Knox County" (H. P. 451) (L. D. 626)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Clerk of Courts of Knox County" (H. P. 452) (L. D. 627)

Bill "An Act to Increase Certain County Salaries in Lincoln County" (H. P. 492) (L. D. 676)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Clerk of Courts, Sagadahoc County" (H. P. 555) (L. D. 782)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Officers of Franklin County" (H. P. 794) (L. D. 1127)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Sheriff of Waldo County" (H. P. 847) (L. D. 1201)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Clerk of Courts of Penobscot County" (H. P. 886) (L. D. 1254)

Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Officers in Androscoggin County" (H. P. 1031) (L. D. 1463) acting by authority of Joint Order (S. P. 526), reporting a Consolidated Bill (S. P. 574) (L. D. 1577) under title of Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers" and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "B" and "C"

In the House, the Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Where this consolidated bill pertaining to increase in salaries does not follow the usual procedure in some respects, I would like to have permission to table this until later in the day.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, that Consolidated Bill, "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers" be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session pending acceptance of the Report in concurrence. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

From the Senate: The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

May 23, 1957

Hon. Harvey R. Pease
Clerk of the House of Representatives
Ninety-eighth Legislature
Sir:

The Senate today voted to insist on its former action on the Bills and Resolves listed below, and to join Committees of Conference. The President appointed Conferees on the part of the Senate as indicated below the titles of the bills and resolves in question:

Bill "An Act relating to Facilities Furnished by Public Utilities for Rate Fixing Purposes" (H. P. 186) (L. D. 249)

Senators:

MARTIN of Kennebec
ROGERSON of Aroostook
LESSARD of Androscoggin

Resolve Authorizing Attorney General to Investigate Title to Certain Island in B. Pond, Piscataquis County (H. P. 614) (L. D. 861)

Senators:

BUTLER of Franklin
FERGUSON of Oxford
FARLEY of York

Bill "An Act relating to Initial Motor Vehicle Number Plates" (H. P. 957) (L. D. 1358)

Senators:

COLE of Waldo
ROGERSON of Aroostook
FERGUSON of Oxford

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

Senators:

CARPENTER of Somerset
WILLEY of Hancock
BOUCHER
of Androscoggin

Resolve Authorizing Forestry Resource Survey (H. P. 588) (L. D. 837)

Senators:

SINCLAIR of Somerset
DAVIS of Cumberland
SILSBY of Hancock

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

Bill "An Act relating to Fortnightly Payment of Salaries and Wages to State Officers and Employees" (S. P. 462) (L. D. 1317)

Senators:

ROGERSON of Aroostook
LESSARD of Androscoggin
PIKE of Oxford

and on:

Bill "An Act relating to Employment of Minors" (H. P. 546) (L. D. 773)

Senators:

CURTIS of Cumberland
HILLMAN of Penobscot
ST. PIERRE
of Androscoggin
Respectfully,

(Signed)

WALDO H. CLARK

Assistant Secretary of Senate
The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Construction of Eastport - Perry Causeway (H. P. 807) (L. D. 1151)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act to Correct Errors and Inconsistencies in the Public Laws" (S. P. 477) (L. D. 1389)

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Science Laboratories at Portland Junior College (S. P. 275) (L. D. 734)

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 Increasing Sales Tax" (H. P. 986) (L. D. 1410)

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

Mr. Rollins of Belfast offered House Amendment "D" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "D" to H. P. 986, L. D. 1410, Bill, "An Act Increasing Sales Tax with Exemptions on Water, Fuel and Electricity for Domestic Use."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the Emergency Preamble and the Emergency Clause.

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

Referendum for ratification. The aldermen of cities, the selectmen of towns and the assessors of the several plantations of this State are hereby empowered and directed to notify the inhabitants of their respective cities, towns and plantations to meet in the manner prescribed by law for calling and holding biennial meetings of said inhabitants for the election of Senators and Representatives, at the next general or special state-wide election to give in their votes upon the acceptance or rejection of the foregoing act, and the question shall be: "Shall 'An Act Increasing Sales Tax with Exemptions on Water, Fuel and Electricity for Domestic Use,' passed by the 98th Legislature, be accepted?"

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" and "No" their opinion of the same. The ballots shall be received, sorted, counted and declared in open ward, town and plantation meetings, and return made to the office of the Secretary of State in the same manner as votes for Governor and Members of the Legislature, and the Governor and Council shall count the same and if it shall appear that a majority of the inhabitants voting on the question are in favor of the act, the Governor shall forthwith make known the fact by his proclamation, and the act shall become effective in 30 days after the date of said proclamation.

Secretary of State shall prepare ballots. The Secretary of State shall prepare and furnish to the several cities, towns and plantations ballots and blank returns in conformity

with the foregoing act, accompanied by a copy thereof.'

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have said before and as others have told you, we do not need to raise this sales tax from 2 per cent to 3 per cent to carry on the business of this State. I have made it my business this weekend to inquire of every citizen I met to see if they felt we needed any extra services and without exception all said "No—keep taxes down. What are you fellows doing over there, trying to bankrupt the State?" Money is getting terribly tight as you all know, and all business is having a rough time—that you all know also. Maine is losing business right and left, with two plywood operations closing namely—Patten and Houlton; and others having to scratch to keep their heads above water. Why so? Because we have with taxpayers' money set Japan up in business with capital and the most modern machinery to ship plywood into this country from an economy where they pay 14 cents per hour for labor against \$1.00 per hour here. True this is not the doings of this legislature I'll admit, since you don't even want to have a minimum wage of 75 cents per hour. How can the people pay this tax?

Many of our textiles are in the same situation and are folding up in many areas of our State as you well know. Here we are taking another 9 millions of dollars out of our economy—9 millions less purchasing power from our citizens. I can see no better way to find out if the people desire these services than to send this bill out to the people in a referendum. Let the people speak the same as you have decided to do on the Four Year Term for Governor and the Change in Election date? Why not be consistent in your voting? As one member said a few days ago on these issues, you thought when the citizens elected you they were intelligent. Certainly you would also be intelligent enough to vote on this question—tell you clearly if they demanded these extra services then they certainly would expect to

pay for them. I say let's be consistent—let's let the people decide the issue of what they can pay. Probably the strength of the Press could also be tested again and perhaps they could do as good a job as they did in influencing this Legislature to send out the four year term for Governor and the change of election date to the people to decide.

According to the press everyone is ready for the 3 per cent tax, but I am unable to find anyone who says so, and as long as we can get along and have a balanced budget without—and that we can as you all well know and a sizable surplus also if it is not all cut up and given away to certain pet projects.

We have spent five long months here debating fish and game bills and the like ten times as long as we have on the important issues of the day. Like the Jacobs report, that bill rushed through to engrossment on a Friday and the printed bill arrived on our desks the next Monday. Do you call that good legislation? Well I don't. And now the sponsor of the bill can't begin to tell one what it all means, only that it will cost the taxpayers two and one-half millions of dollars.

Why not operate like a democracy? Let the people—the taxpayers say what the State needs. Let's not just shove it down their throats.

Why this great demand among the States to have their citizens petition Congress through their representatives to set a ceiling on income taxes? Only to stop extravagance. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is plenty of extravagance here in our State government. Let us start right here and now to economize a little and give our citizens a chance to live, even those working for starvation wages, which I am sorry to say Maine still pays wherever possible where Federal regulations on wages can be dodged.

Again I say let's operate like a democracy should, like we have done last week in my city. You in this legislature authorized my city to increase their debt limit for the School District to make more class rooms in our schools for which I thank you all. Our voters went to the polls last Thursday and voted their minds—771 Yes to 169 No to

increase the debt limit two hundred and forty-two thousands of dollars for what they thought was needed and they evidently are willing to pay for it.

Again I say, let us see if the taxpayers are willing to pay for these extra services we hear so much about in the press.

How many are willing to be counted on to start on the road to economy in State Government?

Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I would request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that the House adopt House Amendment "D". The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I haven't any prepared speech. I am in sympathy with the taxpayers of the State I think fully as much as anybody. There are many essentials of life which are taxed, and I believe if we open the door to exemptions at this time that we will have further exemptions as time goes past. I believe that this has a price tag on it of a million, seven hundred thousand for the biennium, and I would ask a question of any member of the Appropriations Committee that by the action we had last week on the supplemental budget, if we have a million seven to spare to have the balanced budget?

The SPEAKER: Before putting the question of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, to save some embarrassment to the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, I would like to point out to him that we are speaking to amendment 558 which simply asks for a referendum on the sales tax, and not to any exemption amendment if I am correct.

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, for calling this error to my attention. I was looking at the wrong amendment at the time.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been consistently against a sales tax, I did not believe we needed it, but I have said to the people back in my area that I would go along with it if they wanted it, but as the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, stated about his people, mine are the same, no one seemed to want it. Now if they do want it I am perfectly willing to vote for it, and the only way that I can see to find out if they do want it is to put it to referendum the same as we have these other things that I did not think that we needed. So I wish to support the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins.

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 if we want to find out what the people feel about services, we should submit the question in regard to services to them rather than to submit the question in regard to taxation. Most people are adverse to increased taxes but a great many people are asking for increased services, and I feel that that is the better way for us to do it.

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

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: With all due respect to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, and the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, while this bill does refer to the emergency clause in the bill, it is my understanding that the bill would be delayed for seventy-two days, the date it would be passed, assuming that the electorate did approve it at referendum. Seventy-two days would amount to approximately twenty per cent of the year, which part of the year would be the time when the summer tourists would be in our state, and it might result—as a matter of fact I had thought that the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, was going to say that it would have a price tag of a million seven hundred thousand dollars

for the first year of the biennium, rather than the whole biennium.

I would point that out for your consideration, and I think that the question here that we should weigh is: where in our budget can we afford to take a million seven, and further, I would like to emphasize the point that was raised by the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, that we will have to hold our whole program in abeyance pending the results of this referendum if we care to go along with this amendment, and it would appear in effect to me that you would be passing our responsibility on the whole program, both on the spending measures and on the taxes, back to the people if you were to allow this amendment to pass.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to concur with the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, as far as this particular amendment is concerned. The only question which would be submitted to the people: Are they in favor of the increase in the sales tax. There are many more facts to take into consideration here because the sales tax is for a particular purpose, it is going to give more services, and I believe it is a question of whether the people can make an intelligent decision. If you are going to give this question to the people, you should also give the rest of the story of what the increase in the sales tax will mean to the people. So that as far as this amendment is concerned just asking for a sales tax increase, whether they want it, I think it is a most unfair way to put a question, and I therefore move that this amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that House Amendment "D" be indefinitely postponed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Perhaps I am the one that is confused, but I thought when I arose to speak to the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, I had the

impression perhaps incorrectly that he was speaking to an exemption amendment. I am not opposed to discussing an exemption amendment. I certainly do not favor this referendum amendment in front of us. I would point out to the House that I appreciate and respect the position of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that he was the sole signer of the only "Ought not to pass" Report on the sales tax. I would also point out that if I felt the way he does, putting this sales tax increase to referendum would be a very effective way of killing the increase in the sales tax, because it is a practical fact of political life that very few people will vote for taxes.

Now when we passed the original sales tax in this House we were told to stand up like men and be counted and pass it and not pass the decision to the people. Amidst many dire threats that most of us would never come back if we did that, we stood up and were counted and we did pass the sales tax without a referendum. I think it is inconsistent, although you have heard that we should be consistent and do the same on this as you did on the constitutional amendments, I don't think that is particularly relevant. Constitutional amendments and a tax measure are not related whatsoever. Constitutional amendments do not call for taxation. This calls for taxation. To put it out to the people, in my personal opinion without casting any reflection on the motives of any other member, is a back door method of killing the sales tax increase which incidentally is the objection. So therefore I sincerely hope that we will be consistent with our action in 1951 when we passed the sales tax in this House, and I hope we will indefinitely postpone this amendment, and I would assure the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell, that I am not in favor of the amendment.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to my good friend Mr. Totman, when the bill was signed down in the Committee on Taxation there were two signers opposed to it. Then on the

bill for the exemptions, the same gentlemen signed the bill for exemptions. When it appeared on the floor of the House, he showed up on the bill for exemptions, but he didn't show up on the bill for "Ought not to pass" on the sales tax, and that is a fact, because I saw it signed above my own name. That neither being here nor there, I agree very thoroughly with the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, and seconded by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that this bill could have another amendment. I would be perfectly agreeable to see it, to detail in as short a form as possible the necessity of this tax, and tie it together with the tax, and then you would get an honest opinion of the voters. If they needed these things they would pay for them the same as the citizens of Belfast did last week on their referendum.

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, if it is possible, I would like to I think correct a statement that the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell, made in regards to the cost of this. He spoke of one million seven. As I understood him, he said annually. The figures that I have from the taxation department are \$840,000 annually which would mean approximately if the economy of the state continues a million, seven hundred thousand for the biennium.

I don't know who made the first motion for the indefinite postponement of this amendment, but I wish to concur with whoever made it. I think we are faced with an issue here where it comes right down to dollars and cents whether we are going to give the people the services they ask for, which in my opinion they did ask for at the last election, and I think that we should face the facts as they are and we should pass this tax without exemptions, regardless of how hard it seems. I believe all taxes are that way.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a roll call vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "D". A roll call has been requested. In order that the Chair may order a roll call vote the Chair must have the express desire for such a vote by at least one-fifth of the members present. Will those who favor a roll call vote on this question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

(Nineteen members arose)

The SPEAKER: Obviously less than one-fifth having expressed a desire for a roll call, the request for a roll call is denied. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller.

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

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

A division of the House was had. Ninety-six having voted in the affirmative and twenty-five having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "D" was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Couture of Lewiston offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 986, L. D. 1410, Bill, "An Act Increasing Sales Tax with Exemptions on Water, Fuel and Electricity for Domestic Use."

Amend said Bill by inserting after "Sec. 3", a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 3-A. R. S., c. 17, § 10, sub-§ III-A, additional. Section 10 of chapter 17 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto a new subsection, to be numbered III-A, to read as follows:

'III-A. Children's clothing. Sale of children's clothing, manufactured

of cloth material, up to and including size 12.'"

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: On this weekend I had occasion to meet quite a few people that I do represent up here, and by the vote that was taken by this House favoring the three per cent sales tax, they certainly feel in their minds that that will go through, regardless of their position on the matter. I have met groups of people in organizations, others have called me up on the proposed amendment that I intend to introduce today, and certainly as I said once before their feeling is that they will have to swallow this three per cent sales tax, even though they don't like the idea of it. But they asked me directly to do everything I can to at least if they have to go along and pay this three per cent sales tax to try to exempt the clothing of our children up to size twelve. That will be some load off the backs of the people with large families that really cannot afford to pay the two per cent sales tax at this time, but they will be going on to a three per cent.

I certainly like to go a little further in bringing to the members of this House specially what I am going to talk about is the City of Lewiston, which is the second largest city in the State of Maine, and which is a city in Androscoggin County, which you can check back to the sales tax revenue that my report was given to me that the Androscoggin County is one of the large payers toward the sales tax in this State. What I want to bring out now is the city of Lewiston and Auburn, to the people of our city of Lewiston are working in Auburn, and those in Auburn are working in our textile mills in the city of Lewiston which you have heard previously and read in the papers about the condition of our textiles in our city. They are laying off people, they are closing some of the mills, and I can't see myself by people with families specially and still have to go along with a one per cent sales tax more during this session as they are on their way out to receive unemployment benefits for

the period of time unknown until the work picks up, which doesn't look too good.

