

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

Ninety-Eighth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1957

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Tuesday, May 28, 1957

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Alfred Ives of Gardiner.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee on Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to Bounty on Bears" (H. P. 159) (L. D. 206) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

STORM of Sherman
HARRINGTON of Patten
BROCKWAY of Milo

—Committee on part of House.

CARPENTER of Somerset
BRIGGS of Aroostook
SILSBY of Hancock

—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

15 Minutes Recess

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

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

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 today to send to the Senate 30 minutes after House action all matters passed to be engrossed in concurrence, and all matters 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 objections to the gentleman's request?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(Off Record)

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to Superintending School Committee of City of Portland" (H. P. 835) (L. D. 1191) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. TEVANIAN of Portland
MAYNARD of Portland
CHILDS of Portland

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have just come from the other body in which there are still on the table, literally speaking over in that branch, about a dozen committee of conference reports. I think it is only fair to say at this point that because of the pressure of adjournment, very few of those remaining committees of conference are receiving the attention and consideration I think some of us hope to receive in a committee of conference. My only point in arising is that as we go down the calendar today those who arise and request a committee of conference I think should appreciate realistically that the possibility of getting together quietly and discussing the compromise measures are very limited at this point in the legislature.

Paper from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

May 27, 1957

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

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

Bill "An Act relating to Bounty on Bears" (H. P. 159) (L. D. 206)

Senators:

CARPENTER of Somerset
BRIGGS of Aroostook
SILSBY of Hancock

Bill "An Act to Authorize the Construction of a Bridge Across the Passagassawaukeag River at Belfast" (H. P. 997) (L. D. 1425)

Senators:

PARKER of Piscataquis
FERGUSON of Oxford
DAVIS of Cumberland

The Senate on May 24 voted to adhere to its former action whereby it voted on May 23 to indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act relating to Registration of Farm Trucks" (H. P. 404) (L. D. 534)

The Senate on May 24 voted to adhere to its former action on Bill "An Act Regulating Public Utilities Engaged in Non-Utility Business" (S. P. 276) (L. D. 735) whereby it voted on April 25 to accept the "Ought not to pass" Report.

Respectfully,

(Signed) WALDO H. CLARK
Assistant Secretary
of Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Orders Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

Mr. Ross of Brownville presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research mittee be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to study the operations of the warden service, including the service rendered by biologists, within the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game with the end in view to make such services more efficient and effective; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee report the results of its study to the 99th Legislature. (H. P. 1106)

On motion of Mr. Ross of Brownville, tabled pending reproduction and distribution to the members desks and assigned for later in today's session.

Tabled and Assigned

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

ORDERED, that the rules of the House be amended by adding at the end of Rule 1, the following paragraph:

And to appoint a Clerk of the House to fill any vacancy that may occur in that office while the Legislature is not in session. A Clerk so appointed shall serve until the House in session shall elect a Clerk.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Although we hope that he does not decide to do this, this would take care of a vacancy in the office of the Clerk in case our most competent and astute incumbent, Mr. Harvey Pease, decides to retire after this session, and this would give the Speaker authority to appoint a Clerk to fill out the unexpired term.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that this Order receive passage. The Chair will rule that this being an amendment to the House rules, it is required that this Order lie on the table until the next legislative day before it may receive final action. It is so ordered.

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

House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Increase Salaries of Justices of Supreme Judicial Court and Superior Court" (H. P. 310) (L. D. 427) which was recommitted, reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1103) (L. D. 1608) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Mr. Bean from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Various Department Heads and Commissions" (H. P. 449) (L. D. 685) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1104) (L. D. 1609) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted and the New Draft read twice.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, offers House Amendment "A" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1104, L. D. 1609, Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Various Department Heads and Commissions."

Amend said Bill in "Sec. 3" by striking out the last 2 paragraphs and inserting in place thereof the following paragraphs:

"The Treasurer of State shall receive an annual salary of \$6,000 \$8,000. ; he He shall receive no other fee, emolument or perquisite."

(There is hereby appropriated from the general fund the sum of \$2,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958 and \$2,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 to carry out the purposes of this section.)"

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, my only point in arising is to ask a question through the Chair of any member of the Appropriations Committee to explain to this House why this particular department head should be singled out for a special increase.

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

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: In this particular bill, L. D. 1609, each department head has been increased by twelve and one-half per cent. We thought that being fair with one would be fair with another, so the increase of twelve and a half per cent went for all of them. Does that answer the question?

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, consider his question answered?

Does the gentleman wish to continue?

Mr. STANLEY: If I may.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STANLEY: With that thought in mind I would move indefinite postponement of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, that the House now indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The present annual salary of our sixteen department heads averages \$8,000, some get \$10,000, some get more. With this present increase of course they would get twelve and a half per cent. The State Treasurer gets \$6,000 a year, which has developed into a full time job, and during the past biennium he through his efforts has made for the State of Maine by the investment of surplus funds \$1,170,-318.14. There is no other department head that makes a nickel for the State. And he puts his effort into it and it is a full time job. And that salary has been away down there when it used to be a part time proposition. And I believe that he is entitled to the average. The average of the Treasurers in the five New England States is \$8,500. And I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I too want to concur with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, because I believe it is low pay for the responsibility of this particular man, and you take twelve and a half per cent of his total against twelve and a half for the others, it is not to me a fair comparison. And I hope when the motion is taken it is taken by division and I hope the motion does not prevail for indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is very embarrassing for me to arise and perhaps appear to be in the position of trying to deny a man an increase, which apparently to some of the members of the House they feel he is entitled. However, I think each of you have seen the Appropriations Committee face the test of fire here on far bigger questions as to cuts. And apparently this House, with one minor exception, has backed up its Appropriations Committee. Here is a bill that has come out of Appropriations Committee who had the benefit of studying various department head salaries over the past months. I think it would be unfair to the other department heads for this House to come in here piecemeal and more or less on the spur of the moment arbitrarily raise one man. I would think the other department heads would feel as though they had not taken advantage of perhaps contacting members of the House and asking them to also intercede. I personally want to back up our Appropriations Committee and vote for the indefinite postponement.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly hope we go along with the indefinite postponement of this amendment. Furthermore, I would like to have someone explain to me why the

Appropriations Committee felt it necessary to raise the salaries twelve and a half per cent.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member of the Appropriations Committee who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before the Appropriations Committee was the P.A.S. recommended pay plan for heads of departments. Their recommendations were quite a bit higher than the ones that we came up with. We felt that they were too high, but we did feel that there was a need for some increase, that since the last biennium State employees have had a raise in pay, and we felt that the department heads should have an increase too. The twelve and a half per cent was arrived at after studying the fact that some people had an increase of fifteen per cent, some had had an increase of nine per cent, and some four and a half per cent. It is a little difficult to tell you just how we arrived at the twelve and a half per cent, but we did feel that that was a fair figure and gave everyone the same increase. It was not nearly as much as was recommended in the P.A.S. plan.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentlewoman from Falmouth consider her question answered?