You also have seen in the same city that I am talking about now at this time that the City Council and the additional leaders of our city what we had to do with the tax rate in cutting projects and work that should have been done, but had to go along with the people of our city to try to keep our tax as low as possible, the reason of the condition of the unemployment in that city. I for one certainly can't stand up here and vote in favor of that three per cent sales tax unless at least this exemption will be on it. I mentioned to you at our last day in session that this exemption would mean approximately \$200,000 and that is the figure of the taxation bureau, which they definitely oppose for the reason of some additional work in that office. On that basis I am sure that some fifteen or twenty per cent of our total cost that they claim it will could be deducted out of that amount. They made it just as hard as it possibly could be made so certainly it could be defeated. At this time for the sake of the people of that city that I do represent and some of you represent similar cities in the textile and shoe industry as I do, certainly after reading in the paper and found out about these exemptions in different parts of the counties, that they feel that their products that they raise on the farms also have to be bought by them after paying sales tax also. But there is no way to release the load on these people according to the vote previously stated, and the only thing that I am asking now at this time is the adoption of this amendment for at least it will take care of these people with a large family that cannot pay that sales tax at this time, but ought to be able to pay that three per cent sales tax, and I hope that this House will go along with this amendment.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this exemption as I would rise in opposition to any exemption which is narrowing the base of the sales tax. There are only two general forms of recog-

nized taxation, one being the sales tax and the other being the state income tax. The more exemptions that we adopt as far as the sales tax is concerned, that much sooner the structure of the sales tax is going to collapse, and we are only getting closer and closer to the point of a state income tax. Now all I can see is if we keep putting exemptions on it is going to mean that much less revenue coming in and as our demand for services become greater and we have a collapse in the sales tax, it is only eventually going to mean that very shortly we will have a state income tax, so I therefore move that this amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "B".

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to Mr. Childs, my good friend from Portland, he has come out with a few words, a state income tax. That possibly would be a fair tax. Certainly if there was an income tax, all of you know that we would have to go along with these exemptions, they go on to the exemptions of people with families similar to the federal government taxes, then they would be taken into consideration, but right now through this sales tax of three per cent, they are not. At least if it was an income tax, they would be. Right now they can't, they have to go along and pay even if they can't.

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, to explain to the House the position of the Taxation Committee, this bill was slated for hearing at two different dates, and the hearing was never heard, but the bill was discussed in committee, in executive session, and I believe that I can speak for all members of the Committee, that they were not in favor of this bill, and therefore it came out "Ought not to pass". I certainly hope that the motion of the gentle-

man from Portland, Mr. Childs, prevails.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, I would request a roll call on this indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse.

Mr. BESSE: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that any taxes have to be collected in the state. I think that our program for this session could have been greatly simplified if at the beginning two additional bills had been introduced. One of them would be a blanket bill to automatically grant all requests for exemptions; the other would be to do away with all taxes. It would have simplified things a great deal.

During the process of the session the Taxation Committee had requests for exemptions amounting to \$8,803,000 presented to it, that is on the basis of two per cent. Of course they can't be granted without upsetting our whole program, and I don't think any should be granted, because they are going to upset our programs. This particular one amounts to \$215,000 figured on two per cent which would make around \$300,000 at three per cent. It would also cost between \$18,000 and \$19,000 to administer. I suppose that means the tax assessors must audit the sales slips in the stores to see where the clothes went to. I think it is impractical to do it, and therefore I think the amendment should be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "B". The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, has requested a roll call vote. In order that the Chair may order a roll call vote the Chair must have the express desire for such by at least one-fifth of the members present. Will those who desire a roll call vote please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously less than one-fifth having expressed a desire for a roll call, the request is denied.

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

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "B". Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "B" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Ninety-eight having voted in the affirmative and eighteen having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "B" was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Couture of Bath offered House Amendment "C" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "C" to H. P. 986, L. D. 1410, Bill "An Act Increasing Sales Tax with Exemptions on Water, Fuel and Electricity for Domestic Use."

Amend said Bill by adding thereto a new section to be numbered 'Sec. 5.' to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. R. S., c. 17 §10, sub-§VII-A, additional. Section 10 of chapter 17 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by chapters 405 and 477 of the public laws of 1955, is hereby further amended by adding thereto a new subsection to be number VII-A, to read as follows:

'VII-A. Water purchased by any individual for use exclusively in his home and upon the land surrounding the same; provided said water shall not be exempt if, without separate metering or separate intake, the premises supplied with water shall be used not only for the home of the purchaser but also for a store, place of business, farm or any other purpose.' "

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House: I feel very much like the batter who looked at a called third strike, I know before I say anything I know, but I did present a bill here a

couple of months ago exempting the water from the sales tax, and I think the bill had a lot of merit, I think the House realizes that, I know the members feel probably the same as I do. I don't think it is a matter of money, I think it is a matter of principle. I think the money involved is somewhere around \$60,000 every two years. This is just from the water. For that reason I would like to see this amendment adopted. I don't think the people are against the sales tax, I haven't heard too many people say that they were against it. I know they realize and I think we also realize that they elected a Governor who campaigned, and one of the themes were that we had to have these services and everybody knows if we are going to increase our services we have got to get revenue and the only way to get revenue is through taxes, and I feel more or less on the matter of principle and nothing else, that we should adopt this House Amendment "C", and I won't request a roll call, just a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Couture, that the House adopt House Amendment "C". The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture.

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly can't go along with this amendment. My reason is this. On this basis that the water is taxed I can see the rent goes up higher and still the small man is going to take the load on who at this time already have a load on them, and I move the indefinite postponement of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, that House Amendment "C" be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question? A division has been requested. Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "C" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-nine having voted in the affirmative and nineteen having vot-

ed in the negative, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "C" was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, the Bill "An Act Increasing Sales Tax" (H. P. 986) (L. D. 1410) was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendments "A" and "B" and House Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, in regard to item four which we just acted upon, in view of its importance, I would like to move under suspension of the rules by unanimous consent that this be sent forthwith to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the matter last dealt with, Bill "An Act Increasing Sales Tax" under unanimous consent be sent forthwith to the Senate. Does the Chair hear objection? Does the gentleman object?

Mr. COUTURE: I want to question the last vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair can only entertain the question: Does the gentleman object?

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, rises to a point of order. He may state his point of order.

Mr. COUTURE: The vote was taken one opposed and none for, was accepted by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman question the Speaker's ruling?

Mr. COUTURE: Yes. I said no and there was none yes. (laughter)

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that the Chair stated the motion in a proper manner and as is customary when silence prevails in answer to the Speaker's question: Is this the pleasure of the House? It is understood that the silence means yes, and that the declaration of the vote was not doubted.

Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, objects to the unanimous request to send this matter forthwith to the Senate? There is no objection and it is so ordered.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.
Order Out of Order

On motion of Mr. Hatfield of Orrington, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Warren of Saco be excused from attendance because of illness.

Finally Passed Constitutional Amendment

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Guaranteed Loans for Industrial Purposes (S. P. 580) (L. D. 1581)

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

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

Mr. **BRAGDON**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am surprised that a measure of this importance has reached the emergency enacting stage without any discussion of the matter at all. I am not going to attempt to influence anybody's vote, but I feel that the measure is unsound, impractical and unworkable, and I shall be obliged to vote against it.

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

Mr. **TURNER**: Mr. Speaker, I don't like this bill at all, this \$20,000,000 a year to back up building buildings for Tom, Dick and Harry, I can't see where — we will pass a three per cent sales tax and drive them out of the state and now we are going to pass this to try to call them back in again. I move indefinite postponement of this outfit.

The **SPEAKER**: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Guaranteed Loans for Industrial Purposes be indefinitely postponed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett.

Mr. **CROCKETT**: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have a Development Commission here that is trying to bring new industries into the State of Maine. We have raised last session \$480,000

to spend annually to bring business in. Now there are several people that would be probably willing to come into the state that have been investigated, that are a good risk if we only had the buildings for them to move into. Rental would be charged on these buildings and eventually they would be paid off by the industrialists that come here to our state. Now if this is going to stop our progress I am not for the bill, but I think that it would help our Development Commission of Industry, economic conditions, to bring industry in and I hope the resolve does pass.

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

Mr. **BRUCE**: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: Just this morning in conversation with the Mayor of Augusta seated at my left, he mentioned the fact that approximately two-thirds of the graduating class of the University of Maine have been offered and have accepted jobs outside of this state with various large companies. We are paying money to educate these boys and we do not have employment for them here in the State. Just this morning the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, lamented the state of the textile and the shoe industry in the State of Maine. Now here is a bill which will cost the state nothing. It will enable us to offer to industry, and I do not mean fly by night industries, I mean good, sound substantial industries, in keeping with the trend of the times, to attract these industries to this state, to keep our boys and our girls here in the state, to stop the tremendous migration of working men and people out of the state, to help the prosperity of the state. It is one of the — I would classify it as one of the most important bills for the State of Maine, and I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, is not even considered. Thank you very much.

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 expressed by my good friend from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, because we are having peo-

ple that are folding up all the time and going out, and I have been wondering if the passage of this bill and we say we will pick up the tab for them if they can't make a go of it, will they come back in, and then we will have to pick up the tab. He says it is not going to cost anyone anything. Well now if that were so the bill wouldn't be here, that's sure. Sure it is going to cost someone something. And I am just wondering how many of you folks here ever had anybody to pick up the tab for you if you didn't make a go of it. I am sure I I didn't have and I started just about as low down on the ground as anybody possibly could start, and the only thing that was said to me as was said to each one of you who started a business, was "root hog, or die". Now what this bill proposes to do as I understand it, it says to me if I am outside of the state, come in here and take a whack at this thing. You can't lose anything because if you do why we will pick up the tab. I think it is unsound and unfair to the people of the State of Maine, and I hope that we do not enact it, although I am glad it does have to go to the people for I feel very sure they feel very much the same as I do.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I think it is somewhat unfortunate that the State of Maine must remain so conservative as compared to other states. Just this past week, as I was telling the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, prior to this particular bill coming up, I have talked with industrial representatives from two industries. In the conversation they have pointed out the advantages that other states will offer.

This is really not a pick up the tab proposition which other states really do have. Other states come pretty close to picking up the entire tab for establishing an industry at extreme cost to the states as well as state organizations. This bill here will allow for financial aid to industries. It is true that if industries fold and the entire

amount is not recoverable, I would assume that the state would lose some funds in this proposition. It is also true that we have extremely good men in our Department of Economic Development. I have great confidence in them. I spent some time with them since the first of the year. They are rooting for this bill very much. They realize that it can offer the State of Maine a great potential. I feel likewise. The city of Augusta is about ready to join the flock in losing the textile industry. I can visualize a time not too far away when we will have no textile industries left in the state. We are losing ground fast. The population of this city has been practically static for the last forty or fifty years. If we don't get off our hands here in the State of Maine, we can anticipate a further static population. It brings tears in my eyes to see our experienced and qualified people leaving the State of Maine in droves. The only way that we can keep them here and build the State of Maine to what it should be is through progressive action such as this. I hope that you can see the merits of this bill. I can't see where it can cost the State of Maine any terrific amount. I can see great benefits from it, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. RANCOURT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I also rise in opposition to that motion to indefinitely postpone this bill. I concur with the Mayor of Augusta, Mr. Carey. In my opinion this is one of the best and the most important and the most far reaching bills that has been presented to this House so far. It cannot be analyzed in dollars and cents, but it can be analyzed in importance to the cities. You have in most all cities, Augusta, Waterville, Lewiston, Portland, Biddeford, Saco, you have plenty of available space, but when you come right down to it, what do you have? You have these multi-story buildings, old factories that nobody wants, nobody wants to lease them because they are not the trend any more, they are too expensive to operate. They want sin-

gle story units that spread over a lot of land with plenty of parking space. No city in this state right now can afford to build these buildings and you can't find the backing to build them. I could name you a couple of industries, if it was kosher to do so, that would have moved to Lewiston, and I am talking now about businesses like electronics and machinery, machine shops, that could have moved to our city if we had had the available single story buildings that they require. We cannot do that and we cannot find sufficient backing for these buildings, so we have to go without and we have to lose these industries. This bill would certainly help a lot all over the state, and I am very much in favor of passing this bill as it is one of the most important bills to hit this legislature.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the matter has been very well covered by the two preceding gentlemen, the two leading speakers and Mayors from Augusta and Lewiston, Messrs. Carey and Rancourt, but I would like to point out that in this type of loan you are actually only risking thirty per cent of \$20,000,000 because a bank would always lend you up to at least sixty per cent on commercial property and under this bill the industry must put up ten per cent, therefore leaving only a maximum thirty per cent risk. Besides that in the merits of the matter, I would like to point out that many states that are in competition with us for industry have enacted similar legislation. We have got to follow along if we are going to survive in this competitive field. The State of Pennsylvania within the last six or seven months, as was pointed out in the Committee on Judiciary of which I am a member which heard this very measure, has approached four or five of our industries with the same type proposal if they would move to their state they would guarantee their building costs and single floored units, and I feel that it is a matter not whether we think it is sound, but to enter in, although I do think it is sound, we have got to enter into the competitive business with

other states of bringing industry into this state. It is not a question of whether we like it or not, it is a question that we have to do it. We have no choice if we want additional industry in the State of Maine.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is my understanding, and the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, can correct me if I am wrong, that this goes to a vote of the town and that the town approves these. I thought the original bill did at least and then the bank has to approve it. I know that some of the people in my town were very much interested in this bill and I would hate very much to see it defeated.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: What I don't like about this is the financial aid to the out-of-state boys. Now if you have got a company in here and they are just hanging on and it is a question of whether they can get some aid or go out of business, under this bill they can't get any help and I think the thing should be amended if we have got to have it to protect some of the industry we have already got in here. And the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, spoke about thirty per cent. Of course the state is going good for the thirty per cent that you are going to lose anyway. I never have seen many of those big buildings that they put up but what they have got to go into bankruptcy two or three times before they really got down to where somebody could afford to own them, and of course in this case the state would be losing their percentage. Still the thing is no good.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the impression that may have been given the House by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner. This bill would of course include industries that are already

in operation in Maine and need expansion or new facilities.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner that Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Guaranteed Loans for Industrial Purposes, Senate Paper 580, Legislative Document 1581, be indefinitely postponed. The Chair will order a division.

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

A division of the House was had.

Nineteen having voted in the affirmative and one hundred and two having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the Clerk if there was an amendment put on this making it an emergency matter?

The SPEAKER: This is not an emergency matter, it is a constitutional amendment. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I did not vote on the motion to indefinitely postpone assuming that I was going to vote against emergency enactment. I hope I was not mistaken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the House that this is not an emergency enactor but it is a constitutional amendment.

Thereupon, this being a Constitutional Amendment and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 104 voted in favor of same and 19 against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Passed to Be Enacted
Emergency Measure**

An Act Amending the Town of Milbridge School District (S. P. 594) (L. D. 1600)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emer-

gency 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.

Passed to Be Engrossed

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

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

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

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

Enactor

Passed Over Temporarily

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.

At the request of Mr. Carey of Augusta, passed over temporarily.

An Act Increasing Certain Fees of Sheriffs and Their Deputies (S. P. 226) (L. D. 569)

An Act Increasing Compensation of Clerks of the Law Court (S. P. 290) (L. D. 789)

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

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

Enactor

Passed Over Temporarily

An Act relating to the Unfair Sales Act (S. P. 555) (L. D. 1551)

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

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As to item number ten "An Act relating to the Unfair Sales Tax" Legislative Document 1551, I see that an opinion of the Justices has been sought as to the constitutionality of this item and they have distributed it to our desks, an opinion to the effect that this Act is unconstitutional.

I therefore move that this Bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would request the House that if any member wishes to take up any of the enactors, would they be so kind as to advise the Chair what the item number is and we will take them up one by one after we have enacted the ones that are not being questioned in any way.

Is the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, agreeable to deferring his motion for the moment? The Chair understands that item number ten is to be dealt with separately. Is there any other item from three to nineteen?

An Act Changing Name of Maine School for the Deaf to Governor Baxter State School for the Deaf (S. P. 597) (L. D. 1601)

An Act Creating the Maine Commercial Feed Law (H. P. 254) (L. D. 352)

An Act Amending Employment Security Law as to Disqualification for Benefits (H. P. 779) (L. D. 1112)

An Act relating to Benefit Eligibility and Definition of Unemployment Under Employment Security Law (H. P. 780) (L. D. 1113)

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

Enactor

Passed Over Temporarily

An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets (H. P. 818) (L. D. 1161)

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

At the request of Mr. Cote of Lewiston, passed over temporarily.

Enactor

Passed Over Temporarily

An Act to Incorporate the Town of Medford (H. P. 844) (L. D. 1198)

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

At the request of Mr. Brockway of Milo, passed over temporarily.

An Act Amending the Law Permitting Municipal Employees to Receive Federal Social Security Benefits (H. P. 1086) (L. D. 1565)

Finally Passed

Resolve Providing for State Pension for Beverly Ann Archer of Rumford (H. P. 56) (L. D. 68)

Resolve Creating an Advisory Committee on Education (H. P. 727) (L. D. 1031)

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

Order Out of Order

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Joint Standing Committee on Natural Resources be, and hereby is, authorized to report forthwith on a bill amending Chapter 322 of the Public Laws of 1957; the bill to be limited to the Saco River, main stem, New Hampshire boundary to junction with Ossipee River (S. P. 605)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House the Order was read and, on a viva voce vote passed in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor,

Recessed until two o'clock this afternoon.

After Recess

2: P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Passed to Be Enacted

The SPEAKER: The House is continuing under enactors, and the particular item is item number six

which was passed over this morning, Bill "An Act relating to Expanding Aroostook County Funds for Ricker College," Senate Paper 224, Legislative Document 567.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Carney of Augusta, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Enactor
Indefinitely Postponed**

An Act relating to the Unfair Sales Act (S. P. 555) (L. D. 1551), item 10, which was passed over temporarily.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As you remember I think it was over a week ago I asked to send this along to the other branch and I would explain when it got back that we had sent it up to the Supreme Court and you had it on your desks L. D. 1597, and whereas the original bill was unconstitutional and we added the amendment, I am very much indifferent as to what happens to it because it has no teeth in the law whatsoever.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, that Bill "An Act relating to the Unfair Sales Act" and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, the Bill was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets (H. P. 818) (L. D. 1161), item 15, which was passed over temporarily.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, I move that item fifteen and all accom-

panying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, that Bill "An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets" and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very definitely opposed to the indefinite postponement of this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I only want again to reiterate what my position was some time ago as far as matters which should be handled by rules and regulations. I am of the definite opinion that this is something that should not be included in legislation. If we are going to start getting ourselves involved with how the Commission should handle itself we might just as well do away with the Commission and pass laws in regard to everything in regard to racing instead of having the Commission given the right to promulgate rules and regulations. They are the ones that are supposed to have the best knowledge of what is good for the game and also in this particular matter I know for a fact that they are at this time considering passing a rule limiting the number of quinellas and I think it is something we should leave up to the Commission.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill was debated a few weeks ago. It is back in this branch now for enactment. The bill is very simple: "Quinellas or any similar types of designations shall be permitted at any harness race or race meet each day for the last heat only of the race conducted on any particular day."

I have with me the rules and the laws of the Harness Race Commission. Harness racing started as you no doubt know in Lewiston last Fri-

day evening. This book, the rules and laws of harness racing in the State of Maine, are the present rules that they are operating upon. The Racing Commission has met very, very often since the last meet at Cumberland last fall. This is a seventy-four page book and there is only one paragraph in the whole book that concerns itself with quinellas. The only paragraph in the book seventy-four pages long which concerns itself with quinellas, states: "The quinella system of wagering can be in effect on the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth races only." Now just imagine, if they were allowed on the second race of a daily double, you would be hooked into a daily double, a quinella which involved the first and second winner or the second horse and the first horse as winners, and also win, place and show. Speaking of Nevada.

Now the Commission could have amended these rules because they have had ten months to do it in. Now the other answer to the thing insofar as the Commission being in the process of eliminating the rules, I can hardly understand what they are waiting for. This is the twenty-fourth of May paper, Lewiston Journal, "Open Tonight in Lewiston, Harness Racing. New Thrilling Quinellas." They are running four of them now in Lewiston. Now I am not going to take up too much time of this body on this measure. I don't think there is a member in the House that doesn't know that I feel somewhat strongly about it. I don't claim to wear a halo either, I never have, but I do contend that sometimes I like to go along at least partially with what I know to be right. Now it is as simple as this. The reason I introduced this bill, the same reason I introduced the location bill which will come here within the next twenty-four hours, is that I want good racing in Maine. I want it conducted properly. I am accusing no one of anything. I presented a bill calling for one Commission. I killed my own bill twice because the answers had been given to me at hearing had I gotten a split report on it. The location bill that I have got, I have gone to the people involved whom it might affect. They

have helped me to draw up the amendment. I have gone with the seventeen per cent which gives them more funds and helps out the fairs and I am all for that and I have been for it. But I am against the numbers racket. The greatest gambling syndicate in the world is an illegal one and it is the numbers racket, and I have had one or two members tell me right in the House: "Let her go Louis, how do you pick your quinellas?" "Well I just choose my age" or "I think you might choose your children's age. I could go on forever, but I too want to try to get out of here next Wednesday night sometime, and I very definitely for no selfish reasons whatever but for the fact that I want good government, I want good racing in Maine and that we cannot leave this up to the Commission because they have had years to amend their laws, they have not done it, they are flouncing it right in our faces now with four quinellas at home, and it will go on and on. For that purpose I am definitely opposed to the indefinite postponement motion. If you want to go on with good government, this restricts it to the last race of each day, last heat of each racing day to keep that crowd there, to further help them, we are all for that, but any further betting insofar as quinellas are concerned is in my opinion an obnoxious form of gambling that we definitely should not entertain in this fine state.

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 the remarks made by my colleague and friend, Mr. Jalburt from Lewiston, because when we open up the avenue to additional quinellas we certainly open up legalized gambling without any question. I am opposed to quinellas in any form, but at least for the sake of helping in a small way, I went along with this bill for just allowing one, but evidently from the Racing Commission and from the broadcasts you hear over the radio and over television advertising quinellas, that is plural, that means any set amount the Commission may find in their thinking to

be justified that they would allow. Now if you are going to bleed the public, if you are going to allow the teen-agers to get in there and see these problems, it is just as bad as drinking or other vices. I would say this is another one in that same category, and I certainly hope that the passage of this bill will be received and indefinite postponement will be voted down because by doing so you are allowing one and that is all. You are telling the people that you are going to protect their interests in the future, so I hope the indefinite postponement does not prevail.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, said we are going to open up gambling as far as the racing is concerned. We have had pari mutuel racing in the State of Maine since 1935. Now as far as quinellas are concerned the greatest opposition from quinellas comes from those who bet large sums of money at the race track, and I am certainly making no reference to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, but at large tracks there is a great deal of opposition to quinellas because you have most of your two dollar betters who like to bet quinellas because they are many more tickets sold on quinellas. In other words, they are investing two dollars for the purpose of maybe getting fifteen or twenty dollars back for their two dollars. The reason that the large tracks are opposed to it, because where your big betters are, because the ones who are betting quinellas are taking the two dollars out of the straight pools. In other words, the straight pools, the pools are much less because many of your two dollar betters are betting quinellas, so that is the reason that at all large tracks they are opposed to quinellas because the large betters do not want quinellas because the two dollar betters at that time are not betting the straight racing. In other words, the large betters do not have anybody to put their money against.

I guess that is about all I can say, that as far as I am concerned

I still think it is something that belongs in rules and regulations, and I know the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, made mention that the Commission has done nothing about it yet. I talked with one of the Commissioners the other day on the telephone and I asked him if anything was going to be done and he said the reason they have not passed a rule limiting them was because there was a measure now before the legislature and as soon as the legislature had disposed of this matter that the Commission was going to meet and at that time limit the number of quinella betting.

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

Mr. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, mentioned the two dollar betters. In regard to that this quinella was put out so they would have a chance. Well let me tell you that the two dollar betters and the daily double betters and quinella betters, them two dollar fellows, that is what the race tracks want because they are the suckers in this thing, and the big fellow he don't play even a daily double or a quinella either, so I think that the motion should not prevail.

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

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I oppose indefinite postponement of this bill. This bill has merit to it. I have been going to races for many years and enjoyed the sport, but as the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert says, years ago they permitted one daily double until recent years, possibly three or four years. Then they introduced the quinella on the last race to keep the crowd there. Well last fall at the meets they have a daily double on the first and second race and then had quinellas on the rest of the race. I—like Mr. Hickey, the gentleman from Biddeford said, it is a real sucker game. The big gamblers never play the quinellas no matter where you go, and they are after the two dollar better. As the gentleman from Portland said, it is really taking from the regular pool, the betting pool,

and those people play the quinellas. It is nothing more than a rackets game or a numbers game. I too oppose indefinite postponement. I am not speaking for any special interests and I have no enemies to punish here, but for the sake of decency I want to go on record as opposing this indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, but believes the gentleman has spoken twice to the motion.

Mr. JALBERT: I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs. Is it not so that last Friday when I left him in my home city after having had a splendid meal and I told him I would go to the track with him but I couldn't even afford to buy myself a quinella ticket?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is going to rule that that is a rhetorical question and will not request an answer.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you know we were told the Racing Commission should clean its own house. I think that if they had meant to clean their house maybe they would have at least refrained until we were out of these halls before they had four quinellas in one race.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, that the House indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets" House Paper 818, Legislative Document 1161.

Mr. JALBERT: I request a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone this Bill, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twelve having voted in the affirmative and ninety-three having

voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Incorporate the Town of Medford (H. P. 844) (L. D. 1198), item 16, which was passed over temporarily.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Brockway.

Mr. BROCKWAY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is an act that I presented in the legislature by request. I want to give the members of the House some facts about the case. To the best of my knowledge there are thirty-one there would be at the moment, thirty-one voters in the town of Medford, and I don't know exactly what it takes to incorporate for the officers to run a town but I think it is around ten or eleven, I haven't checked that with the Statutes. And that would be about one-third of the people that are living in this town would have to hold office which I believe would be almost an impossibility to get that percentage of people that would agree to take office in the town. They have a valuation there of \$137,400 in real estate and in personal property there is only \$22,300. Just think that over and you will see that is only about the valuation of one good farm. There are so many farms in the State of Maine that are valued that much. The last three weeks while I have been home I haven't had anybody speak to me in favor of this bill, but I have been lobbied awfully hard against it. I have been presented with a petition signed by eighty per cent—signed by property owners that hold eighty per cent of the property in this town that they are against the organization. The town is divided by a natural barrier, the Piscataquis River, which cannot be crossed without travelling—people on one side of the river would have to travel about fifteen or eighteen miles to get to the other side to the seat of the government, and all in all I believe in home rule and all that, but I think this would be an injustice to the property owners there be-

cause they were organized and in the early '40's they deorganized and then in two years they were organized again into a plantation and they couldn't operate under it, and now they have come to the legislature to be organized again. I believe that it will be only a couple of years before they will be back again to be deorganized, and I move indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Brockway, that Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Medford" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HENSBEE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: As a member of the Towns and Counties Committee which heard this particular bill, I seem to be a little more interested than usual. This is a small town and I am probably in the same position that many of you folks are, I don't even know where it is. They came down there with a very definite person, with a very definite idea and you have heard me mention the word "cahootism". We have it in its entirety in this bill. Eighty per cent of the large property owners don't want this town organized. I can see that, but I feel that those other people who live in that town who are just in the lower brackets, probably just own enough property to hold up the house they live in, and all they are asking for is the right to take and vote on this measure. Now who are better qualified to settle the affairs of the town of Medford than the people who live in the town of Medford? Now personally I have talked with fourteen of the people in that town and those people appeared to me to be people who were of very sound judgment and they had a very reasonable argument, and I felt that as a member of that Committee signing the "Ought to pass" Report that the least I could do was to extend those people the courtesy of settling their own affairs amongst themselves without interference from others. I rise to support the bill and hope that the motion of the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Brockway, does not sustain.

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

Mr. HILTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have a good friend who lives in this town, this would-be town, who I used to know in 1926, he was a scaler in the woods. He is retired now and he is seventy-two years old. He wrote me a nice letter this winter saying that he wished the town would not be — I believe it is Medford, would not be incorporated. He talked along the lines the same as the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Brockway has. He said they had been organized and deorganized and he wished that they would not organize again.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members: I will not prolong the debate. I just want to bring out one point. This bill has a referendum on it and there has to be better than fifty per cent of the people in the town of Medford vote for it, and I think you know how I felt before and so I won't go into that debate any further. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hermon, Mr. Leathers.

Mr. LEATHERS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think it is only fair that they have the right to vote on this question and decide their own affairs. At the hearing they were all in favor of incorporating the town and I don't think there was any opposition appeared before the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Milo, Mr. Brockway, that the House indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Medford", House Paper 844, Legislative Document 1198. Will all 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.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to Minimum Wages" (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1583) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. ROSS of Bath
EMMONS of Kennebunk
TOTMAN of Bangor

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to Registration of Farm Trucks" (H. P. 404) (L. D. 534) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. STORM of Sherman
EMMONS of Kennebunk
HERSEY of Fort Fairfield

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Certain Beverages to Minors" (H. P. 381) (L. D. 510) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Mrs. BURNHAM of Kittery
Messrs. PIERCE of Bucksport
BRODERICK of Portland

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Increasing Pensions of Elderly Teachers" (H. P. 258) (L. D. 356) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Mr. HATHAWAY
of Columbia Falls
Miss CORMIER of Rumford
Mr. QUINN of Bangor

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Construction of a Causeway, Connecting Cousins Island with Littlejohns Island, and a Bridge and Causeway Connecting Littlejohns with Chebeague Island" (H. P. 19) (L. D. 24) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. CALL of Cumberland
DENBOW of Lubec
HIGGINS of Scarborough

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a point of information on one of the Committees of Conference ap-

pointed, I understand one was pertaining to an act relating to registration fees for farm trucks?

The SPEAKER: That is right.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would like to inquire of the Chair what L. D. number that was?

The SPEAKER: The L. D. number is 534.

Mr. TOTMAN: Well if I would be in order I would like to point out that there were two companion bills and this morning we acted on one. I would suspect that the sponsor of that bill would be willing to withdraw his motion if he knew that the other bill passed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm, but would advise the gentleman that now that the Committee has been appointed the only action that can be taken to the contrary would be for that committee to resign, but the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STORM: Mr. Speaker, that was my bill but I didn't ask for the Committee of Conference and I wasn't aware until it was mentioned that the Committee had been called for.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emons, was the one who requested the Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: Out of order and under suspension of the rules the Chair will lay before the House the matters distributed to your desks under Supplement number two of the House Advance Journal. The Clerk will read the first matter on that sheet.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution for Appointment of Secretary of State by the Governor with Consent of the Council (S. P. 417) (L. D. 1176)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BUTLER of Franklin
WYMAN of Washington
Mrs. LORD of Cumberland

Messrs. WOODCOCK of Penobscot
HURLEY of Kennebec
— of the Senate.

Messrs. BEYER of Cape Elizabeth
WALKER of Auburn
HANCOCK of York
BROWNE of Bangor
CURTIS of Bowdoinham
EARLES of South Portland
EMMONS of Kennebunk
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BEANE of Augusta
TEVANIAN of Portland
BRODERICK of Portland
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read. On motion of Mr. Tevanian of Portland, the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" was accepted in concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Appointment of Commissioners of Agriculture by the Governor with Consent of Council" (S. P. 437) (L. D. 1234)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. PIKE of Oxford
ROGERSON of Aroostook
— of the Senate.

Messrs. ROSS of Bath
WADE of Auburn
BRAGDON of Perham
CHILDS of Portland
TOTMAN of Bangor
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Messrs. ELWELL of Brooks
WALSH of Brunswick
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read. On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" was accepted in concurrence.

Orders of the Day

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the House has in its possession Senate Paper 439, Legislative Document 1236, Bill "An Act relating to Confidential Character of State Tax Assessor's Records Under Blueberry Tax Law"?

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

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Rollins of Belfast, under suspension of the rules the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the bill was passed to be enacted on May 24.

On further motion of the same gentleman under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Rollins of Belfast then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 439, L. D. 1236, Bill, "An Act Relating to Confidential Character of State Tax Assessor's Records Under Blueberry Tax Law."

Amend said Bill by striking out the words "Confidential Character of" in the Title.

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of that part designated "Sec. 245-A" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 245-A. Character of the Assessor's records. Neither the Assessor nor any employee engaged in the administration of sections 238 to 249, inclusive, or charged with the custody of any such records or files shall be required to produce any of them for use in any action or proceedings except in behalf of the Assessor, in an action or proceeding under the provisions of sections 238 to 249, inclusive, to which the Assessor is a party, or in behalf of any party to any action or proceed-

ing under the provisions of sections 238 to 249, inclusive, when the records or files or the facts shown thereby are directly involved in any such action or proceedings.'

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the House is in possession of Senate Paper 319, Legislative Document 815, Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Total Incapacity under Workmen's Compensation Act"?