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have done a lot of raising here, we have raised the sales tax, we have raised the automobile license, we have raised the car license, and I would be very reluctant not to raise the department heads. I think it is in order to have a raise all the way around, but I would be glad to vote with anyone who wanted to move indefinite postponement of this bill.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wish to go along with my portly friend from Belfast, Mr. Rollins. He has explained to you that

the average over the eight states of the Secretary or the Treasurer is \$8,500, that is right. Now, coming from Madison I find that I had to accept part of what I went after from the Appropriations Committee, and I was happy to get it, although it was just half of what I asked for. And being the only man here from Madison and looking over these figures, I notice that even with the increase this Treasurer of ours will still be a thousand dollars under. It seems to be kind of rough treatment for the men from Madison. Our State Treasurer happens to come from there too.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion for indefinite postponement of the amendment carries. I would like to go on record here now as a member of this Legislature to be very much in disagreement with the Appropriations Committee for going along and giving the low classified employees a four and a half per cent increase and giving the top men a twelve and a half per cent increase. I think that this is a direct slap in the face at little people who are not getting enough today to bring up their families. And I am sorry to see that this thing has happened in this session of the Legislature.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel ashamed just for one thing, to go home and say that we have had to raise all these taxes and also raise these department heads who are now getting more than the Governor. I think we belittle the job of the Governor of the State of Maine when we increase these salaries. I think they are being well paid, they are being paid as much as some states much bigger than ours at the present time. Therefore, I am opposed to not only the amendment but the whole bill. And I now move that we indefinitely postpone the whole bill and its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that the motion to indefinitely postpone the amendment

must take precedence over a motion to postpone the bill.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, the increase which we granted the employees last night was a four and one-half per cent increase across the board. In the supplemental budget there was an increase which averaged about nine per cent across the board, making it a total of about thirteen and a half per cent. So that the people in the smaller pay brackets were used a little bit better than the department heads.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A". A division has been requested.

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

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-three having voted in the affirmative and thirty-seven having voted in the negative the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I now move indefinite postponement of the bill.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that with respect to Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Various Department Heads and Commissions", House Paper 449, Legislative Document 685, in new draft House Paper 1104, Legislative Document 1609, that the Committee Report be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks.

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker, I request a division when the vote is taken.

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

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from

Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that the House indefinitely postpone the Bill and all accompanying papers.

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

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think somebody should stand up here and say that I hope that motion does not prevail. If we are going to grant pay increases for employees then it surely would be kind of discouraging for department heads who have a lot more responsibility and take their jobs much more seriously in most instances, and work hard and long hours at it, if they aren't given some increase. So therefore I hope that this motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I more or less go along with the remarks of the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Allen. I would say that in this PAS Report in many of these cases of these department heads that a raise of fifty per cent had been recommended. The Appropriations didn't feel like going along with any such an increase as that at this time. They did more or less compromise on the twelve and a half per cent, feeling that some raise was justified, and we felt that we could defend our position on that raise. I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There is no hardship on any of these department heads. They are all getting a wage that they can live on very comfortably, and on some of the lower income tax brackets there is actually a hardship. They couldn't actually exist on the wages they were getting. That is not so in these department heads, and neither is it so that they are not replaceable. There isn't a man that works for the State that isn't replaceable. And besides there is the Governor, someone spoke of belittling the men getting a raise under these department heads. If we raise those folks I still say we are belittling the post in our State of Governor, \$10,000 or

whatever it may be, and these department heads getting as much or more. And after all, they are under or should be under the Chief Executive at least, and I hope the motion does prevail.

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley. Does the pay raises as designated in L. D. 1609 constitute the entire raise for the department heads or are they also taken care of in the supplemental budget?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: The Bill 1609 is the complete raise in pay for the department heads, there is nothing in the supplemental budget for that purpose. I would say that when we have left these halls we will entrust carrying on the various bills and various policy issues that we have made here to the department heads to carry on. I think that they are in need of a pay raise, whether twelve and a half per cent is the correct one or not I am not to say, that was our recommendation. I do feel that they need a raise in pay. As to the Governor's pay, that is something very much different. The Governor has an expense account and he has his house provided to him. I would hope that the motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. MAYNARD: As I understand it the raise to be granted to the heads of departments is twelve and a half per cent, is that correct? And the employees four and a half per cent.—

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman addressing a question to anyone in particular or to anybody?

Mr. MAYNARD: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, is ad-

dressing a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer.

Mr. STANLEY: The raise for the employees in the supplemental budget was roughly nine and a half per cent, nine per cent, and in the bill we passed last night it is four and a half per cent, a total of thirteen and a half.

Mr. MAYNARD: May I comment on that?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MAYNARD: Of course twelve and a half per cent of \$8,000 is a lot more money than the thirteen per cent or whatever it is of say \$4,000. In other words, the heads of departments are getting a much larger increase than the people actually who need an increase much more. And in that way it seems an unfair proposition. However, I can see the advantage in paying more money to these department heads, I can go along with that. But I still think we are away below what we ought to be as far as the employees are concerned.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. MORRILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley. Is it true that some of the people in the Treasurer's Department are getting more money now than the Treasurer?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Morrill, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry, I can't answer this gentleman's question. If some people in the Treasurer's Department get more money than the Treasurer I am not aware of it.

The SPEAKER: Is there any member of the House that can answer the question of the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Morrill?

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I was advised this morning talking to the Treasurer, that his assistant re-

ceives more pay than what he does, the Treasurer himself. Does that answer the question?

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to Mr. Stanley. As the P.A.S. Report recommended up to, varying amounts, but up to fifty per cent for department heads, what did the P.A.S. Report recommend for the employees of the State?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: In the P.A.S. Report the average increase recommended for employees was roughly nine per cent. Some of them got more than that. The attendants at the institutions, engineers, and I think one other category got more than the nine per cent, but the average was about nine. The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, just passed me a paper which shows that clerks, clerk stenographers got an increase of about four and a half per cent. Attendants, nurses, correctional officers, guards, laundry workers, housekeepers and so forth got nine per cent. House parents, teachers, thirteen and a half per cent. Physicians went up roughly twenty-two per cent.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Belfast consider his question answered? Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. BESSE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for information, I don't know just how to go about it. But supposing this bill is voted down, would there be any way that an increase of five per cent perhaps could be given to these department heads instead of twelve and a half?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Besse, that this bill now under consideration is the only bill dealing with salaries of department heads. If this bill were indefinitely postponed there would be nothing further that could be done. Does

the gentleman from Clinton consider his question answered?

Mr. BESSE: I do, that part of it. Then the way to bring that about would be to vote down this move for indefinite postponement and add an amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr. BESSE: I think that would be the way to accomplish this thing.

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to arise to support the Appropriations Committee. They have made a thorough study of this. It seems to me that they are in a much better position than we are to determine just what should be done. Certainly you want good executives as heads of your departments, and certainly this is also true, that the various heads have different responsibilities. It seems to me that we can do nothing other than go along with what the Appropriations Committee has done if we want to have good executives. And from various stories that I have seen in the papers about what college graduates are now getting and what they are offered, we are certainly not going to be able to keep our present executives if they are good ones unless we go along with a substantial raise.

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

Mr. MORRILL: Mr. Speaker, I just received an answer on a question that I had. This is just one case, there may be more, but the Treasurer is getting \$6,000, the assistant is getting \$6,344. If you increase the higher pay bracket thirteen per cent and the other one twelve and a half, your department head is going to be the lower paid man in the department.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, that Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Various Department Heads and Commissions", House Paper 1104, Legislative Document 1609, and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

Those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone the Bill will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twelve having voted in the affirmative and one hundred and one having voted in the negative, the motion for indefinite postponement did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of County Attorneys and Assistant County Attorneys" (S. P. 572) (L. D. 1575)

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

Resolve Providing Funds for the Training of Firemen (H. P. 636) (L. D. 903)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Policy of the Milk Commission" (H. P. 304) (L. D. 421)

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

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Both because of reasons of conscience and dictates of reason alone I am going to have to move indefinite postponement of item four, L. D. 421.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, that Bill "An Act relating to Policy of the Milk Commission" and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winthrop, Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill would not put the Milk Commission out of commission. All it asks is that the industry recognize its problems and together with the Commission and the Department of Agriculture try to find solutions to

those problems in some other manner than through governmental regulations. For the past twenty-two years the Commission has been concerned with administering the present law. Little if any attention has been paid to finding answers to the basic problem. I think it is about time these problems were studied.

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Those of you who still have your L. D.'s in front of you, I wish you would go to 421. The bill reads in this way: "The Commission in administering the provisions of this chapter shall adopt such policies as are consistent with the promotion of marketing programs which progressively eliminate those conditions in the milk industry necessitating the present law. The Commission shall cooperate with the Commissioner of Agriculture and with representatives of the Commissioner of Agriculture and with representatives of the promotion of marketing programs to implement such policies."