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

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Ross of Bath, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed on May 24.

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

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 319, L. D. 815, Bill, "An Act Relating to Compensation for Total Incapacity Under Workmen's Compensation Act."

Amend said Bill in the 11th line of "Sec. 2" by striking out the underlined figure "\$39" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$35'.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is necessary due to an oversight. The Committee recommended increasing Workmen's Compensation as I have mentioned two or three times from \$30.00 to \$35.00. The original bill said \$39.00. Consequently that had to be cut down in each instance to \$35.00. There were three places in the bill that said that amount and the Committee Amendment just mentioned two of those, so this straightens it out and takes care of the third place that was just overlooked.

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

House Order Out of Order Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

Mrs. Smith of Falmouth presented the following Order out of order and under suspension of the rules:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, requested to study the laws relating to electricians and plumbers, particularly the phases of such laws which prohibit apprentice electricians and journeymen plumbers from performing their work except under the employment and supervision of master electricians and plumbers; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, requested to study the impact of such laws on small towns, the end result of such laws being that many small towns are without electricians and plumbers to the detriment of the health and safety of the inhabitants of such towns; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee report the results of its finding to the 99th Legislature. (H. P. 1102)

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Legal Affairs having wrestled with some bills from the two groups and not being able to resolve them sent them out "Ought not to pass" but feel that there are hardships worked and they should be studied by the Legislative Research Committee and reported to the next Legislature.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, again without commenting at all on the merits of the order, I would simply request that it be reproduced and distributed and that the order be tabled only long enough to later in the day to permit reproduction of the order.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that this Order be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session and that it be reproduced and distributed to the members' desks. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Order was so tabled.

The gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, was granted unanimous consent to address the House briefly.

Mr. CROCKETT: I have been requested by my fellow citizens of Freeport to say a few words on the floor of the House in recognition of a distinguished adopted son of the State of Maine, who is suffering from a most serious illness.

John Trevor Godfrey moved to the State of Maine from our sister State of Rhode Island, in which he had been a State Senator, some six years ago. He was the 2nd ranking World War II air ace, with thirty-six enemy planes to his credit, and had served in the Royal Canadian Air Force, the Royal Air Force and the United States Air Force, receiving twenty-two decorations from the United States, Canada, England and France.

During the six years he has been a resident of this state he has become one of our leading industrialists, the founder of Casco Laces, Inc., which has provided employment to many of our people in the Freeport area. A prominent Republican, he is beloved by all who know him.

May these brief remarks serve as an expression of the whole-hearted good wishes of his fellow townsmen for the alleviation of his physical suffering and as an assurance that he will always be in the thoughts of those who have known and worked with him. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House the first item of unfinished business, Joint Order relative to Directing Legislative Research Committee to Study Procedures, etc. tabled on May 24 by the gentleman

from Bangor, Mr. Totman, pending passage in concurrence.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At the present time there is an amendment under consideration with reference to this matter, so I would like to put this on the table until later in today's session.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that Joint Order Relative to Directing Legislative Research Committee to Study Procedures, etc. be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session pending passage in concurrence. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number two under unfinished business, Joint Order relative to a Special Joint Committee to Investigate lack of proper enforcement of Liquor Laws of State, House Paper 1101, tabled on May 23 by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, pending passage. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs.

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If you have read this order you without question can come to the conclusion that it only does one thing. It amounts to an investigation of the Liquor Commission. Now the order requests that the Speaker and the President of the Senate appoint respective members for the purpose of doing this. May I point out to the House that if this were done that the members who were appointed would have no power or authority at all. If you are going to carry on an investigation it would mean you would have to have some power to subpoena witnesses and you would have to have power to put people under oath. Possibly the department would cooperate with them, but that is all that could be accomplished by this order. Therefore I move that this order be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that Joint Order relative to a Special Joint Committee to In-

investigate lack of proper enforcement of Liquor Laws of State be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question?

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of this Order please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number three under unfinished business, Bill "An Act relating to the Department of Finance and Administration, Senate Paper 221, Legislative Document 576, tabled on May 23 by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, pending the motion of the same gentleman to reconsider passage to be engrossed under suspension of the rules. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have spoken on this matter twice rather extensively pointing out the possibility of saving the State considerable money by a little investigation by the Research Committee in the matter of state-owned cars versus privately-owned cars on the mileage basis. I don't want to bore you any further on it, but I now move that the pending motion be considered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that the House reconsider its action whereby it passed to be engrossed An Act relating to the Department of Finance and Administration.

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, has given you a great number of figures, and the figures were correct, but those figures were concerning automobiles that were privately owned and not operated out of this garage. It still remains a fact that the cars operated out of this garage are going to be operated by the same individuals burning the same gasoline, using the same oil, using the same tires, serviced by the same mechanics under this bill as they are today, at a saving, not at additional expense. I see no reason,

logical reason in the world for reconsideration on this bill. It is a good bill from top to bottom. Statistical facts prove that it will be a saving and not an expense, the same people operating and the same cost per mile and the same people as I said servicing and so forth, so I hope that we do not reconsider our action and allow the bill to pass for enactment.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the State Government Committee I would like to concur with the remarks the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, has just conveyed to you. Several times we have been confounded and confused with a multitude of questions, of figures which are mostly irrelevant. If we could in any way save the state money certainly the State Government Committee would not have recommended something that would have been more of a spending. Now the one thing that has not been pointed out, nobody suggests, nor does this bill suggest, discontinuing the department garage. It just suggests transferring the supervision from the Bureau of Purchases in the Department of Finance where it is now to the Highway Commission where they have the trained personnel, where they are certainly more competent to take care of them and where 96.2 per cent of the cars in question now are handled and there are only five cars in question, so there certainly cannot be this tremendous saving to the state. It would more apt to be a saving if we went along with the present bill.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I too served on that Committee on State Government which considered this bill and we unanimously agreed that it was a good bill, and I want to concur with the sentiments of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I was not a member of this Committee, but I

have given a lot of time to this particular bill and I have been impressed with it. I can see no useful purpose to be accomplished by reconsidering our action. The Departmental Garage if the people do not know where it is, it is in the highway garage, it is one part of it, and if this amendment was put in to do away with it we certainly wouldn't do away with the garage, the garage would still be there but it would be operated by the Highway Department as the rest of the garage is now, and in the departmental garage ninety-six per cent of the mileage used from that garage is by the Highway Department. This piece of legislation has been in the process of being made for at least four sessions and lots of times we spend money for surveys to recommend to the legislature what we should do. This has been done without any expense to the state at all, and the recommendations go along exactly with those of the State Government organization which we get bulletins from every month. I see no useful purpose in reconsidering our action.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, as still another member of the Committee on State Government I concur in the opinions of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, and the other members of the Committee.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In this apparent deluge of approval by the Committee on State Government I still think we ought to give some vote of commendation to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, because it is very obvious he has done a considerable amount of research and study, and I have listened with some serious interest to some of his points about the entire question of automobile mileage being a proper subject for the Legislative Research Committee. I think he has an excellent point. I would like to second any order he would put in asking the Legislative Research Committee to make such a study. I do think it is unfortunate that his motion to put on an amendment to this particular

Bill is apparently a misunderstanding that this garage is not being disposed of but simply being transferred in its management, and I therefore do agree with my fellow committeemen that I hope we do not reconsider it, but I do want to say that I hope the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, does put an order in for the Legislative Research Committee.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel snowed under. In spite of the eloquency of the various members of the Committee on State Government, it is not a simple matter of just transferring the departmental garage to the highway motor transport pool. It is to do away with the state garage as such. Now if you will just read the L. D. you will find that it says: "At the close of business on August 31, 1957, the Motor Transport Division of the State Highway Commission" that's the Highway Commission, "shall purchase, take title to and pay for the motor vehicles of the Departmental Garage not on requisition to agencies, commissions and departments of the State Government other than the State Highway Commission and such other equipment and supplies of the Departmental Garage as the State Highway Commission may deem usable in the operations of the Motor Transport Division." Now that says that they may take the automobiles in the Departmental Garage that they use and such other equipment and materials in that garage as they deem useful to themselves. Now what's going to happen to the rest of it? "Motor vehicles, equipment and supplies of the Departmental Garage not acquired by the Motor Transport Division of the State Highway Commission under the provisions of this section shall be transferred to other agencies, commissions and departments of the State Government having need thereof;". Now those vehicles that are transferred to other members of the State Department are not going to be maintained or equipped or taken care of by the Motor Transport Division of the

Highway Commission. They only service the Highway Commission vehicles, they do not service any of the departmental vehicles. This Departmental Garage is being discontinued. It is the only garage that maintains and takes care of departmental vehicles other than those used in the Highway Commission. The other automobiles "shall be transferred to other agencies, commissions and departments of the State Government having need therefor, or otherwise disposed of by the State Purchasing Agent in a manner satisfactory to the Governor and the Commissioner of Finance and Administration."

Now any cars that are transferred to other departmental groups will be serviced entirely by private garages at an exceedingly higher expense than the Department Garage now is maintaining those vehicles.

I pointed out to you the large amount of miles and the large amount of money being expended for the use of privately owned vehicles on a mileage basis. I further pointed out to you that this garage has been functioning with these departmental cars at five cents a mile which includes the cost of the car, the cost of operation, the cost of the garage and the cost of insurance. Now if they can do it for five cents a mile, why should we be paying seven cents a mile? Why shouldn't we enlarge the departmental garage and have more of it? We are not going to enlarge it if the Research Committee takes the matter under consideration and by the time they get it the garage is discontinued, and its property is disbursed. I say we should hold it intact until such time as we give due consideration to the doing away with much of this travel by mileage by privately owned cars and have the majority of it done by state-owned cars at this lower rate of expense. I pointed out to you that this garage does it at five cents a mile with that coverage, and it has been the experience that the State Police Garage does it even cheaper at the rate of 4.93, under five cents a mile. Now if that is so, we have a bill before us to increase the mileage from seven cents to nine cents a mile, a differential of four cents per mile.

Doesn't it behoove us to save a little money for the state? Doesn't it behoove us to go a little slow in discontinuing this efficient garage? Doesn't it behoove us to refer the whole thing to the Research Committee before something is done away with that we have expended so much money in and have such efficient workers working there.

Consequently, I now move that this L. D. and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, in making the last motion, the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, has really made quite a motion because this motion concerns the reorganization of the Department of Finance and Administration. In feeling he was attacking just one facet of this long document which was three years in the making, which the State Government Committee went over page by page and spent six whole days in Committee discussing, and it certainly would not be fair if that is his only reason on the Departmental Garage. And one more thing on the Departmental Garage. There are four hundred and sixty-seven cars in the state owned and operated by state departments and agencies. Of these at the present time only eighty-five have been relegated to the Departmental Garage. Now if this goes through only five of those cars are going to be affected. The eighty will still be there, and so for these five cars they will be serviced by private agencies but remember, private garages are now servicing three hundred and eighty-two of our state cars. It would never be feasible for those to be brought back to Augusta because they are in various outlying districts managed by persons in that area so you couldn't have them all come to Augusta for service and so forth. This as far as the Department Garage is concerned it would be a saving rather than a loss to the state. And I certainly hope that the whole L. D. is not indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on a previous occasion I

pointed out to the members of the House the fact that two of these other garage setups had garages throughout the state, and possibly that might be the answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that a little research by the Research Committee might determine that this departmental garage might be extended, in fact take in the work of some of these other substations throughout the state. Now the Highway at the present time has sub-garages at Scarborough, Ellsworth, Caribou, Waldoboro, Rockland and Carmel. And the State Police have garages at Augusta, Kittery, Scarborough, Orono and Houlton. Now if the Research Committee went into this thing and came up with the proper answer, the chances are they would have more state-owned cars. They not only would have the garage here but they would have sub-garages around within easy location to take care of the servicing of the state cars, and save considerable in mileage for the taxpayers.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, a question if I may.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. JALBERT: As I understand his suggestion, it would be for us to pass this bill, then have the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn go further and present an order to the Research Committee for further study, is that right?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. TOTMAN: In answer to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, inasmuch as the bill under consideration simply proposes a transfer of management, that is correct. I do not see any point in killing the bill when the Research Committee could well dig into the question as I get it from Mr. Quinn, the general question of mileage on all cars. I would like to speak further on this bill very briefly.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TOTMAN: I have been quite impressed by the continued use of the word by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, of "efficiency" in this Departmental Garage. I want to make it very clear to the House that the State Government Committee had many, many bills trying to improve the efficiency of our state government. Quite frankly, speaking as one member of the Committee, protecting or saving this Departmental Garage is neither a crusade nor a fetish with the Committee or with myself. If the members of the House have some reason to change it from the way the Committee recommends that it is certainly your prerogative to do so. However, I would like to repeat, as far as this highly talented efficiency in the Departmental Garage, I would like to read two lines: "The net loss to the Departmental Garage for 1954 and '55 was \$7,000. The net loss for 1955 and '56 was \$6,000."

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, on the motion made by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, to indefinitely postpone this bill, if you do, all you have to do is turn over in my direction and look out the window at the new state office building and you have landed home many, many statements of the thousands and thousands of dollars that the State of Maine is going to have to pay to go over and correct mistakes that are in that new office building. The State of Maine has many more buildings to construct. Why were those mistakes allowed? Because there are no provisions in the present law to take care of the situation. This bill will take care of the situation where it will save the State of Maine thousands of dollars in the construction of buildings. Bear that in mind when you vote.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that Bill "An Act relating to the Department of Finance and Administration", Senate Paper 221, Legislative Document 576, and all ac-

companying papers be indefinitely postponed.

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

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone this Bill please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Ten having voted in the affirmative and ninety-two 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 Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that the House reconsider its action whereby it passed this Bill to be engrossed. Is the House ready for the question? The Chair will restate the question. Under suspension of the rules the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it passed this Bill to be engrossed. Will those who favor the motion to reconsider please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously less than two-thirds having given their approval of the motion, the motion does not prevail.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number four under unfinished business, Senate Report "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" of the Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to the Department of Finance and Administration, Senate Paper 150, Legislative Document 347, tabled on May 23 by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill and the one we just acted on are companion bills, and the need for this bill is incorporated in the bill just passed, I now move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of

the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the House indefinitely postpone the Committee Report on Bill "An Act relating to the Department of Finance and Administration". Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report and Bill were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number five under unfinished business, House Report "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey, House Paper 1066, Legislative Document 1524, tabled on May 23 by the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Edwards, pending acceptance of the "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, I move that item five pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Carey, moves that the House accept the "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" Report of the Committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse.

Mr. BESSE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Among the towns that I represent is Sidney, and Sidney is one of the towns where they propose to investigate for this airport, and I have been asked by the Selectmen and the Airport Committee from Sidney to oppose this bill. As you know, Sidney is a relatively long, narrow town lying to the north of Augusta along the west bank of the Kennebec River. When the interstate highway is constructed it will go the entire length of the town, and in doing so it will take \$21,000 worth of taxable property out of the town of Sidney, and will also cut up their farms, so no one knows what the real damage will be. If the airport as they understand it should go into Sidney, it will take five hundred more acres out of the town amounting to \$94,000 worth of taxable property. And this is a rural community, about all they have is farms and land and if they take out

\$115,000 worth of taxable property out of town they are going to be severely handicapped in operating as a town. As the bill stands now, at least some of the people see no useful purpose in it. Therefore, I move its indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse, that the House indefinitely postpone the "Ought to pass" Report. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Coyne.

Mr. COYNE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I introduced this bill with no definite purpose in mind except to have a survey made for a probable airport in the area between Waterville and Augusta. There is no particular expectation that it will be located in the town of Sidney as North Vassalboro is very anxious that it should be located there, but this bill would provide for a survey by which we might start from there to do something in regard to a future airport. Therefore, I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. PIERCE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion by the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse. I am heartily in favor of this survey. Very briefly I hesitate to inject myself into another gentleman's territory, but I have been interested in commercial aviation since its inception in New England. For my information I did make a study of the length of the runway at Augusta, it is 4,200 feet, the major runway. The major runway at Waterville airport is 4,000 feet. I have been interested in the development of commercial aviation and particularly Northeast Airlines since its inception. I do have no connection financially or otherwise with Northeast Airlines. My sole thought is to bring commercial aviation into Maine and keep it here. I am well informed that the new type of ship that Northeast is now purchasing and is now running on a temporary basis from New York to Miami, the minimum runway is 5,000 feet. It is economically and probably unjustifiable to attempt to increase either Augusta or Waterville. If we are going to

have aviation in this part of the state we need new airports, one new airport.