Now for the sake of comparison, I would like to substitute a few words here as it would apply to the Liquor Commission. "The Commission in administering the provisions of this chapter shall adopt such policies as are consistent with the promotion of marketing programs which progressively eliminate those conditions in the liquor industry necessitating the present law. The Commission shall cooperate with the Commissioner of Liquor and with the representatives of the industry in devising marketing programs to implement such policies."

I think that this kind of Bill here is a bad and a dangerous statement of policy. First of all, the conditions that supposedly exist within the milk industry and this bill is supposed to hand over a mandate to the Commission. The words "eliminate those conditions" is a nebulous kind of term. I think that what is really involved here, I think this is so important, and I have said this before in speaking on this bill here, that really what we are considering here, we are saying that controls of any sort are bad, and really the problem in the area of the dairy industry when we are constantly try-

ing to seek the best kind of controls, not the worst kind of controls. Whether or not controls should be eliminated or whether they should be kept on or whether they should be improved or whether they should be refined and changed. But this bill here gives the Commissioner and compels him with a mandate to eliminate controls or to work to the eventual elimination of controls whether controls may or may not be good or bad for the milk industry. And so I think it follows necessarily that this bill 421 hands over to the Commissioner and compels him to do something which may or may not be good for the milk industry. I think the same thing that applies in a sense to the Liquor Commission, or any other kind of governmental agency. We set up controls and we try to select those controls that will do the best kind of job for us, but this bill here, 421, is a statement of policy saying "Period, controls are wrong." We know that in other areas where we have found a most workable kind of solution we haven't proceeded along that kind of policy. I think this bill here in that — inasmuch as that does hand over that to the Commissioner and compel him to seek those kind of conditions which eliminate controls is a statement of policy saying controls are not bad, and by any reason of imagination I cannot go along with the idea that controls in themselves are per se wrong, and I would urge you then to vote for the indefinite postponement of this bill and accompanying papers.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly hope that you are not going to make the same comparison that the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, has made as far as Commissions are concerned. We certainly cannot compare the Liquor Commission with the Milk Commission. The Liquor Commission is a monopoly which the State has and which has to be controlled. It is a well-known fact that liquor has to be controlled and it has been cited in many, many opinions. Now as far

as controls themselves per se being bad, in my opinion, actual controls which is in competitive business per se is bad, and if we have been striving for many, many years to get rid of governmental controls, and even the men who are in the milk industry will say that governmental controls are not good and that we eventually should work toward abolishing them. All this bill is going to do is for the Commission to take into consideration certain procedures and so forth which will eventually eliminate the Commission, and I certainly hope that the gentleman's motion does not prevail and I request a division when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Frost.

Mr. FROST: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't seem to me that the answer to this bill would be indefinite postponement. As I understand it the Research Committee came out with this bill and we turned it down here once before and it has been revived in the Senate, and at this late hour it doesn't seem to me that we are going to gain anything by throwing this out the window. I would certainly hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail. I can see no reason why this would be any hardship to the milkman, it is duplicate to the measures in the 1214 bill instead of improvement, and I hope you don't go along with this indefinite postponement. I went along with it once.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winthrop, Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Most of you will agree, at least those of you who know anything about the milk industry, that there are problems in that industry. It doesn't seem right to keep on ignoring those problems, they should be studied and studied by people who know something about them, the milk industry, the Milk Commission and the Department of Agriculture. If there is a possibility of stabilizing that industry without governmental regulation, we should do it. The controls are not in keeping with our basic philosophy of free enterprise. If you have a terrible pain in your side and go

to a doctor you certainly expect him to relieve that pain, but you also hope that he will remove the basic trouble in your side.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, that Bill "An Act relating to Policy of the Milk Commission", House Paper 304, Legislative Document 421, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. 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.

Twenty having voted in the affirmative and ninety-nine having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Registration Fees for Farm Trucks" (S. P. 349) (L. D. 929)

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. 598) (L. D. 1603)

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

Bill "An Act relating to the Licensing and Distribution of Trading Stamps" (H. P. 831) (L. D. 1187)

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

Bill "An Act Creating Office of Hearing Examiner under Liquor Law" (S. P. 558) (L. D. 1553)

Bill "An Act relating to Employment of Certain Persons" (H. P. 782) (L. D. 1115)

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

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

Resolve Authorizing Survey and Plans for a Maine-Quebec Highway (S. P. 235) (L. D. 635)

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

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

**Passed to Be Enacted
Enactor Requiring
Two-Thirds Vote**

An Act to Authorize Ferry Service for North Haven, Vinalhaven, Islesboro and Swan's Island (H. P. 1081) (L. D. 1555)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a division was had. 130 voted in favor of the same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Appropriate Moneys for Legislative Expenditures for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1957 (S. P. 599) (L. D. 1605)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 129 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 Enacted

An Act relating to Compensation for Specified Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Act (S. P. 355) (L. D. 961)

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

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

Enactor

Passed Over Temporarily

An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law (S. P. 419) (L. D. 1178)

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

(At the request of Mr. Karkos of Lisbon, passed over temporarily.)

An Act to Revise the Inland Fish and Game Laws (S. P. 565) (L. D. 1571)

An Act relating to Maintaining Financial Responsibility in Motor Vehicle Accidents (H. P. 252) (L. D. 313)

An Act relating to Pollution Abatement (H. P. 257) (L. D. 355)

An Act Authorizing Sunset Real Estate Corporation to Construct a Bridge Across Medomak River (H. P. 424) (L. D. 601)

An Act relating to Hunting with Bow and Arrow (H. P. 742) (L. D. 1056)

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

An Act relating to Location of Harness Race Meets (H. P. 819) (L. D. 1162)

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

An Act relating to Bank Deposits or Loan and Building Shares in Two or More Names (H. P. 918) (L. D. 1308)

An Act relating to Sales Financing of Motor Vehicles (H. P. 993) (L. D. 1421)

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 Arbitration Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Contracts (H. P. 1099) (L. D. 1599)

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

(At the request of Mr. Tevanian of Portland, passed over temporarily.)

**Enactor
Passed Over Temporarily**

Resolve Appropriating Additional Funds for Certain Construction at Portland Municipal Airport (S. P. 168) (L. D. 447)

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

(At the request of Mr. Jacques of Lewiston, passed over temporarily.)

Finally Passed

Resolve Providing for Survey of Abandoned Agricultural Lands (H. P. 522) (L. D. 750)

Resolve for Repairs to Teachers' House at Peter Dana Point, Washington County (H. P. 1097) (L. D. 1596)

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

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law (S. P. 419) (L. D. 1178), item 4, which was passed over temporarily.

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

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: There has been an amendment attached to this bill which is really objectionable. The purpose of this bill—this amendment originally was a bill itself, 1111. If this bill was passed it simply means this, that if a person worked for an employer for a number of years and this employer paid and set up an annuity policy or a pension plan, if this bill passes this money will be deducted provided he is entitled to unemployment insurance. Now, a man can have a thousand dollars coming in, or he could have almost anything, ten houses, income. But this here would penalize the man who has worked possibly forty or fifty years for an employer. Furthermore, this was a deductible expense on the employer's income tax, but it is an income that is taxable to the employee. Therefore I would like to make a motion if that is the proper procedure, that the amendment be killed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that in order

to accomplish what he wants the House would first have to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. KARKOS: I move that we reconsider our action.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that the reconsideration must be done under suspension of the rules and must have the approval of two-thirds of the House. Does the gentleman move reconsideration?

Mr. KARKOS: I do.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, that the House reconsider its action under suspension of the rules whereby it passed to be engrossed Bill "An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law" on May 22.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, has mentioned, this was originally a bill, L. D. 1111, and it had to do with pensions and not allowing those pensions to be included when a person collected unemployment compensation. Now, that had to be amended to take care of social security because it was not the intent that social security should be included. At that time it was decided that the best way to amend it was to amend the main bill, the clarification bill, which is the one before you now, 1178. And at that time and at the time of the amendment I spoke before the House and I mentioned the reasons for it. Now, this year we have given a lot to labor, and industry had in three small bills, one dealing with holidays, one dealing with disqualifications and this one dealing with pensions. The comparison in the benefits to the working man is negligible. The Legislature is certainly giving labor a great deal more than they are giving to industry. But there are some union people who are never satisfied unless they just get everything with nothing given in return. I have mentioned several times that industry and labor got together and agreed to these things. Now, I will admit that not every person in the House who is a union man or labor man agreed, certainly they did not. But the head of the

Federated Unions of the State of Maine did agree to these, industry did agree, and I certainly hope that we do not reconsider it at this time.

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

Mr. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the question is, take anyone that is now getting a pension from a corporation, will he be deprived of that through social security or unemployment insurance?

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, under the procedure of the Employment Security Commission when a man is out of work, if the bill is passed by this Legislature, if he is out of work and cannot find work in his line he will receive \$33 a week. The Legislature in its wisdom has deemed that that is the amount that he shall receive. Now, if a company also is paying a man \$10 or \$15 a week that will be deducted from the \$33. It did not seem wise to industry, and labor as I said, the head of the Federated Labor Union agreed that it did not seem wise that just because he was out of work he should receive both the unemployment compensation plus the pension for that time.

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

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker, why should the man be penalized? This is something he earned previous to that, the company had attached—

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman addressing a question to any particular individual?

Mr. KARKOS: I am addressing my remarks to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. KARKOS: The question is why should a man be penalized after working a number of years, the

company had a tax deduction on the income tax, and why should he be penalized for the reward he got for being faithful and conscientious in the performance of his duties? Then if he continues to work like a lot of people have to, why should he be penalized, if he is entitled to \$33 a week under this law, why should this be deducted at his age, some of them are as high as 65 and 70.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, I certainly don't think a man should be penalized, but I don't consider when we consider this law of unemployment compensation that he is being penalized. Now, if this was the one thing that we had before us I would say that the stand of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, would be absolutely justifiable. But we don't, we have several things. And I still say in this type of thing, they just have to be negotiated, they have been negotiated. I certainly have tried to explain that stand on the floor of this House, and as I say, it is not the merits of this one particular bill, it is the overall picture that we should be considering.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker, let me also state this, that prior to 1954 there were only twenty-one per cent disqualifications when it came to unemployment insurance, and at the present time there is about sixty-three. There are persons that go and register after being laid off, there is one disqualification or another, they are just deprived of something, and it was the intent in the first place to give these people enough money to support their families. But when they go before a deputy, what does he say, "Well, I am sorry, but you can appeal and go up higher." And they keep on doing that. And a lot of them even give it up because they are not attorneys, understand, and don't understand this. I think

that we should consider it especially and cease these disqualifications.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, if the contract with the company that has negotiated a pension plan in their plant, and the person has retired after 65, in our contract that we used to have the company could keep them on until 69, and then he could be disqualified if they saw fit, will he be then penalized for the pension that was negotiated by the union and the company for drawing unemployment insurance?

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, as far as being penalized from the rights derived from the contract he has signed, no, he would not be penalized there, but his unemployment compensation would be cut down accordingly.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, that the House reconsider its action whereby it passed to be engrossed on May 22, Bill "An Act to Clarify the Employment Security Law", Senate Paper 419, Legislative Document 1178. This reconsideration must be conducted under suspension of the rules, and in order to prevail must have the approval of two-thirds of the House.

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

A division of the House was had.

Twenty-seven having voted in the affirmative and seventy-six 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.

Enactor Reconsidered

An Act relating to Arbitration Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Contracts (H. P. 1099) (L. D. 1599), item 15, which was passed over temporarily.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, under suspension of the rules I would now move that we reconsider our action of some time ago and reconsider this Legislative Document 1599 so I can offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, moves that under suspension of the rules the House reconsider its action whereby on May 24 it passed to be engrossed Bill "An Act relating to Arbitration Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Contracts".

Will those who favor the motion to reconsider the action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Sixty-five having voted in the affirmative and twenty-five having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider prevailed.

Mr. Tevanian of Portland offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 1099, L. D. 1599, Bill, "An Act Relating to Arbitration Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Contracts.

Amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 21-A" by adding after the underlined words "contract or" in the 3rd line the underlined words 'out of'.

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 21-A" by adding after the underlined words "contract, or" in the 5th line the underlined word 'such'.

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 21-H" by striking out all of the last underlined sentence in subsection "IV".

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 21-H" by adding at the end thereof the following underlined paragraph:

'Where an award is vacated and the time within which the agreement required the award to be made has not expired, the Court may, in its discretion, direct a rehearing by the arbitrators.'

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

Finally Passed

Resolve Appropriating Additional Funds for Certain Construction at Portland Municipal Airport (S. P. 168) (L. D. 447), item 16, which was passed over temporarily.

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

Mr. JACQUES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Two years ago the Legislature appropriated \$250,000 as the State's twenty-five per cent share in the construction of a new runway in the City of Portland. The City of Portland put up an equal amount and the federal government put up the balance. It came to construction difficulties, trouble with the contractor, employment of a new one, and a suit against the original contractor and it appeared that the cost of the project will be \$1,600,000 instead of the original \$1,100,000, estimated. So the State is being asked to kick in another \$150,000. We do not know who is to blame for the costly project, a mistake of one or the other. I do not oppose providing a Portland Airport another runway, which is badly needed, but what does concern me, is the fact that the State failed to protect the taxpayers money. I would like to table this for later on today.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jacques, that Resolve Appropriating Additional Funds for Certain Construction at Portland Municipal Airport be tabled and specially assigned for latter in the day pending final passage. 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.

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

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve Authorizing Attorney General to Investigate Title to Certain Island in B. Pond, Piscataquis County (H. P. 614) (L. D. 861) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed) DUDLEY of Enfield
HARRIS of Greenville
ROLLINS of Belfast
— Committee on part of House.

BUTLER of Franklin
FARLEY of York
FERGUSON of Oxford
— Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act to License and Regulate Operation of Trading Stamp Companies" (H. P. 895) (L. D. 1281) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed) HAUGHN of Bridgton
DUDLEY of Enfield
MORRILL of Harrison
— Committee on part of House.

CARPENTER of Somerset
FARLEY of York
LESSARD
of Androscoggin
— Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

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 Apprentice Lobster Fishing Licenses" (S. P. 137) (L. D. 274) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed) MILLER of Portland
FARMER of Wiscasset
HAUGHN of Bridgton
— Committee on part of House.

PIKE of Oxford
 COLE of Waldo
 HURLEY of Kennebec
 —Committee on part
 of Senate.

Report was read and accepted
 and sent up for concurrence.

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 Initial Motor Vehicle Number Plates" (H. P. 957) (L. D. 1358) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed) HAUGHN of Bridgton
 CROCKETT of Freeport
 STILPHEN of Rockland
 —Committee on part
 of House.

COLE of Waldo
 FERGUSON of Oxford
 ROGERSON
 of Aroostook
 —Committee on part
 of Senate.

Report was read and accepted
 and sent up for concurrence.

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 Local Option for Sale of Liquor by Certain Part-time Hotels" (H. P. 665) (L. D. 946) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed) JALBERT of Lewiston
 HANCOCK of York
 PIERCE of Bucksport
 —Committee on part
 of House.
 CARPENTER of Somerset
 WILLEY of Hancock
 BOUCHER

of Androscoggin
 —Committee on part
 of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and
 sent up for concurrence.

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 Services of State Police on Maine Turnpike"

(H. P. 106) (L. D. 144) reporting
 that they are unable to agree.