The bill itself merely authorizes the Aeronautics Commission to make a study to determine if needs exist, to make a survey of the two proposed sites or — and I will stress this—or any other sites that may be advisable to determine the feasibility and practicability. It is further in the last paragraph of the Resolve stated that the Aeronautics Commission report the results of the study to the 99th Legislature or to any special session of the 98th Legislature. Your Appropriations Committee did strike out the second paragraph of this resolve. That states that \$15,000 shall be appropriated from the unappropriated surplus of the general fund for the purpose of this study. I have determined through the financial authorities in the other building that the Aeronautics Commission does have a balance in excess of \$100,000 as of the end of last month. True, some of that is marked for additional surveys, for snow removal at certain airports, but I am convinced that they do have sufficient funds there to make a preliminary survey to report back to the next legislature or to a special session of this Legislature. I am heartily in favor of passing the resolve with the Committee Amendment striking out the appropriation from the unappropriated surplus. I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse, does not prevail and that the resolve will be passed.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I have talked to several people in the Sidney area. They are apparently not all opposed to this measure because most of the ones I have talked to have been quite strongly in favor. They can see the possibility of additional taxable property in the town of Sidney. I might point out here that a week or two ago I was reading a famous history of this area and I came upon an article that pertained to Augusta and Sidney and Waterville. At that time they were constructing a railroad up through here and Sidney objected to the railroad.

Vassalboro got the railroad and Vassalboro will probably get the airport if Sidney objects. However, we need an airport here very badly that can handle cargo traffic and the new types of aircraft coming in I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have talked to members of the Aeronautics Commission and the Director and this bill without the appropriation is of no value to them at all. One of the Commissioners in particular pointed out that without the appropriation this bill wouldn't do them any good, in fact if an amendment was put in which he thought might come in to take money away from the small airports whereby the municipality is matching state funds and the state with federal funds to get the money. Now in this survey it is entirely all state funds and the municipalities of Waterville and Augusta neither one proposed to raise any money for this. Now we have a good airport in Augusta and there is a good airport in Waterville. They are large enough to take care of the present aircraft that Northeast Airlines are using. A few years ago Northeast Airlines was claiming that they would come into the Augusta airport with Convair service if the runway was extended, so the state and the city spent a lot of money, around \$250,000, extended the runway that could handle the Convairs and Northeast to this date hasn't come in with Convairs because the traffic doesn't warrant it, and therefore I think we are reaching too far into the future to make a survey that would build a new airport between Augusta and Waterville whereas there are so many places in the state that are in actual need of air service. We are covered pretty adequately here now for air service and there might come a day some twenty years hence in which it would be highly desirable, but I would like to go along with the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse, to indefinitely postpone this at this time.

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

Mr. HILTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have a daughter and a son-in-law living in Sidney and they are opposed to this thought of an airport being constructed there on the reason that as the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse, has told you, it is going to cut so much of their taxable property out. They are a very small town and they are building a school house and they feel that they don't like the airport.

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

Mr. TOTMAN : Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Perhaps some of you are a little confused as to whether you will be doing justice or an injustice to go along with the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse. Since I have admired that gentleman's stand several times in this House and feel he has pretty sound logic, I would like to back him up by pointing out one very simple fact. In case you decide to go along with his motion, don't feel too badly, because with the appropriations taken out the Governor signed a bill this session authorizing a state-wide survey of all airports, and I frankly think if this bill were passed without the appropriation it would be simply repetitious.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse, that with respect to Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey, the House indefinitely postpone the "Ought to pass" Report. Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Carey, that the House accept the "Ought to pass" Report. Will those who favor the acceptance of the "Ought to pass" Report please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Resolve read once.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1066, L. D. 1524, Resolve, Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey.

Amend said Resolve by striking out all of the 2nd paragraph.

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and under suspension of the rules the Resolve assigned for second reading at eight o'clock this evening.

House At Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I ask the Speaker to request Mr. Baird and Mr. Webber to come to the well of the House.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from China, Mr. Webber, and the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Baird, both kindly approach the rostrum and meet in the well of the House?

Mr. Crockett of Freeport was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Webber, it is a great pleasure for me to congratulate you. We are a little late in celebrating your honeymoon. I know you are more than able but if you are not, let any of the members know and we will give you any assistance required to help you out in your new married life. I know you are a young fellow trying to get along in the world. I know you are going to make a go of it, and may all your troubles be little ones. And on behalf of your colleagues, the ladies and gentlemen of this House, it gives me great pleasure to present you with a little gift and good wishes on your honeymoon.

Thereupon, amid the applause of the House Mr. Webber was presented an electric coffee maker and each of the lady members presented

the gentleman with two pounds of coffee.

Mr. CROCKETT: Sherm, on behalf of your colleagues here in the House, it gives me great pleasure to present you with a token of friendship and love toward you, we all love you, specially you as our baby in the 97th, but you are growing up now. You are big enough now to be married, and if you need any help from any of your constituents here in your married life, just call on us and we will be very glad to help you.

Thereupon, amid the applause of the House, Mr. Baird was presented an electric coffee maker and each of the lady members presented the gentleman with two pounds of coffee.

Mr. BAIRD: Thank you Ben, and thank everybody here for what they have done. (Applause)

Mr. WEBBER: I want to thank all of you ladies and gentlemen for your thoughtfulness. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number one on Supplement number two of the House Advance Journal that has been distributed under Matters Tabled This Morning and Assigned for Later Today, Resolve Authorizing the State of Maine to Convey Certain Land in Bangor, Senate Paper 604, Legislative Document 1606, tabled this morning by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, pending reference.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Just in way of information, this bill is to give the State authority to convey to the City of Bangor approximately an acre of land which is now directly in back of the State Armory in the City of Bangor. The city has an industrial development division and they are using the land which was formerly the State Home and Hospital property, and this land is adjacent to it. At the present time they have people who would like to build using this particular piece of property. They have checked with the Adjutant General and he is in favor of transferring the property back to the City of Bangor. As it

says in the bill the land on which the Armory was built was City property originally. Then if you would accept the resolve, I have an amendment which I would like to propose.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that under suspension of the rules this Resolve shall be given its first reading without reference to any committee?

The motion prevailed and the Resolve was read once.

Mr. Stanley of Bangor offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 604, L. D. 1606, Resolve Authorizing the State of Maine to Convey Certain Land in Bangor.

Amend said Resolve by adding after the 2nd paragraph the following paragraphs:

'Also another certain piece or parcel of land located in city of Bangor and bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point formed by the intersection of the northerly side of Main Street and the easterly side line of the Armory Lot, thence northwesterly by and long said easterly side line of the Armory Lot; said line also being the dividing line between the Armory Lot and City Farm Land for a distance of about 1105 feet to a granite monument at the northeasterly corner of said lot; thence southwesterly and at right angles to the last described line, a distance of 15 feet; thence southeasterly parallel with and 15 foot distance from the first described line to the northerly side line of Main Street, a distance of about 1105 feet; thence northeasterly by and long northerly side line of Main Street for a distance of 15 feet to the point of beginning.'

House Amendment "A" was adopted in non-concurrence and the Resolve assigned for second reading at eight o'clock this evening.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the second item under matters tabled this morning and assigned for later today, Bill "An Act relating to Superintending School Committee of City

of Portland", House Paper 835, Legislative Document 1191, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, to adhere to House action. This Bill had been passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendments "A" and "B" and comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I notice that my colleague, Mr. Maynard, the gentleman from Portland, has not been here today, and whereas this is his measure and whereas the other branch requested a Committee of Conference, I would now move that we insist on our prior action and join in the Committee of Conference.

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

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number three under matters tabled this morning and assigned for later today, Bill "An Act relating to Repossession of Property Subject to Conditional Sales Agreement", House Paper 418, Legislative Document 595, tabled this morning by the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Shaw, pending further consideration. This bill in the Senate was engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "B" in non-concurrence. In the House it was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A".

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

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

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

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House Senate Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties on Several Bills reporting a Consolidated Bill, L. D. 1577, S. P. 574. Comes from the Senate with the Report accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "B" and "C". This bill was tabled earlier this morning by the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. WALTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to the Senate Amendment "B" which changes the effective date pertaining to the retroactive feature.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would ask the gentleman if he would be willing to defer until the report has been accepted and the bill read twice.

Mr. WALTER: Yes.

Thereupon, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read twice.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have two amendments, Senate Amendment "B" and Senate Amendment "C". Now it so happens that I have had some comments from the County Commissioners and the people in these counties, and as you know, the Statute provides that the County Commissioners must give notice to the people in the papers that a meeting will be held for the last Monday in December for the purpose of going over the county estimates, and this has been done in several counties, and the county commissioners along with the delegation have had these meetings and recommended certain salaries to be paid. Now the usual procedure after those recommendations come in the House is that it goes before the Committee on County Estimates and it is approved or disapproved and that is the end, but in this particular case it came before the Committee on Towns and Counties and has come to us in a consolidated bill.

Now I am going along with the Senate Amendment "C" even though it is a compromise and even though

it does not meet the approval of some of the counties, and if it is in order now, I assume that Senate Amendment "B" will be the first taken up, I would like to move that that be indefinitely postponed. It does change the effective date or the retroactive date from January 1 to July 1.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 574, L. D. 1577, Bill, "An Act Relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of sections 9, 41, 48, 64, 76 and 83.

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

'Effective date.

Sec. 84. **Effective date.** The provisions of this act shall be retroactive to July 1, 1957.'

Further amend said Bill by renumbering the sections of said Bill to read consecutively.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, that the House indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "B". Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "C" to S. P. 574, L. D. 1577, Bill, "An Act Relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers."

Amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$3,240" in the 5th line of "Sec. 42" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$3,400'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$3,000" in the 5th line of "Sec. 45" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$3,100'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$2,500" in the 5th line of "Sec. 46" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$2,700'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$2,400" in the 5th line of "sec. 47" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '\$2,500'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$3,250" in the 4th line of "Sec. 74" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "\$3,400".

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$2,800" in the 4th line of "Sec. 36" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "\$2,900".

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "\$3,250" in the 4th line of "Sec. 38" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure "\$3,400".

Senate Amendment "C" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading at eight o'clock this evening.

On motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, the House voted to take from the table the fourth tabled and unassigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Exempting Children's Clothing of Cloth Material from Sales Tax", House Paper 841, Legislative Document 1195, tabled on May 22 by that gentleman pending acceptance of the report, and the Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This was tabled pending our final decision on exempting children's clothing from the sales tax. As you recall, we made our decision this morning and I therefore move we accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am certainly in one position at this time that there is no other way than for me to go along with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, to accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" Report. Will those who favor the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" Report please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the "Ought

not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

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

Thereupon, Mr. Fuller 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 House is working under orders of the day. The Chair awaits the motion of any of the members to take any bill off the table.

On motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, the House voted to take from the table the first tabled and unassigned matter, Bill "An Act Increasing Registration Fees for Motor Vehicles and Operators' Licenses", House Paper 1088, Legislative Document 1572, tabled on May 21 by that gentleman pending passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't know quite frankly what particular arguments are necessary at this time inasmuch as I feel that we have so thoroughly debated the idea of taking a million dollars from the general fund that if we wish to go through with our intention of financing the bond issue, we have left before us this L.D. plus the so-called Highway Use Tax which is item five. I believe the proper misconception has been made that increase in registration fees for motor vehicle and operators' licenses is solely drivers licenses and registration plates. I would point out that this bill is a combination of three or four separate bills that were before the Transportation Committee. We have put three or four bills into one. This bill represents the increase on the drivers' license of one dollar, it represents the increases on the automobile license plates of one dollar, and it represents also something that has not been mentioned too much, but it certainly is the most

important part of the bill in my estimation. It represents a seven per cent increase on the registration fees of trucks. You will probably hear in subsequent debate that we are letting the trucking industry get off comparatively easy in view of the bond issue which will finance new major highways. I would like to point out that the Transportation Committee in bringing this bill out attempted to give an even seven per cent increase across the board to both automobiles and trucks in this bill, and neither segment is favored. I would also like to point out that some members at least of the Transportation Committee, and this particular bill was unanimous "Ought to pass" Report, felt that while there may be some merit in future years in a more responsible taxation bill for trucks, in view of congressional action now pending to make a thorough study of truck taxation, we would be imposing a new major taxation method on an outdated foundation if we should pass the so-called Weight Distance Tax now until that study is completed.

Therefore, the Transportation Committee recommended this bill, and I believe the most intelligent way to proceed is to take a vote on the measure.

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

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: Having been a freshman in this place up until now, I think I am graduated now that we have three days left, it has been my policy to sit in my seat and listen and try to learn, at least up to the capacity of my small brain. We have been listening to figures here and specially on this particular bill. Figures bother me at times anyway, and I cannot quite understand. This—I believe this bill is for the purpose of financing the bond issue which would raise around a million dollars a year. The other day when this particular item was up I understood some gentleman to say that it would only require \$90,000 a year for the next two years to finance. I would like to ask if the gentleman who said that remembers

who he was and I wish he would explain that to us.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, asks a question through the Chair to any member of the Transportation Committee who may answer if he so chooses.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Perhaps it would be more in order for a member of the Highway Committee to go into the reasons for the financing, but I think I can answer the specific question very briefly. It is true that to finance the bond issue itself and nothing more, it would require \$90,000 a year. However, unlike the general fund budget which was brought out in two parts, a current balanced budget plus a supplemental budget, the Highway budget was brought out in one form and included the expenditure of \$2,000,000 for the next biennium, a million dollars a year, and those two millions of dollars were expected to be raised through this particular bill. Now I recognize myself among the first to agree that that in my opinion is a rather unusual procedure. In other words, we are bringing out a highway allocation bill that presumes that a suggested piece of legislation will pass and we will get our revenue from a new source of taxation. I wonder if I have answered the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

Mr. HATHAWAY: No, not exactly. If it was to cost a million dollars a year which on a \$24,000,000 bond issue I can see where it would around four per cent if you had to pay, but why only \$90,000 the first year. Does that mean that we are only going to issue bonds for about \$2,000,000 the first two years?

Mr. TOTMAN: I would like to go on and answer the question more specifically.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TOTMAN: It has been shown that the actual retirement and interest payments during the next biennium will only cost approximately \$90,000. Without confusing the House, I will say that is the net

result. How it is arrived at I don't see any particular point in going into detail. I will say that the million dollars that this bill is raising is not going towards the bond issue, it is going towards the highway allocation bill for various types of road construction that the Highway Committee brought out. It is over and above the bond issue, and I repeat, I would normally have looked for a supplemental highway financing budget, but the Committee saw fit, and perhaps some of the Committee would care to comment on why they did it that way, they depended upon this bill, the million dollars raised in this bill, to help finance our regular highway allocation fund.

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

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, I don't plan to be difficult at all but when this other bill was in to take a million dollars from the fund, from the surplus fund or the unappropriated fund to pay for this bond issue, it was turned down and then we said we would have to resort to this. In other words, if the first bill had passed, this would not be necessary. Am I right? The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, now states that it is to be used for highway construction and not necessarily to pay off the interest on the highway bond issue.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, asks a question through the Chair. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would repeat to the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, that we have a choice of financing our road construction. It is financing both our road construction and the bond issue in general, our entire program. We had three choices, we could take it out of the general fund, we could pass this bill or we could pass the truck weight distance bill. The House the other day voted not to take the money to finance the highway construction program from the general fund.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the gentleman's name over there, I don't know him very well, but I perhaps can clarify it by saying that there are two — I hope to his satisfaction— there are two contemplated bond issues proposed, one for twenty-six million and one for twenty-four million. We passed the twenty-four million one with the idea that two million of the financing program will be financed by current taxation. I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have heard it said here that we are using the front door and the back door to obtain results. I think somebody found a secret passage to this one by the cellar door. This type of legislation I am certainly opposed to because to me I have been given all kinds of alternatives how to raise money. We have had incidents here where we did not force upon people taxation which would have brought returns back in here pretty near sufficient enough to meet these needs. Now they come up with something more of taxation to put upon people who may be with a certain amount of income, set income, and we are going home to tell these people once again we are going to put a hardship upon the small rural areas which it certainly will hit because wages have gone up in big cities. Living costs have gone up it is true, but living costs went up in the rural areas but wages have not. Now that is the biggest part of your segment that you have got to consider on the particular type of legislation of this nature, and at this time I know there is a lot will get into it in discussion and I hope they do, but I would move indefinite postponement of this bill and ask for a roll call vote when the vote is so taken.