(Signed) CROCKETT of Freeport
 HAUGHN of Bridgton
 JALBERT of Lewiston
 —Committee on part
 of House.

PARKER of Piscataquis
 COLE of Waldo
 FERGUSON of Oxford
 —Committee on part
 of Senate.

Report was read and accepted
 and sent up for concurrence.

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 Salaries of Superintendents of Schools" (H. P. 639) (L. D. 906) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed) FULLER of South Portland
 MATHIESON of Montville

CORMIER of Rumford
 —Committee on part
 of House.

LOW of Knox
 FARLEY of York
 SINCLAIR of Somerset
 —Committee on part
 of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and
 sent up for concurrence.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, House Joint Order relative to a Study by the Legislative Research Committee of the laws, rulings, etc. of the State Liquor Commission, House Paper 1105, tabled on May 27 by the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, pending passage. Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, through the Chair I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, if it is possible.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, first will he please explain the reason of the Order?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There has come to my attention and to other members of this House various complaints about the liquor industry and the way it is handled. And I have had this order prepared simply for the Legislative Research Committee to give it some study, and if they find any changes they would like to recommend that will be brought before the next Legislature. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, now I can read down here the administration of the enforcement activities of the Liquor Commission. Now, on the request of this order, Mr. Speaker, I certainly feel in my mind that the Liquor Commission is certainly enforcing the laws as much as they can now, and they are well covering their duties. And if we wanted kickbacks to all those violations of other laws we can find that they are covering their duties in the entire State of Maine. In this case that they are covering their duties, to my experience and investigation as a member of that Committee, I will now move indefinite postponement of that order.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, that the House indefinitely postpone House Joint Order relative to a Study by the Legislative Research Committee of the laws, rulings, etc. of the State Liquor Commission.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to take different views with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture. I want to support

the order as presented to us by the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, because in the town of South Casco just two weeks ago there was twenty teenagers picked up for either having intoxicating beverages in their possession or under the influence of liquor. They were brought before the courts, the Liquor Commission as yet has made no effort to determine where they got the liquor from, that was twenty teenagers in one dance hall. And when that condition exists there will be more violations unless we enforce some of these rules. And I hope the motion for indefinite postponement does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, in violations of any laws, we have added members to the State Police, but I can assure you that there are still violations of speeding, and there are still violations of other laws. I only know this that the Liquor Commission at this time is doing everything they can. Regardless if you add on more of these inspectors you cannot have one inspector for each citizen in the State of Maine. And they certainly violate all laws. Without violations of any laws you would not have any courts, the attorney would not live, you would not need any judges. Of course they do. And even on the enforcement of this you are just throwing a penalty further on some of the people in business. On that Committee myself I tried to get some protection for the licensee to a certain extent in points where they were not guilty in times of violations of the laws in times where there were misrepresentations of their age on cards and so on, that the licensees will not be involved and be penalized. The answer on this was that the man serving these minors should know better, that he can tell the difference whether a man is twenty-one or twenty. I feel this way, that these persons operating these licensed places are paying the fee to operate, and the responsibility rests upon them, but notwithstanding all the evidence that minors are drinking, you can-

not hold the licensees responsible alone. Everything that is published that minors are caught under the influence of liquor, everything boils down to the licensees in this state. Instead of penalizing these licensees any further than they are now we ought to give them some protection. And I certainly feel that this order should be indefinitely postponed, because they are doing their duty now irregardless if we have one inspector for each individual in the State of Maine.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't think that the intent of the House is to debate here this morning whether the Liquor Commission is or is not doing a proper job.

I think the intent of the House is to decide whether or not they want the Order of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, to go to the other branch where it will join about thirteen or fourteen other Research Committee orders, and they will be correlated, and I can assure you that all thirteen or fourteen cannot be passed onto the Research Committee, there will be some that will have to be deferred. Therefore, since I can see no useful purpose in continuing the discussion of this item now because we have other business and it is now approaching the noon hour, I would now move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, has moved the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain this motion the Chair must have the approval of one-third of the members.

Will those who favor the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count. Obviously more than one-third having arisen the previous question is ordered.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I request a division when the vote is taken.

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

been requested. The Chair would advise the House that the question now before the House is shall the main question be put now. That motion is debatable with a time limit of five minutes to each member.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Flynn.

Mr. FLYNN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this 98th Legislature: My good friend from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, has stood up bravely for the enforcement division of the—

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to advise the gentleman that the merits of the proposal are not debatable at this time. The only thing that is debatable is the question, shall the main question be put now.

Mr. FLYNN: In other words I can't say much?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may debate the question as to whether the main question shall be put now.

Mr. FLYNN: No, I say it shall not.

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

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

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

Forty-three having voted in the affirmative and eighty-six having voted in the negative the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Flynn.

Mr. FLYNN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this 98th Legislative Body: I have been here this session waiting patiently for this opportunity to bring forth to this legislative body the actions which exist in our Maine State Liquor Department as far as liquor enforcement is concerned. For the past ten years since 1947 there has been no liquor enforcement division in the Maine State Liquor Department. And why have we got the corruption that is existing in this state today is because of the fact that the liquor enforcement division men are handcuffed and shackled by their chief executive who is the Director

of the Enforcement Division of this State, "You must report but you must not touch, we will take care of that ourselves at the opportune time." But the opportune time never does arrive. These boys and girls that are out here drinking in cars and buying liquor, I have made two or three investigations since I have been here in this Legislature this winter, I was in one of our neighboring towns here one night, in two different places that I inspected there were violations in both of them, one of them wasn't fit for any human person to be there to witness the facts that was going on. There is no law enforcement in this state, and this Order of my good friend, the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, certainly does need a lot of good courage and deserving of this legislative body for a research of the law enforcement division of this State, and I hope that every member of this House will go along with this Order, and it should be a lot more drastic than it is at this moment. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture—

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, through the Chair I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Flynn.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. COUTURE: Why does the gentleman have to limit that to ten years only, was the enforcement in the state satisfactory prior to ten years ago?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Flynn, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. FLYNN: Mr. Speaker, in 1947 Timothy J. Murphy became Chief Inspector of the Law Enforcement Division of this State. I worked and operated for every chief inspector that operated in this State. Every one of them were honorable and good gentleman who were in favor

of law enforcement of our State liquor laws. Since 1947 there has been a red curain hanging, and you could report but must not touch. I am a bootlegger and Mr. Rowe knows that I am a bootlegger. He is an enforcement officer, he can't touch me, he can report, but there will be no action taken, and that is why I refer to the past ten years.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I know the previous question was moved, but the thing has been reopened and I realize that the gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Flynn, had something on his mind. Personally I shall go along with this order, and I know there will be no need to debate it. I want to give my two reasons why I shall go along with this order. The first reason is that if everything turns out all right it will give a clean bill of health to the enforcement division. The second reason is this, that I attended on several occasions hearings when people were brought in from restaurants or cocktail lounges or hotels or what have you. I have yet to see somebody brought in or methods or means found as to what they do with the violators under age insofar as they are buying in our own liquor stores. I mean we always seem to penalize, and I have been in court and I have heard time and time again, and I think many attorneys here will bear me out, time and again, where did you get this thing. They always name a restaurant or a hotel, but they never name the liquor store. That is what I want to find out, and I have been trying to find out for fifteen years.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must remind the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, that he has already spoken twice to the motion, and must have the consent of the House for further speaking. Does the gentleman wish that consent?

Mr. COUTURE: I wish to ask a question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, aware of what happens to

the liquor stores when they are selling to minors?

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

Mr. JALBERT: I don't want to get into a running debate on this, but I didn't even understand the question.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman restate his question.

Mr. COUTURE: Is the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, not aware of what happens to the Maine State Liquor Stores when they are selling to minors?

Mr. JALBERT: That is what I want to find out.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House briefly.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, requests permission to speak further to this motion. Will those who favor allowing him to speak further please say aye; those opposed, no.

Mr. Couture of Lewiston was granted unanimous consent to speak further on a viva voce vote.

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: On that Committee this year this was one of my questions. How come that the licensees in restaurants and hotels are penalized when they are serving youngsters and minors. The answer was that they are not closing the liquor stores for a period of time, but the clerk that is responsible for selling to a minor is automatically discharged or suspended. That has been going on for quite a few of them.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, that the House indefinitely postpone House Joint Order relative to a Study by the Legislative Research Committee of the Laws, Rulings, etc. of the State Liquor Commission, House Paper 1105. The Chair is going to order a division.

Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone this Order

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

A division of the House was had.

Three having voted in the affirmative and one hundred twenty-one having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich, that this Order receive passage.

Will those who favor passage of this Order please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House item number two under tabled and today assigned matters, House Order relative to removal each day of Tabled Matters which are Unassigned, tabled on May 27, pending passage.

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

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker, as it now appears we may not need this next week, I move it be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, that this Order be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Order was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair now lays before the House item number three under tabled and today assigned matters, Bill "An Act Revising the General Laws relating to Municipalities", House Paper 320, Legislative Document 437, tabled on May 27 by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Browne, pending further consideration, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Browne, moves now that the House recede and con-

cur. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Whiting.

Mr. WHITING: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Out of order and under suspension of the rules I move reconsideration of Senate Paper 574, Legislative Document 1577 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Whiting, moves that the House now reconsider its action whereby last night it passed to be engrossed Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers", Senate Paper 574, Legislative Document 1577.

Will those who favor the motion to reconsider the action whereby this Bill was passed to be engrossed please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

Mr. Whiting of Skowhegan offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE 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 adding thereto a new section to read as follows: "Sec. 71-A. Effective date. The provisions of sections 65 to 71, inclusive, shall be retroactive to January 1, 1957."

House Amendment "B" 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 Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: May I ask a question of the Speaker please? I would like to offer an amendment to this bill also. What would be the procedure?

The SPEAKER: The procedure now would be that the House again reconsider its action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed, and the gentlewoman would then be in order to offer her amendment.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, I have not the amendment prepared, may I table it until I can get the amendment ready?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would suggest that the gentlewoman first put before the House the motion to reconsider.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action whereby we passed this bill to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it has just passed to be engrossed Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers under suspension of the rules.

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I want to call the attention of the House to this amendment 567 to Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers", and the provisions of sections 65 to 71, inclusive, shall be retroactive to January 1, 1957.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, that the House has already adopted that amendment.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, may I have that amendment tabled until a little later in the day?

The SPEAKER: The amendment has already been adopted, the whole bill may be tabled.

Mr. CALL: May I have the bill and the accompanying papers tabled please.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, that Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers", and all accompanying papers be tabled until later in today's session, pending passage to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor,

Recessed until two o'clock in the afternoon.

After Recess

2:00 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Conferece Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve in favor of Mabelle K. Toole of Bangor (H. P. 389) (L. D. 520) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

QUINN of Bangor
NEEDHAM of Orono
WALSH of Brunswick
—Committee on part of House.

DAVIS of Cumberland
LOW of Knox
DUNN of Kennebec
—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve Authorizing State Highway Commission to Study Desirability of Bridge Across Saco River (H. P. 460) (L. D. 653) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

PLANTE of Old Orchard Beach
HIGGINS of Scarborough
HANCOCK of York
—Committee on part of House.

PARKER of Piscataquis
FARLEY of York
COLE of Waldo
—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

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 Injury to Monuments and Places of Burial" (H. P. 920) (L. D. 1310) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

QUINN of Bangor
FRAZIER of Lee
SHAW of Bingham
— Committee on part of House.

SILSBY of Hancock
WOODCOCK of Penobscot
BUTLER of Franklin
— Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to taking up out of order papers from the Senate as itemized on Supplement number one of the House advance journal? The Chair hears no objection.

From the Senate: The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
May 27, 1957

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

The President of the Senate today appointed the following Conferees on the part of the Senate to join members of the House in a committee of conference 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)

Senators:

BOUCHER of Androscoggin
WILLEY of Hancock
CARPENTER of Somerset

and

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

Senators:

SINCLAIR of Somerset

DAVIS of Cumberland
LESSARD of Androscoggin
Respectfully,

(Signed) WALDO H. CLARK
Assistant Secretary
of Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Senate Order Out of Order

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, The House concurring, that the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs be, and hereby is, authorized to report forthwith on such bills or resolves as in the opinion of the Committee require legislative consideration prior to final adjournment (S. P. 606)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Appropriating Money to Construct a Fishway at Aroostook Falls" (S. P. 320) (L. D. 1479)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Final Reports

Final Reports of the following Joint Standing Committees:

Constitutional Amendments
Correctional Institutions
Inland Fisheries and Game
Judiciary
Labor
Legal Affairs
Natural Resources
Public Health
Veterans and Military Affairs
Welfare

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey (H. P. 1066) (L. D. 1524) which was passed

to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on May 27.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Carey of Augusta, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Purchase of Milk for Redistribution in Maine" (H. P. 309) (L. D. 426) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" in the House on May 13.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: At this late day I don't know that there is too much that we can do about this but I would just like you to know what it is all about. The Hood Company particularly is buying milk in Maine on the Boston pool and selling it on the Maine market. Now when you buy milk in the Boston pool it means that that milk is going to Boston and the producer cannot receive so much for it because he has to pay the cost of transportation for getting it to Boston which is around ninety cents a hundred-weight, so the producer who is on the Boston pool is getting ninety per cent less for his money than the producer whose milk is sold here in Maine. Now the Hood Company in the northern part of the state is purchasing this milk on the Boston pool and never taking it away from Aroostook County or from their place where it is brought in from the farmer. It is being taken care of there and processed and sold there on the Maine market and they are putting the ninety cents in their own pocket. Now this bill is to correct that.

Now there is a time when dealers do have to go to the Boston pool because of the summer trade down here in the southern part of the state, and so the bill was so amended and left it with the Commission

to decide that if the need was shown and they did have to buy from the Boston pool, that they could buy it there. It seemed like a very good bill. I was talking with the Governor about it, or he was talking to me, and he said they would send it over to the Court for their opinion and they thought perhaps that the mention of the Boston pool someone might take it up and it might be unconstitutional, and their thinking was that it might be, but for the rest of it, he thought they thought that perhaps it was alright, although there could be a question of the constitutionality of the whole thing, but as far as he was concerned, it looked alright to him and with the amendment that would be presented in the unspeakable body—for several reasons unspeakable — the Senator from Fort Fairfield, Senator Reed, why it would correct that, and the Governor said that he would go along with it, but that body has indefinitely postponed and I don't know as it would do any good, but just let them know that we are fair-minded in here, I move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, that the House insist upon its former action and request a Committee of Conference.

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House under tabled and today assigned matters, item number four at the top of page five of the calendar, 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 27 by the gentleman from Columbia Falls, Mr. Hathaway, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The same situation is in existence that was last night. We are still waiting for the other branch to rule on the bill in regard to the hours, and before that is done, I would rather not take action on this matter. So therefore I move that it remain on the table.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that both reports be tabled specially assigned for later in today's session pending the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to House Order giving the Speaker authority to remove unassigned matters from the table, the Chair lays before the House item number one under tabled and unassigned matters on page five of the calendar, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating the State Institutional Emergency Fund and the Personal Services Reserve Account", House Paper 371, Legislative Document 1239, tabled on May 23 by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, that the Bill be substituted for the Report.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I asked prior to this and last night that I have your permission to leave this on the table until we found the outcome of the salary plan from the other branch. I would again ask your indulgence to let this lie on the table until we find out what the other branch does with the salary bill.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, that the "Ought not to pass" Report be tabled and specially as-

signed for later in today's session pending the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, that the Bill be substituted for the Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to what happened to item ten on page three that was tabled until later in today's session? Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there are two items ten on page three I would clarify and say it was L. D. 635, Resolve Authorizing Survey and Plans for a Maine-Quebec Highway, tabled by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, I believe, in behalf of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, who was not here.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House item number ten under Bills in the Third Reading on page three of the calendar, Resolve Authorizing Survey and Plans for a Maine-Quebec Highway, Senate Paper 235, Legislative Document 635, which was tabled earlier today and specially assigned for later in today's session by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, pending third reading.