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

Mr. HERSEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill came out of the Transportation Committee of which I am a member without opposition, or at least on paper a unanimous report, although there were three of

the Committee who were not in favor of the bill in its present form, I being one of them. We had, as the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, has stated, several bills, one having to do with increasing registration fees on passenger cars, another to increase registration fees on light trucks, another to increase operators' license fees, and another one to increase the cost with the application to take a driving license examination. I was in favor of some of those bills, but not the one to increase registration fees on light trucks and passenger cars nor to increase the fee by one dollar for operators' licenses. I was in favor of the one to increase the registration fees for the heavy trucks, that is the 18,000 pound category and on up to the 50,000 or 60,000 pound limits which will be after this legislature adjourns, but I am not in favor of combining all of those bills in one and coming out with this one bill and reporting it out "Ought to pass". If there was some way that the thing could be broken down and give you a chance to vote on increasing the registration fees for passenger cars and the driving license and another bill to increase registration fees for trucks, I think we would be getting down to a better understanding of the measure instead of it being in its present form. There is another matter tabled, I think item five on the unassigned list, that will do a lot better job for the state, put the cost of these highways where it properly belongs, and I think with the amendment that will be proposed by the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Farmer, will be a good workable bill. But I do not want to go back home myself and tell the constituents in my town that I had any part in increasing the fees for driving licenses or their registration fees for their passenger cars and light trucks.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: If we are going to build any roads on that ninety-ten, we simply have got to have some money from somewhere, and I opposed this first just because of the increase of the drivers'

license for fear that they might not adopt the bond issue. But now we have taken care of the other, I believe it was the gentleman from Gardiner has presented, we killed that, and I believe that we should go along with this bill, and in answer to the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, about this \$90,000, as I understand it, bonds are only floated as they are needed, and it may be four or five years before the full \$20,000,000 will be floated. So this — that is just simply to pay the interest where they only intend to float \$2,000,000 at this time. If this bill passes the money will be in the highway fund to retire these bond issues year by year as provided. For that reason I hope that this receives passage.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to ask through the Chair of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, a question if I may be permitted to do so. If we do not accept item one under tabled and unassigned matters that is a way of financing our bond issue, is the alternative item number five on page ten of the tabled and unassigned matters?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, has asked a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question if I heard it correctly, I will repeat it to see if I did get it right, would I accept number five in lieu of number one for the financing? I would say definitely not. I still think there are other avenues open to us.

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

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if this discussion has anything to do with the so-called hardship cases state aid, this million dollars. As I understood, that was tied in with the bond issue, if we didn't pass the bond issue that is the first thing that would be cut

out. The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, might be able to answer that.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, has asked a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would answer the gentleman's question by saying this, that a million dollars from this particular measure was going to be used in the general highway fund allocation bill. As to what million dollars it would apply against, I did not understand it was specifically earmarked. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. RICH: As I remember it when we had the Highway Commission before the Republican Caucus some weeks ago, they told us that this million dollars for so-called hardship cases and the \$500,000, a half million for town road improvement, would be the first things that would be discarded if they didn't get the necessary money. I was worried about this bill here. If we indefinitely postpone this bill are we going away from here without any money for those things which we people from the rural areas are particularly interested in?

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

Mr. TOTMAN: In further answer to the gentleman's question, where this legislature would decide to cut out a million dollars out of the highway bill would certainly be up to probably the Committee, the Highway Committee to decide with the direction of the legislature. It has been rumored admittedly that the most obvious place to cut first would be the hardship fund since there is no matching money.

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

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I think we should think carefully before we discard every means of taking care of these things, not only taking care of the interest on the bond issue. You all know that I voted against the bond issue which probably was a foolish move of mine, but I certainly think that we must have some

more money, and if we are going to kill the other measures, we want to be careful before we indefinitely postpone this particular one. I personally know that it will create a lot of dissatisfaction, but I don't believe that is going to last very long. People will criticize us for giving them a dollar increase on the license fee or a dollar increase on their registration, but I believe the people who think carefully will realize that those things that we are working for, better roads, are worthwhile, and we have got to have the money. Therefore let's get it somewhere.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: If you were to go over the highway allocation bill which we have passed here and is now resting on the table in the other house, if we fail to raise another one million dollars, there are just two places that you can apply the guillotine. One is the so-called million dollar hardship money, and the other is the million five town improvement fund, and I hope you will consider that very carefully when you vote on the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. TARBOX: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is another shell game I should call it, for two years ago we had it thrown up at us if we didn't do such a thing we wouldn't have the hardship money and town improvement money. I put in a bill for it which came out of the Committee "Ought not to pass" and has been lost. Now this will be another thing for two more years. If we pass it now in two years hence they will throw out the town unimproved roads and what have you. I for one hope the thing is indefinitely postponed because I don't think this is the way to pay off our bond issue.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I hope this bill receives passage, but I hope it doesn't receive passage by someone

trying to say it as a threat. As I understand it we have already passed the million dollar hardship fund and the town road improvement fund, and it will last through the biennium. Now probably if we don't pass the bond issue why in other words we won't have the money to take up this ninety-ten, and then again another legislature will be faced with the same thing we are about this. So let's keep this scare thing away from it. As I understand it that has already been passed and I believe that we should go along and pass this bill because I think I am opposed to it as strongly as anyone but in looking over the situation more thoroughly and checking it which I have done very thoroughly and with the folks back home I think they will buy it when they find out what it is all about.

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: In this building and in the state office building are some of the greatest minds in Maine, and yet from no mind has come a single thought as to how we can raise this lonely million dollars without taxing the motorist in the State of Maine, and I can't understand this situation. Opposed as I am to this bill, I feel as though I have been shut up in a box. Now the box was built by whom I do not know, but I do know that the people of this State are absolutely opposed to any increase in motor vehicle registrations or an increase in drivers' licenses. I feel certain that if this measure is defeated some means will be found whereby this last and lonely million can be secured.

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

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 here, and one signer that knew what he was doing and signed without equivocation, I believe that this is the fairest and most just measure of taxation to finance the highway problem. As has been brought out by the gentleman from Bangor,

Mr. Totman, by his statements, and questions asked by the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, that your highway allocation bill has already been passed. The highway allocation bill does not say where the money is coming from to finance the whole program. There is a shortage of funds. We have discussed that at quite length. We have also passed the bond issue to take care of that, and I voted for the bond issue to take care of the shortage in the highway fund with the idea that we would raise money to take care of debt service of the bond issue. Now this money would go into the general highway fund increasing the amount there enough so that the special state aid program could—the hardship fund could be still kept in effect—your regular state aid highway could be kept in effect, and your mud money or your million and a half for your town road improvement fund could be kept in effect, and also so that your federal aid secondary fifty-fifty matching funds would not have to be sliced nor your matching funds on your ninety-ten on your interstate system. Now if you kill this bill, somewhere along the line I am going to assume that you are going to have to cut out something. It will be up to this House to decide what they want to cut. As many of us come from small towns, requesting cutting our town road improvement fund or our special state aid funds or our regular state aid funds. However, it would be kind of silly to cut out a matching fund too, especially a matching fund where we only have to contribute ten per cent. Now it has been said that there are fair minds, good minds that have worked on this. This is the program that they have come up with. It might not be the best, but I think it is the best one that this House has got before it to consider at this time, so I think you should consider well before you defeat this, and I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mrs. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hesitate to interject any observation into this

learned discussion, but there is an observation that occurs to me that I think should be mentioned. Every time we read a newspaper report of the doings of this legislature and so forth, we are confronted with the millions that are going to the surplus, that are going to be left over, and I am sure I don't want to go home and have to explain to the people of my community that we have to raise their license fees, their registration fees seven and a half per cent or whatever amount is needed, with the extra millions in the fund. I am sure I cannot explain it and I am not going to vote for this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse.

Mr. BESSE: Mr. Speaker, you may recall that last Friday I think it was, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, made the statement that money was drying up. The way he said it may have been funny, but what he said was no joke. I think money is drying up. Very recently one of the better stores in Waterville took in thirty-eight cents in cash. Now that doesn't indicate that money is flowing very freely around here. Also I think last Friday the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Hanson, offered you a way to finance this thing through the general fund with a million dollars, and to my mind that is saving a million dollars of the taxpayers' money. It was rejected as a matter of principle. Now when principles have a price tag of a million dollars each, I think they are too high for us to indulge in.

Now evidently from the discussion that has taken place, actually about a hundred thousand dollars is needed for the bond issue and the rest of it for other purposes. I don't know why the other money wasn't attached to the regular highway money instead of being brought in through the back door, if you please, this way. Through the increase in the sales tax and this money if this bill is passed, we are going to take approximately ten million dollars out of the taxpayers of Maine which is roughly a thirty per cent increase. Now I think we have a fair cross section of the people of Maine here in this House. Is there anyone here

who expects a thirty per cent increase in their income next year? I am sure they don't. And if we are increasing the taxes thirty per cent it means it must come out of peoples earnings or their savings. If it comes out of their earnings it means that they have ten million dollars less money to spend for goods and services. That means that there will be less business done, probably less business on which the sales tax will be collected, because there are many of those things, food and services and such, that are not taxed, so it is a possibility that there will not be a definite increase in the sales tax in proportion to the two per cent that we now have. I have been told since I came here, this is my first time, but I have been told that the previous legislature was criticized for passing patchwork taxation. If this doesn't qualify under that heading I would like to know what does. Thank you.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Although you have passed the sales tax over my dead body, nevertheless with all the pickings that has gone out of it, there will be about \$3,000,000 left, and there is something like \$5,000,000 that the taxpayers are going to pay with that three per cent tax on automobile accessories and so forth, and there is no reason, no justifiable reason to shove this one to them.

This bill the way it stands today, you have got an increase of three dollars. You also passed a bill that is going to ask for that license on the birthday date. Now you think of one who is in the last quarter, he is going to pay six dollars when he gets his license to bring it around to his birthday. And you know many of you, there are many in this House that know that when a man has to pay two dollars some of them for their license to get it the first of the year they have to borrow it from somebody, and it is not going to set very well on their stomachs. I might say in answer to my friend from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey, there still is alive L. D. 1039, An Act Increasing the Fee for Operators' License, and L. D. 1228, An Act Re-

lating to Registration Fees on Passenger Vehicles. They are still existing in that unspeakable body on my calendar here. And the gentleman mentioned that we might take them separately. There it is right there.

I believe the other day on the general appropriations bill I had an amendment here for a hundred thousand dollars. It was my understanding from the figures from the Highway Commission — not the Highway Committee, but the Highway Commission, that it would be a \$90,000 bill, well I put it in an even hundred thousand dollars, and I came into the House while that debate was going on on the million dollar bill and I understood at that time that the floor leader, our able floor leader, Mr. Totman, the gentleman from Bangor, said it had gone up to a million. Well now, today, I think if I heard right, the same gentleman said it was \$90,000, the figure I heard the other day. I did not present my amendment, but I believe we can take this segregated if we have to from those items that are still alive, and I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

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

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking the questions was not that I was in opposition to this bill. My thought was that if it required only \$90,000 or \$100,000 to finance the bond issue and the bond issue itself was for the purpose of financing the roads, and the sales tax our other expenditures, why it might be possible that this particular item could be — bill could be turned over to the next legislature, and voted on then when we do have more expense to the bond issue. If the whole twenty-four million dollar bonds are out I don't believe interest would come to more than a million dollars then. Now if this money is needed for other purposes I certainly would go along with it, but if for only \$90,000 I would suggest that the next legislature could pass a bill like this, and where we are passing a sales tax it might look a little better to not pass this.

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

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Highway Committee I would like to make a couple of observations. First I would like to state that we do need the million dollars in order to balance the allocation bill and in turn provide the funds that are necessary for the state's share of the services which we are expected to maintain, including the town road improvement fund and the special state aid or the hardship money as it has been referred to. Second I would like to say that I feel a responsibility to support some sort of a financing program that will carry our highway program over the years. We have debated the general fund approach twice and defeated it twice just as I think that we should have. I think this is the most equitable of all the proposals which are before us. While I don't like to vote for taxes any more than the next person, I would be in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question through the Chair to anyone who may be able to answer it. Have I picked up the idea somewhere that if this bill is passed and the money that would be raised from it, that the state police force would be increased by twenty-five this year and twenty-five the following year? Is that something I just heard somewhere else?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member who care to answer. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would answer the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris, that I feel out of place somewhat as the Chairman of Transportation in answering questions for the Chairman of the Highway, but since the question has been raised towards me I would say that the highway

allocation bill does provide for additional police.

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

Mr. HERSEY: Mr. Speaker, in reply to a statement made by the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, he called attention to two items that are on the table in the Senate, both tabled, the House Report leave to withdraw on one an act increasing the fee of operators licenses and the other an act relating to registration fees for passenger cars. So far as I am concerned, they can grant leave to withdraw on those. There is also an item eleven on the Senate calendar another item, Bill, An Act Relating to Registration Fees on Certain Commercial Vehicles tabled pending enactment. If they will enact that piece of legislation in there I would gladly follow suit when it gets back here in the House.

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

Mr. FARMER: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn. We have just sent to the other body a sales tax item increasing revenues some eight million dollars, and I would ask you to consider just where that eight million dollars is coming from. It is my contention that it will come primarily from the poor man in this state, and we are now presented with another piece of legislation that is going to hit that same man the same way again with the hardest proportion of the burden here. Presently our highway costs are divided with some seventy-five or eighty per cent falling on the small passenger car operator and some twenty-five per cent on the trucks. I am opposed to this measure because it will maintain the same ratio, and if anything it will increase the burden on the small car operators. About half of the revenue this measure will provide will come from the increase in the drivers' licenses, and it will certainly be much less than twenty per cent of that half that will come from the truckers.

It has been at least insinuated here today that if this were not passed, the first thing that would happen would be our town road and

special hardship money, it would be sacrificed. Well it is my contention that if this were not passed and if there were no revenue produced instead of this, which I do not recommend, but if that would be so, it would still be possible for the Highway Commission to meet their full program by simply deducting \$500,000 a year from their unappropriated surplus.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, this is no doubt the first step our leaders feel in building our interstate \$50,000,000 state highway system. I don't think it is fair or reasonable to expect the little guy to carry the burden of paying for this super highway. In the last few years he has had a two per cent sales tax added to his troubles, also several increases in the gas tax, increased insurance costs. Take the excise tax and increased federal taxes and all told the little guy, the little family car man is sure doing his part for what little he uses the highway. I am against this bill and have been ever since the first of the year. At that time I was told by our double-barrel leadership what our financing program would be at that time for the new highway. We have just passed a bill giving the trucking industries of this state and the nation the right to increase the length of their vehicles five feet and their gross weight from 50,000 to 60,000 pounds. This gift is worth millions of dollars to the industry, and what did we get for that? Nothing. Nothing. The same industries now say they are in favor, and we must have this interstate highway. What are they offering to pay? Nothing. Nothing. This bill will not collect one cent from the out of state truckers. Do you think it is fair and just to let these out of state freight trains on rubber, 15,000 strong, use our highways for about five dollars each per year? Our highways, their place of business.

Maine has a large investment in its roads. That investment must be protected by this body. There is no question that in fairness to all we must get our fair share of money that is being made on our highways today from the people who

use them as a place of business. We have heard about sending it back to the people. Why not be honest with the people? Let them vote on the bond issue; also on the method of payment, either this bill or the good honest weight distance bill. We will then see if the people want to bond the state and the people's choice of payment. What could be fairer? Oh, no! The leaders can ram it down the throats of this body, but they know with the voters they would be taking on too much territory. I have here over fifteen thousand signers on petitions. These petitions are sponsored by the Small Car and Small Truck Owners Association, John Gould, Lisbon Falls, President. In the heading of the petition it reads: "We the undersigned, believing that the average Maine motorist is already bearing more than his share of highway construction and maintenance costs, and that the large heavy commercial truck, a majority of which are owned and registered out of state, are not bearing their proportionate share of such highway construction and maintenance costs, do oppose passage of bill before the legislature which would increase the drivers license fees, and motor vehicle registrations." Now these petitions are from all over the state. Even some members in this House have circulated them and a lot of the members have signed them. These petitions are from the little people back home. The ones we knew when we were seeking election to this body. Do not let them down. Let's show that we have not forgotten them and kill this unfair measure. It isn't fair, honest or just to make this low income group pay for the place of business of the trucking industries of this state and all the other states. The success of the passage of the bond issue could be in the method of payment.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to go on record as definitely opposed to this bill believing that we do not need it, and that the repercussions if we pass it will really hurt every member of

this House that supports it. I concur with the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, to indefinitely postpone it. I concur with the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey, and the gentlewoman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham, and others that I for one don't want to go back home and tell the people that I supported this issue after having voted the three per cent sales tax and the \$24,000,000 bond issue. I believe the people in every legislative territory have a right to know how their representative voted on this matter, and I request that when the vote is taken it be taken by a roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Knapp.

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I understand that some of this money that is to be raised is to hire more state police. I would say that if the state police that we have, got out on the road and worked all of them then we wouldn't need any more. Now I understand that the police over at the barracks over at Scarborough are just laughing at us. They say "Oh we'll get some more". Now I would think it is time something could be done. I travel from Yarmouth to Portland on an average of three times a week and there is only one state cop there that I see all the time, and I know there are two or three that should be going back and forth. Instead of that they are parked on the side of the road or two or three sitting in a car together, and I think that if the cops we have went to work we wouldn't need to raise any money for any more.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have not been in favor of increasing the drivers' licenses ever since I first heard of it, but if, as the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin said, if we are boxed in, we boxed ourselves in last Friday, because when the supplemental budget was being discussed, the amendment was prepared as has been mentioned before this afternoon. For the benefit, and strictly for the benefit of those who might not under-

stand the situation in the House, I explained that they could either favor that amendment or they then would have to favor either the drivers' licenses or the weight distance tax. Now this afternoon I don't think that it is technically possible to do anything else—I will ask that question afterwards. I think that those who vote against increasing the drivers' license and registration fees are then going to be duty bound to support the weight distance.

Now I have a question, Mr. Speaker, I have a question as to whether or not since it has been more than two days, whether or not we could reconsider our action on the supplemental appropriation without unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tem: In answer to the gentleman's question the Chair will rule that any reconsideration must take place within twenty-four hours by a two-thirds vote.

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I feel we have two reasons for voting against this bill. One, there has been a great deal of uncertainty as to how much money is needed, and in legislatures of many years ago when a problem was not understood it was considered good form to vote against that bill.

Secondly, here we have the chance to do something for the little fellow we have been talking about during the entire session by voting to indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have been told by some members of the Committee that this money is needed. Secondly, I believe that despite the vigorous efforts of John Gould and others who circulated the petition, that we are exaggerating the public objection to these increases in these fees for licenses and registrations. I base this upon the—I think it is an obvious fact that these same people whom we are talking about will buy a new set of tires and the sales tax on that purchase under the new bill will amount to probably three dollars or more, and they will pay that without batting an eye. I really feel that we are—

furthermore, I would like to point out that this million dollars from these fees isn't going to run our highway program next year, it is a relatively small contribution, but it is the last contribution to balance the highway allocation fund. I am going to vote against the indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Member of this Legislature: I have to take exception with my good friend Bob Wade. When I went home after the last session and we passed the so-called package deal there was criticism from almost everybody. If I go back to Brownville Junction this time and we pass an increase in the drivers' license and an increase in the car license, there is no sense in me running again down there or anybody else because they are absolutely one hundred per cent against it in my section. We have a lot of people, it is a railroad town, and we have a lot of people there, they all own cars and they all work for the Canadian Pacific Railroad, and there is a tremendous amount of them now that are pensioners. Their pensions haven't increased but prices are going up and the cost of living is going up and if we increase the licenses, as I said before, they are dead against it, and I have to be against this bill and I ask that you don't crucify us on the cross of political expediency.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with my distinguished colleague from Auburn, Mr. Wade, but if I understand this situation, we are asked to increase the license and registration fees in order to provide some additional revenue for the Highway Department. Now in looking back I seem to recall that we increased the sales tax three per cent, even though two and one-half per cent was represented to us as an amount necessary to do the job. We were told that one-half of one per cent would be cumbersome to collect. It has been further suggested that our system of govern-

ment was such so that we could not touch the general fund. As a freshman legislator, I probably haven't been taught all the facts of life yet, but it would seem to me we are merely putting our collective heads in the sand like a bunch of ostriches, and I will go along with the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, to indefinitely postpone this bill.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, before I make a few comments, I first would like to ask a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, if he can give to us a breakdown of what we will receive under this plan for drivers' license, truck registrations and license increase fees if that is available?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, who may answer if he so chooses.

Mr. TOTMAN: I would answer the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, on this obviously very unpopular bill, that the license fees are fairly simple to compute inasmuch as we have roughly four hundred odd thousand drivers in the state which includes incidentally truck drivers as well as automobile drivers, a dollar increase that is roughly four hundred thousand. On the increase in license plates, I am giving round figures, it is roughly two hundred and seventy thousand, and the increase on trucks which is around seven per cent increase on their present registration fees is the balance to make up the million.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information. It certainly would fit the needs as he so claims, but I wonder if we realize that here just a week ago that we had an opportunity on the state police angle to pay for twenty of those state police that we now have in our budget which we have no income for or which we are seeking to get income for. However I am sorry to say we did pass it in the supplemental budget for those gentlemen. I do not deny the need or the right that we

should have them, but let's refer for one moment to the Maine Turnpike Authority where you had \$164,000 could be obtained by the state because they now pay it, which I still believe should have come out of the revenues derived from that highway, that would have paid for twenty police in our supplemental budget, we would be asking for the forty but we would only have to raise money to pay twenty, because the other money derived would have paid for the other twenty. Now we turn around and ask the same question once again, can we continue to tax the small individual man or family for any additional burden? I say it is political suicide for any of you who may attempt to do so in my estimation.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the question before the House today is to raise a million dollars to take care of the highway allocation bill. I wonder if some gentleman on the Highway Committee would tell us whether there is an additional twenty-five state police in the highway allocation bill and how much it costs for those police? In our budget, the general fund budget, we did not include the twenty-five police, so if there is twenty-five in the highway allocation bill, we will have to up the amount of money in our budget, in the general fund budget, to take care of half of those.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, has directed a question through the Chair to any member of the Highway Committee who may answer if he chooses. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, in the new draft 1503 there is put up money enough for twenty-five additional new police. Where it says \$853,000 I think in the general budget there is only around \$600,000, is that right?

Mr. STANLEY: I didn't get the amount of money in the highway allocation bill for the extra twenty-five police.

Mr. TURNER: They are all added in together which makes it \$853,-

000 and I think in the general budget it is around \$600,000 some odd because I would think it would be about \$200,000 a year added to this budget for the state police.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman from Bangor consider his question answered?

Mr. STANLEY: Yes, I guess that answers my question. If we cut out the twenty-five state police, there would be around \$200,000 to be deducted from the Highway Allocation Act.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly hope that I have not seen the hand-writing on the wall. We have passed a twenty-four million dollar bond issue. Now I certainly hope we are not going to dip into the general fund and try to finance it through that source. I don't think we have got any right to pass such a headache on to the next legislature. If we are not going to pay for it ourselves then I think we ought to kill the bond issue, because if you go ahead now and take it out of the general fund or attempt to take it out of the general fund, then the next legislature may do exactly the same thing, and before many years go by we are going to find ourselves in a very difficult position on education and on institutional services and many, many other services. Now I think if we are going to pass a bond issue that we should be strong enough to find a way of financing it and not even think of dipping into the general fund. That is just what is going to happen if we defeat this.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lovell, Mrs. Harriman.

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, a great deal of argument has been made here on the floor about pay as you go and also about deficit financing. Now all of us have to borrow money at some time or another, but if we meet the payments plus interest it is pay as you go. Maybe I am wrong with that assumption. Now with this bill before us I see nothing but pay as you go. We are not dipping into the gen-

eral fund. We have borrowed say twenty-four million dollars in bonds but we are going to make the payments plus interest and pay as you go with the additional fees on drivers' licenses and registrations. I know that we may be most unpopular, but go back home and every one of your constituents will—well I have a word for it, but they will complain and they will say: "Why didn't you get this piece of road built?" and "Why didn't you do this and why didn't you do that?". Now they must realize if we do it they have got to pay for it. I think we are acting like children on this, and furthermore, I will say this on the drivers' license that hasn't been increased since 1912, I was five years old then. I don't know of anything else I can buy today that I would only have to pay the same as I did when I was five years old. Now use your heads. These people are going to use your roads and I heard the statement made this morning that they didn't want these things, they haven't made their desires known for all these things we have granted them here in this legislature. I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, they certainly do want this state to do everything it can only they don't stop to realize they are going to have to pay for it. Now I think that every one of us knows how we are going to vote and I thereby move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lovell, Mrs. Harriman, has moved the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question one third of those present must show their desire for the previous question. Will those who favor the previous question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count. Obviously more than one-third having expressed a desire for the previous question, the previous question is ordered.

The question before the House is shall the main question be put now. Debate of not more than five minutes is in order.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the main question shall be put now?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the mo-

tion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that this Bill "An Act Increasing Registration Fees for Motor Vehicles and Operators' Licenses, House Paper 1088, Legislative Document 1572, be indefinitely postponed, and the same gentleman has requested a roll call.

In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for a roll call, one-fifth of the members present must show their desire. Will all those present who desire a roll call please rise and stand in your places—obviously more than one-fifth having arisen a roll call is ordered.

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that Bill "An Act Increasing Registration Fees for Motor Vehicles and Operators' Licenses" be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will say "yes" when their name is called; those opposed will say "no". The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Besse, Brewer, Brewster, Brockway, Brown, Ellsworth; Browne, Bangor; Burnham, Christie, Cole, Cote, Couture, Bath; Couture, Lewiston; Edgerly, Emery, Farmer, Flynn, Frazier, Frost, Hatch, Hatfield, Haughn, Heald, Hendsbee, Hersey, Hughes, Hutchinson, Jack, Jewell, Jones, Karkos, Knapp, Leathers, Libby, Lindsay, Mann, Morrill, Pierce, Rankin, Roberts, Rollins, Ross, Brownville; Sanborn, Shepard, Smith, Falmouth; Tarbox, Turner, Walker, Webber, Wheaton, Whiting, Winchenpaw, Wood.

NAY—Allen, Andrews, Babineau, Baird, Bartlett, Bean, Winterport; Beane, Augusta; Beyer, Blanchard, Bragdon, Broderick, Bruce, Call, Carey, Carville, Caswell, Childs, Cormier, Coyne, Crockett, Curtis, Cyr, Davis, Calais; Denbow, Dostie, Dudley, Dumais, Duquette, Edwards, Elwell, Emerson, Emmons, Foss, Fuller, Gallant, Hancock, Hanson, Harriman, Harrington, Harris, Hathaway, Hendricks, Hickey, Hilton, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Kelley, Kinch, LaCase, Latno, Mathieson, Maynard, Miller, Morway, Nadeau, Needham, Plante, Porell, Prue, Quinn, Rancourt, Rich, Ross, Bath; Rowe, Madawaska; Roy, Saunders, Shaw, Smith, Portland;

Stanley, Stilphen, Storm, Tevanian, Thackeray, Totman, Vaughan, Wade, Walsh, Walter.

ABSENT—Anthoine, Carter, Etna; Carter, Newport; Davis, Westbrook; Day, Desmarais, Earles, Ervin, Graves, Hanscomb, Higgins, Hoyt, Lane, Letourneau, Maxwell, Rowe, Limerick; Violette, Warren, Williams.

Yes 52, No 79, Absent 19.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Fifty-two having voted in the affirmative, seventy-nine having voted in the negative with nineteen absentees, the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

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

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

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, before I make the motion to adjourn, I would like to make one parliamentary motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I might add to the members of the House, that this will be the last time we have to read this each session. We will arrange tomorrow to have it apply to the rest of the session, so once again, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that unless previous notice is given to the Clerk of the House by some member, of his or her intention to move reconsideration, that the Clerk be authorized to send to the Senate one hour after the House recesses this afternoon, all matters this afternoon passed to be engrossed in concurrence, and all matters acted upon this afternoon that require Sen-

ate concurrence. After such matters have been sent to the Senate by the Clerk in accordance with this unanimous consent agreement no motion to reconsider shall be in order.

The SPEAKER: The House has heard the request for unanimous consent made by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, Does the Chair hear objection to the gentleman's request?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(Off Record Remarks)

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, the House recessed until 7:30 P.M. today.

After Recess
7:30 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to taking up these matters out of order and under suspension of the rules?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

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 Facilities Furnished by Public Utilities for Rate Fixing Purposes" (H. P. 186) (L. D. 249) reporting that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the engrossment of the Bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

(Signed)

HAUGHN of Bridgton
FRAZIER of Lee
PLANTE

of Old Orchard Beach
— Committee on part
of House

MARTIN of Kennebec
LESSARD of Androscoggin
ROGERSON of Aroostook
— Committee on part
of Senate.

Report was read.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: For the purpose of the record, I wish to state that the added language in Section 17 should not be considered as an added factor in the establishment of a rate base. The factor that should be considered by the Public Utilities Commission is contained in Section 18 and the language in Section 17 should not be considered in relation to this section.

Section 17 provides for the statement a general feeling rather than any specific direction as to the establishment of the rate base.

I make this statement so as there may not be any confusion in the future as to the legislative intent. And I now move we recede and concur with the Senate.

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

Mr. BRUCE: I rise to a point of order. Would the remarks of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, be a part of the record which would be perhaps misconstrued or referred to as remarks of the Committee or the Conference Committee, or is that his personal observation? The only report that I have is Senate Amendment 'A'.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must rule that the gentleman is not stating a point of order, he is addressing a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn. The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to answer the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce. This that I read for the record is my own personal feeling as well as some of the other members, but this is not the Committee of Conference. The Committee of Conference is that we recede and concur with the Committee of Conference and the Senate, but the others I have stated for the record.

Thereupon, the Committee of Conference Report was accepted.

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

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Construction Reserve Fund in Department of Finance and Administration" (S. P. 442) (L. D. 1260) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence in the House on May 24.

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

In the House:

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 442, L. D. 1260, Bill, "An Act Relating to Construction Reserve Fund in Department of Finance and Administration."

Amend said Bill by striking out the semicolon at the end of subsection IV of that part designated "Sec. 34-A" and adding to subsection IV the following underlined punctuation and words:

' , except that with respect to allocations from the construction reserve fund, no allocations shall be made for the purpose of acquiring real estate in any municipality until such time as the acquisition has been approved by the governing body of that municipality;'

The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Increasing Sales Tax" (H. P. 986) (L. D. 1410) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendments "A" and "B" and House Amendment "A" in the House earlier today.

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

In the House:

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

**Non-Concurrent Matter
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act Revising the General Laws Relating to Municipalities (H.

P. 320) (L. D. 437) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 24 and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" on May 20.

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 Bangor, Mr. Browne.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, whereas this amendment has just reached our desks, and where it is rather long, I would like an opportunity to look at it, and I move we table this until tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Browne, that this matter be tabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for tomorrow morning. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Cutting of Christmas Trees" (H. P. 1091) (L. D. 1585) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence in the House on May 23.

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

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill "An Act relating to Cutting of Christmas Trees" be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson, that where we are dealing with a non-concurrent matter, the motion to indefinitely postpone is not in order. The motions which would be in order at this time are to recede, to concur, to insist or to adhere. The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, I move we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson, that the House adhere. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that the House recede and concur.

Will those who favor the motion that the House recede and concur please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and fifty-four having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Policy of the Milk Commission" (H. P. 304) (L. D. 421) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 10.

Came from the Senate with the Bill substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Agriculture and passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Roberts.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I move we adhere to our former action.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Roberts, that the House adhere.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House recede. Is this the pleasure of the House? Will those who favor the motion to recede please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-five having voted in the af-

firmative and fifty-three having voted in the negative, the motion to recede prevailed.