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

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The people in Aroostook County are not united in any desire for a Maine-Quebec Highway at this time. We feel that the project is ill-timed, and we in the County and others in the rest of the State feel that there are other road projects that need and demand attention before the Maine-Quebec Highway is considered. You don't have to travel very far from Augusta toward Belgrade, Farmington or Belfast to notice that. A preliminary report of the Highway Department was unfavorable as to this survey. The cost of the survey is high. We turned down a \$25,000 survey of our forestry resources in the branches of the House, not in the House branch, in the unmentionable branch, and this entails many more thousands of dollars. The cost of this road has been placed tentatively as between eight and

a half to nine million dollars. And I think at this time it would be not economically feasible or in the best interests of the State to conduct this survey, at a later date perhaps, but not now. And for these reasons 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 Caribou, Mr. Brewer, that the House indefinitely postpone Resolve Authorizing Survey and Plans for a Maine-Quebec Highway.

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

Mr. PRUE: Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I have to arise in opposition to my good friend from Caribou, Mr. Brewer. I have here a telegram this morning, in fact I have three. When they say that there are a lot of people in Aroostook that don't agree with the Highway, that may be true. But the Chambers of Commerce of Aroostook in a county meeting, we have in the bylaws that any Chamber that votes in the negative throws out the whole vote. In the Associated County Chambers eleven voted for the Highway, three did not. But due to the bylaws it came out unanimous against the highway, which was not the true fact. Now, I have one telegram I would like to read to you members of the House. This telegram comes from George C. Sawyer, he represents the landowners in this region, he is also President of the Associated Fish and Game Clubs of the County. He says, "Sixty miles of the proposed eighty mile Maine-Quebec Highway exists as improved gravel private road." He suggests the fact that this will help keep the survey costs down since most of those are readily acceptable if the road is eventually open to public travel, this should create tourist travel the whole length of the state. Now, in his opinion the cost has been estimated and we believe it is high, that is one telegram there. I have another one here from the Ashland Chamber of Commerce that I received this morning, and there is still another one here from the town council of my town, and I understand more telegrams just came out, and I don't

know who has them. I would hate to see the House go along with the indefinite postponement of this Resolve. I am only trying to get it back into the unmentionable branch to be tried again. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, that the House indefinitely postpone Resolve Authorizing Survey and Plans for a Maine-Quebec Highway.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The representative from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, states that possibly this is not the time for this survey. I agree heartily. I think we are late in making this survey, for several reasons. Oftentimes in the Hall of the House the words "The garden spot of Maine." have been heard, and this is one time that I am going to align myself with the Aroostook County delegation in wholeheartedly endorsing those words.

Those of you who have not visited Aroostook County, particularly in the summer months, should you choose to spend a few days there, would be in for a real treat. The people are extremely friendly. One thing that does impress you, no matter where you go in the County, and I have spent a great deal of time from one end to the other, greet you in the morning and the afternoon and in the evening. It is a sight for sore eyes for anyone to ride along in the valley, to ride in any part of Aroostook County, look across the river and see wheat fields and the potato fields and the beautiful country side.

I speak that way because I have always humbly considered myself a Maine booster, as well as a booster of my twin communities at home. We vote moneys for the Maine industry and commerce. We spend a great deal of money and we should, on our recreational facilities and advertising Maine as Vacationland, and certainly we do that on our number plates. We must bear in mind the hundreds of thousands of visitors that come into this State from Canada. One only has to go in several

sections of the State during the summer months to see that fact and those words that I am issuing now borne out. I certainly feel very strongly on this measure. I don't know what the price tag would be on surveys. I have had a survey of my own for something that is somewhat needed in our communities concerning a third bridge, and I took no issue at all with the Committee. I personally accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee. But I feel on this measure here that we would be remiss if we would indefinitely postpone this measure, because in my opinion it would not only bring more people to Maine, but it would be a business venture. And if the survey proves not feasible, so be it.

But I am sure and certain that regardless of the price tag of the road Maine can gain nothing but good from this measure. And I don't mean in any way to be facetious, I went along with the Aroostook Falls proposition that involved Canada. If we can invest money in Canada we sure can invest it to go see what the falls look like.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would be remiss if I did not speak the sentiments of my constituents in regard to this survey. The Chamber of Commerce of Presque Isle and many other citizens of Presque Isle have expressed very strongly their feeling that this survey should be made. We feel that what is good for Aroostook is good for the whole State of Maine. And we feel that such a road as is proposed through this survey would be good for Aroostook. It would be a short route to the St. Lawrence Seaway. Someone has said that the St. Lawrence Seaway is frozen in the winter, but there are proposals which probably would be carried out in the near future which would take care of that difficulty. And it would be a way in which we could transport our potatoes over a shorter route and probably with a lower freight rate, and freight rates are a very considerable amount from Aroostook County. So I am in favor of going along with this bill.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask two questions through the Chair simply to know more about this survey, which at least from looking at the map, appears to certainly open up Aroostook County. The problem in my mind is still what is the cost going to be, and how much road would have to be built. I recall in the last session we passed a bill to have a survey, and I notice that the L. D. in front of us asks that the Highway Commission make a survey to follow a line substantially the same as the one established in the Maine-Quebec Highway Study of December 31, 1956. I would just like to know why we are having a second survey made. And my second question would be, would they care to let the House know the proposed line of this road approximately, where it would come out in Canada.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, has addressed two questions through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he so chooses.

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

Mr. PRUE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, I believe that was the study that the Highway Commission made to see the feasibility of a survey. A few years ago there was a survey made. That was back in the days when I think Governor Brann was governor, known as the Brann Scenic Highway. I don't know if that answers the gentleman's question or not, and the second question I didn't get, I wish he would repeat that one.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: My second question was would you care to tell the House approximately what towns, in which town this road will start and approximately where it will come out on the Maine-Quebec border.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ashland may answer.

Mr. PRUE: Mr. Speaker, where the road will start I don't think anybody really knows that, they call it the Ashland-Quebec Highway.

We are quite unfortunate in having Ashland in there. But it could start, as I understand it, along most anywhere in the Ashland area perhaps. And it will come out at Daquam on the Canadian side. The Canadian officials are very interested in the road, they have a good highway built within seven miles of the border. And the group that went up to Quebec last winter, the sponsor of the bill was one of the group, he isn't here to answer it and I don't know as I would remember everything that took place. Certainly the Canadian officials are all for it. The base commanders, while they can't come out openly are privately for it. And all this survey and plan is, this is what they call Step number 2. In this Step number 2 these plans could be presented to a Congressional Delegation in Washington which are interested in it, and they could take it up as a defense or military road, and perhaps get some Federal funds to build a highway. If we lose Step 2 we are just set back that much more. I can assure the ladies and gentlemen of this House that Aroostook County does want this project. And this fact finding committee that studied this are from all over the different parts of the County. It is true there is more of them in the central area, but in the outlying areas also they are for this survey. This survey only starts us on our way, we realize that. I certainly hope that the motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I can see very good reasons why this survey should be made. Just yesterday we passed an order or a bill to empower the people to vote on a bond issue to get business into the State, and I think this would go along well with that to get something into the State. In crossing over the country last fall I went through miles and miles and hundreds of miles of very barren territory, and I kept wondering why they had such good roads over such territory. And then I happened to think in talking with others, why I was going somewhere. I was going where there was something, and so they had good roads to get there.