Thereupon the Bill was substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report, given its first and second readings and tomorrow assigned.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Repealing Law Prohibiting Riding with a Naked Scythe" (H. P. 454) (L. D. 629) on which the House accepted Report "B" reporting "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Transportation on March 26.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker, I move we adhere.

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

Mr. HERSEY: Mr. Speaker, I move we recede and concur. I further request the House to extend to the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole, an invitation to come in and demonstrate just what this amendment proposes.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey, that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, I know that perhaps the good Speaker hasn't read this amendment—

The SPEAKER: The good Speaker has read the amendment. (laughter) The Chair would say to the House that we are trying to get some work done, and the only way we can get it done is to pay attention to it, so please let's have order.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, that a motion to

indefinitely postpone is not in order since we are dealing with a non-concurrent matter.

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

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker, in order to hasten the end of this session, I would like to ask the parliamentary minds here how we can dispose of this bill the quickest. If my motion to adhere was not the quickest way, I would like to have some other quicker way. That is a question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, that in dealing with a non-concurrent matter, the quickest way of disposing of this item is a motion to adhere, but unfortunately at this time a motion to adhere is not in order since a motion to recede and concur takes priority over a motion to adhere. The Chair would further advise the gentleman that the only way to dispose of the matter in the manner that he desires would be to vote down the motion to recede and concur.

Mr. STILPHEN: Is that question debatable, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is debatable.

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House: May I urge then that the motion to recede and concur be voted down at the earliest moment.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we insist on our former action and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that a motion to recede and concur takes priority over a motion to insist.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is my good colleague's bill, the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, but I appeared before the Committee and said that I would like to see one of the old laws still kept on the books. In the State of Vermont I know there is a law up there that says if you get caught going to church on a Sunday morning without a shotgun you are li-

able for arrest. Now of course you are not liable for arrest here by taking a naked scythe, but I would say here that we should have some old relics on our books. We are getting too modern, it is costing us too much money to run our government. Therefore, let's abide by some of these old decisions that we used to have and the old laws. Therefore, I say let's have this old law on the books.

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

Mrs. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, if this amendment is passed to us in their wisdom by the Senate, I think we should go along with them. They must know better about it than we do.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The previous question has been moved. For the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question the Chair must have the approval of one-third of the members. Will those who favor the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question please rise and remain standing until — obviously more than one-third having risen, the previous question is ordered.

The question before the House now is shall the main question be put now. That motion is debatable with a time limit of five minutes for each member speaking to the motion.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I request a division on the main question.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the main question shall be put now?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The main question is the motion of the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey, that the House recede Bill "An Act Repealing Law Prohibiting Riding with a Naked Scythe", House Paper 454, Legislative Document 629. A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to recede please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Two having voted in the affirmative and one hundred six having voted in the negative, the motion to recede did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, that the House insist upon its former action and request a Committee of Conference.

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker, is this question debatable?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is advised that the fact that we have had a move for the previous question precludes further debate on the item.

Mr. STILPHEN: Was the motion for the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, or on the motion to recede and concur?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is advised that the motion for the previous question applies to all of these motions because all of these motions were pending.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion and make a motion that we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, that the House adhere. Will those who favor the motion to adhere, please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The following House Reports were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Stanley from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Treasurer of State" (H. P. 696) (L. D. 1003)

Report was read.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would just like to say that this same item is covered in another report from the Committee.

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

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, what that statement meant?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, what I just said, I was trying to give you the information that there is another bill which takes in all department heads. This bill was sent out "Ought not to pass" from the Committee, but the same item of increasing the salary of the Treasurer of State will be included in a bill including all the department heads.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris, has addressed another question to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure as I am at liberty to divulge any further information until the Report of the Committee comes onto the calendar of the House. If that is permissible, I would be very glad to give the gentleman the amount.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire through the Chair of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, whether or not these are all in one class unit together or whether we can act upon them in that bill individually. If we turn this one down can we act on the other ones individually rather than collectively all in one bill?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr.

Stanley, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, it would be my opinion that you could act upon the other bill individually, you could amend it in any way that you see fit. I would say that you could act on this one item if you want to on the next bill.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item lie upon the table pending acceptance of the report of the Committee. I am in hopes that other bill will be out tomorrow and I would be willing to have it tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that the Committee Report be tabled and be specially assigned for tomorrow pending acceptance.

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

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

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I move we substitute the bill for the "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that the motion to accept the "Ought not to pass" Report is the pending question. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that no one has moved the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" Report and therefore his motion is in order.

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that the House substitute the Bill for the Report.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, it appears as the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, has stated, this bill is included in an omnibus bill that has not yet seen the floor of the House. For those who would want to put down the amount or raise the amount I believe that would be the appropriate time, so in order to save time I now move that this item and

its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

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

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

The motion prevailed and the Report was indefinitely postponed.

Ought to Pass

Mr. Edwards from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve Providing Funds for the Training of Firemen (H. P. 636) (L. D. 903)

Report was read and accepted, the Resolve read once and tomorrow assigned.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Hours of Selling Liquor" (H. P. 429) (L. D. 605) which was recommitted.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CARPENTER of Somerset
BOUCHER of Androscoggin
WILEY of Hancock
— of the Senate.

Messrs. DOSTIE of Winslow
COUTURE of Lewiston
PIERCE of Bucksport
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. RICH of Charleston
CROCKETT of Freeport
Mrs. CHRISTIE of Presque Isle
Mr. ANTHOINE of Windham
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move the acceptance of the Minority "Ought to pass" Report. I have spoken on

this before, but I just want to take a moment to remind the House that this will put the people who sell liquor on the same time that is prevailing for everyone else. When we are on daylight saving time from April to October, it puts the liquor people on that time. At the present time they are operating on United States Eastern Standard Time which allows them in the summer to operate until 1:00 a.m. by our legal time, and I hope that this bill is accepted and I request a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the Mrs. Christie, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

Will those who favor the motion to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and return the count.

A division of the House was had. Seventy-seven having voted in the affirmative and thirty-four having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read twice and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: Out of order and under suspension of the rules the Chair now lays before the House Supplement number four of the House Advance Journal, Bills in the Third Reading which were assigned for third reading this evening.

Passed to Be Engrossed Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers" (S. P. 574) (L. D. 1577)

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

Mr. Browne of Bangor offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 574, L. D. 1577, Bill "An Act Relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of "Sec. 50" and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Sec. 50, R. S., c. 89, §98, amended. That part of section 98 of chapter

89 of the Revised Statutes, which relates to the salaries of the clerk of courts and the deputy clerk of courts of Penobscot county, as amended by section 1 of chapter 394 of the public laws of 1955, is hereby further amended to read as follows: 'Penobscot, \$3,900 \$4,100; deputy clerk of courts, \$3,100 \$3,600.' "

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

Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey (H. P. 1066) (L. D. 1524)

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

Resolve Authorizing the State of Maine to Convey Certain Land in Bangor (S. P. 604) (L. D. 1606)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the first item on the same sheet under House Calendar Additions, items which were tabled earlier today and assigned specially for this evening. Item number one, Joint Order Relative to Directing Legislative Research Committee to Study Procedures, Etc., tabled earlier in the day by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, pending passage in concurrence.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This Research Committee Request to study procedures of the House, I think is perhaps more important than appears on the surface. As many of you have probably wondered during the session there are changes that could be made to either speed up our procedure or make it possible for us to get through earlier. There are some of us who felt that a special interim Committee should

be set up. I was one of those who agreed with that idea, but in checking around with various people who would serve on the Committee and who would have to concur with this branch's action, it does not appear feasible that an interim Committee would be favorably considered. Therefore, rather than losing the entire worthwhile study, I will at this time move that this Joint Order receive passage in concurrence in the House.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that Joint Order Relative to Directing Legislative Research Committee to Study Procedures, Etc. now receive passage in concurrence. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House item number two, Joint Order Relative to Directing Legislative Research Committee to Study Laws Relating to Electricians and Plumbers, Etc., tabled earlier in today's session by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, pending passage.

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

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will now await a motion from anyone who may desire to remove from the table any of the items remaining under Tabled and Unassigned Matters.

On motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, the House voted to take from the table the fifth tabled and unassigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Establishing a Highway Use Tax", House Paper 843, Legislative Document 1197, tabled on May 23 by that gentleman pending acceptance of either report.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In presenting this bill I was aware of the ser-

ious problem facing the financing of our highway program, and not wanting to vote for any patchwork bills to finance the thing, I took weight distance tax and I still do. Now I feel that this body has spoken, and this act has accomplished a part of my wishes. Therefore, I move that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

On motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Couture, the House voted to take from the table the second tabled and unassigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve Appropriating Monies to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees, House Paper 405, Legislative Document 582, tabled on May 22 by that gentleman pending acceptance of either report.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In order that I might put an amendment on this bill I would ask that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Resolve read once.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My original intent with this piece of legislation was to put into effect the salary plan of the Public Administration Survey as early this year as possible. As the bill calls for it, the

salary plan would take effect the first payroll period in March. As the session went along and we saw that this could not come about, we decided to amend this bill so that it changes it completely. I would like to now present House Amendment "A" to L. D. 582.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 405, L. D. 582, Resolve, Appropriating Moneys to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees."

Amend said Resolve by striking out the first 2 paragraphs after the Emergency preamble and inserting in place thereof the following paragraph:

'Appropriation for proposed salary adjustments.

Resolved: That there be, and hereby is, appropriated from the general fund of the State the sum of \$550,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958 and the sum of \$550,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 to increase the wages for the employees of the State by approximately 4½% by assigning each class of employment to the salary range next above that range to which it is allocated in the "Recommended Revised Salary Plan dated September, 1956;" and be it further'

Further amend said Resolve by striking out the Emergency clause at the end, before the Statement of Facts, and inserting in place thereof the following Emergency clause:

'Emergency clause. In view of the emergency cited in the preamble, this resolve shall take effect for the first payroll period ending in July, 1957.'

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

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to ask if this raise will give the \$42.00 attendant \$48.00?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp, directs a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Yes, that is correct. The Attendant I would go from \$42.00 with the increase which we have given them in the supplemental

to \$46.00. This particular amendment would bring them to \$48.00.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Stanley of Bangor, House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve assigned for second reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: There remain on the table and unassigned calendar two items, items three and six. Does either of the members who tabled those items care to remove either of them at this time?

The Chair would advise the House that under the terms of the order which the House passed giving the Chair authority to remove items from the table, the order specifies that that authority would prevail on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. This being Monday the Chair is not at liberty to take it off the table.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, would I be in order to request that we suspend the rules and make the order effective today?

(Cries of "no")

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the only way that that could be done would be by unanimous consent. If the gentleman would wish to make a unanimous consent request to that effect, the Chair will entertain the request.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am under the impression that this House unanimously wants to adjourn as soon as possible and that we are unanimous in wanting to work. Therefore, I request unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. Does the Chair hear objection to the request for unanimous consent? The Chair hears objection and the request is denied.

Mr. Rich of Charleston presented the following Order out of order and under suspension of the rules:

House Order Out of Order Tabled and Assigned

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, requested to study the laws, rulings,

policies and practices of the State Liquor Commission with regard to evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of the enforcement of the liquor code and of the disposition of violations thereof, and to recommend measures to be taken, if need therefor be shown, to implement and make more effective the administration of the enforcement activities of the Liquor Commission; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee report the results of its findings and recommendations to the 99th Legislature. (H. P. 1105)

(On motion of Mr. Rich of Charleston, tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending passage, the Order to be reproduced and distributed to the members desks.)

The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Browne, was granted permission to approach the rostrum.

Mr. Stilphen of Rockland, presented the following order out of order and under suspension of the rules:

House Order Out of Order Tabled and Assigned

ORDERED, that all matters tabled and unassigned be removed in order on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen has presented this order and moves its passage. The Chair will advise the gentleman that passage of this order must have unanimous consent.

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to enter into debate tonight, but I would like to have it take effect in future weeks.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, desire this to be on the record?

Mr. STILPHEN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: According to the rules of the House, any change or alteration or amendments to House rules must be tabled for one day before they may be acted upon. Therefore, the Chair will rule that the order presented by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, will be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending passage.

Thereupon the Order was so tabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair notes that there is just one item remaining with which we might deal tonight, item six on page ten. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, I really have no objection to discussing this particular thing tonight. However, I would prefer to wait and see what action they take in the other branch on the bill that we just acted upon tonight before taking this off the table.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's wishes will be recognized.

On motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, the House voted to take from the table the third tabled and unassigned matter, House Divided Report, Report "A" reporting "Ought to pass" and Report "B" reporting "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Hours for Public Dance Halls", House Paper 227, Legislative Document 322, tabled on May 22 by that gentleman pending the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, to accept Report "B".

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, the reason I did not take this matter off the table is because I consider it a companion bill with one of the divided reports which was on our advance journal tonight which is the bill relating to the Hours of Selling Liquor, and at the present time the situation in the State of Maine is this, that you can go into any cocktail lounge or any other place and you can drink to one o'clock and you have to cease dancing at twelve. As far as I am concerned I felt it was a rather ridiculous situation that a person could drink 'til one and only dance until twelve, because you can play baseball, softball, go to the movies and bowl and do many other things on Sunday, but for some unknown reason you cannot dance until one o'clock. So therefore, the only reason that I had for not taking this off the table was because I wanted to see how the matter that I just referred to was

disposed of. If it ended up that we passed the matter which we passed on tonight then I myself would have moved the indefinite postponement of this matter, but if the matter goes to the other body and the other body kills it over there then I should have moved for the "A" Report. So I move the matter lie upon the table.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that both reports be tabled unassigned pending the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that the House accept Report "B".

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

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested.

Will those who favor the motion to table made by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

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

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Speaker, I request the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: A roll call vote has been requested. In order for the Chair to order a roll call vote it must have the expression of desire for a roll call by at least one-fifth of the House. Will those who desire a roll call vote on this matter, please rise and remain standing until the —obviously less than one-fifth having risen, the request is denied.

Forty-seven having voted in the affirmative and sixty-one having voted in the negative the motion to table did not prevail.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I now move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that both reports on Bill "An Act relating to Hours for Public Dance Halls" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn. If people can drink until twelve o'clock, I not only think that they should be able to dance until one, but they should be forced to dance until one to wear it off.

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

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, in defense of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, seeing that this other bill has had its two readings, the companion bill, how would one go about getting the bill substituted for the report and have it progress at the same speed?

The SPEAKER: Did the Chair understand the gentleman moved to substitute the bill for the report?

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would state that that motion would not be in order. The motion before the House is the motion to indefinitely postpone which would take precedence.

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

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, in order to do what the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, would like to accomplish, I would suggest voting against the indefinite postponement, allowing Report "A" to be accepted to ride along with the other bill and at such time as we can determine what shall happen to that one we can take proper action on this one.

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

Mr. BEYER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In fairness to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, who obviously took that bill off reluctantly, I hope you will not go along at this time with the motion for indefinite postponement.

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

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that this bill should not pass. It is my

feeling that dancing should not be continued into Sunday morning and that is what would be true if this bill were passed. I feel perhaps there are some things we disagree on but it seems to me that most of us would feel that it is better not to have dancing on Sunday morning, and so I hope that this motion to accept Report "A" will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentlewoman that the question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, would not another motion to table take preference?

The SPEAKER: A motion to table would take preference.

Mr. HATHAWAY: I move that this be tabled until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, that both reports on Bill "An Act relating to Hours for Public Dance Halls, House Paper 227, Legislative Document 322, be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. 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.

Ninety having voted in the affirmative and thirteen having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the reports and Bill were so tabled.

(Off Record Remarks)

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, would I be in order to ask consent to have the Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees, under suspension of the rules given its second reading so that they would have it in the Senate tomorrow?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that such a request is in order but it is necessary that he obtain unanimous consent.

Mr. STANLEY: I would request unanimous consent for same.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, requests unanimous consent to reconsider the assignment for tomorrow of Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees, House Paper 405, Legislative Document 582, and moves that it be given its second reading at this time. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Resolve was given its second reading and having been reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, before I make a motion to adjourn, I think it should be explained that I am going to move we reconvene at 10:00 because we do not have any items to work on until the other branch has met tomorrow morning.

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor,

Adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.