Now, I think perhaps all of you have had put on your desks a booklet as I did, called the Awakening North. It tells you what Canada is doing. Now Canada is just about two jumps ahead of us in a great many things. In fact they have found ore such as uranium, in fact their dollar is worth two or three cents more than ours. And I think with this highway you could go up there, and like going to California you could be going somewhere. In other words, there would be a great deal of traffic over this road of people going to Canada for the same reasons perhaps that you and I have gone to the west coast to see what we could see, and also a great many people would be going up there to live and to make their homes. And I feel this would be a step in the right direction, and I feel that our state would be taking a backward step if we indefinitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, that the House indefinitely postpone Resolve Authorizing Survey and Plans for a Maine-Quebec Highway, Senate Paper 235, Legislative Document 635. The Chair will order a division.

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

A division of the House was had.

Forty-four having voted in the affirmative and sixty-six having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon the Resolve was given its second reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the Order presented by the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross, earlier today and tabled for later in today's session pending passage and which was reproduced and distributed to the members' desks. The Chair will request the Clerk to read the Order again.

The Order was read by the Clerk as follows:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to study the operations of the warden service, including the service rendered by biologists, within the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game with the end in view to make such services more efficient and effective; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee report the results of its study to the 99th Legislature. (H. P. 1106)

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: After making several superficial inquiries I found that the morale of the warden department is at a very low ebb. Also that the theory of the biologists is that the more deer that are shot the more deer there will be in the woods, and that the more fish that are caught the more fish there will be found in the ponds. I can't subscribe to this theory. It is costing the taxpayers of Maine a lot of money to find out. In the past six years the budget on biologists was \$1,221,973. True the federal government pays three-quarters of this amount, but still the State of Maine's share was \$305,493 and the biologists budget for 1956-1957 is \$362,031.

For this reason I feel the Legislative Research Committee should make a further study of this matter with the idea of making it more effective and to see just what we are getting for our money. Therefore I move the passage of this order.

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We are talking about a multi-million dollar asset that we have here in the State of Maine in our hunting and our fishing. If you will analyze the number of biologists that they have in the other states in the union, you will find that the State of Maine is lower in number than it is in the other states.

I am not standing up to make an issue of facts for the Fish and Game

Department, but I do want to say this, that I do not believe that we can intelligently tell what to do with these great assets that we have here in the State of Maine until we do know the action and the life for instance of smelts that are in three different classifications. How are we going to know how to treat them? If we are overloaded in the opinion of some peoples' minds at the moment with biologists, I say it is necessary, until we find out just what we can do. When you stop to realize the increased pressure by the great number of increased hunters and increased fishermen that are being placed on this great asset that we have here in the State, we must do everything that we possibly can. And this to me is just a device and a way of getting rid of the biologists which I say are absolutely necessary. It is not a life and death matter with me, but we may wake up one of these days and realize that it is just a little bit too late. We have got to do something to help natural propagation as well as to do all the artificial planting that we can possibly do of our game fish here in Maine to keep this recreation industry of ours that brings over \$250,000,000 a year up where it will still bring that amount and more too.

I see no reason for this order. I say this, that if the proponents of this order feel the Fish and Game Department should be overhauled from top to bottom and reorganized, let's overhaul it and reorganize it, but let's not try to sneak in the back door with some device like this. For my money I think that the Fish and Game Department should be given authority to handle these bills so that we don't sit up here and argue hours about bounty on bear and whether this brook should be opened to smelt fishing or closed. And when you have a situation like existed up in Brassua Lake this year where you have a concentration of trout at the mouth of the brook because the water is down low and they go in there and slaughter them by the hundreds, the Commissioner should be vested with the authority to close that at that time to save some of this for years coming along. This looks to me just

like an instrument to try to do away with the things that we have got to start taking care of some day or there will be nothing left for our children, let alone our children's children. I would therefore move indefinite postponement of this order.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know too much about the biology aspects of the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game, but I do feel I have a broad acquaintance in the warden—among the wardens, and I feel among the men that I know that they are a group of devoted public servants. I am particularly well acquainted with the chief, and I feel that he is an outstanding conservation officer and game warden, and I for one particularly with reference to the warden service don't see any need for this order at this time.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Walsh, that the House indefinitely postpone the Order which you have heard read. Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of the Order, please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-six having voted in the affirmative and twenty-nine having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail, the Order was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: As the Chair calls the following list of names, would the persons whose names are called please approach the rostrum and gather here in the well of the House?

Thereupon, the following members assembled in the well of the House: Mr. Storm of Sherman; Mr. Totman of Bangor; Mr. Ross of Bath; Mr. Walsh of Brunswick; Mr. Elwell of Brooks; Mr. Childs of Portland; Mr. Shaw of Bingham; Mr. Wade of Auburn; Mr. Quinn of Bangor; Mr. Bean of Winterport; Mr. Fuller of South Portland; Mr. Stilphen of Rockland; Miss Cormier of

Rumford; Mr. Tevanian of Portland; Mr. Hancock of York; Mrs. Christie of Presque Isle; Mr. Ervin of Houlton; Mr. Stanley of Bangor; Mr. Browne of Bangor; Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston; Mr. Turner of Auburn; Mr. Walker of Auburn; Mr. Tarbox of Gouldsboro; Mr. Bruce of Buxton; Mr. Emmons of Kennebunk; Mr. Beyer of Cape Elizabeth; Mr. Hutchinson of Carthage; Mr. Cote of Lewiston; Mr. Earles of South Portland; Mr. Frazier of Lee, and Mr. Brewer of Caribou.

The SPEAKER: It gives the Chair a great deal of pleasure to extend to you ladies and gentlemen assembled here, to extend once again the Chair's sincere appreciation of your very valued and valuable help at various times as Speakers pro tem.

There has been many a time when the expression "Oh, my aching back!" could be taken literally by your Speaker, and you ladies and gentlemen did a great deal to help that back stand up, and it gives your Speaker a great deal of pleasure to present to each of you a small token of your Speaker's appreciation for your help in this respect. Good luck to you.

Thereupon, Certificates were presented by the Speaker to those members amid the applause of the House.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

(Off Record Remarks)

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

From the Senate: The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

May 28, 1957

Hon. Harvey R. Pease
Clerk of the House of Representatives
98th Legislature

Sir:

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

Bill "An Act relating to Superintending School Committee of the City of Portland" (H. P. 835) (L. D. 1191)

Senators:

LORD of Cumberland
DAVIS of Cumberland
CURTIS of Cumberland

Respectfully,

(Signed)

WALDO H. CLARK
Assistant Secretary
of Senate.

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The following House Conference Committee Report was taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act to Repeal the Westbrook Sewerage District" (H. P. 663) (L. D. 949) reporting that the Bill be referred to the Ninety-ninth Legislature.

(Signed)

PORELL of Westbrook
COTE of Lewiston

RANKIN of Southport
—Committee on part of House.

MARTIN of Kennebec
ROGERSON of Aroostook
DAVIS of Cumberland

—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence, and the Bill referred to the 99th Legislature.

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

Papers from the Senate Committee Conference Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to Closed Time on Deer in Certain Counties" (S. P. 280) (L. D. 739) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

BRIGGS of Aroostook

CARPENTER of Somerset
HILLMAN of Penobscot
—Committee on part of Senate.

CARVILLE of Eustis
HARRIS of Greenville
ROSS of Brownville
—Committee on part of House.
Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

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 Fortnightly Payment of Salaries and Wages to State Officers and Employees" (S. P. 462) (L. D. 1317) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

PIKE of Oxford
LESSARD of Androscoggin
ROGERSON of Aroostook
—Committee on part of Senate.
CROCKETT of Freeport
CYR of Augusta
KINCH of Livermore Falls
—Committee on part of House.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

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 Minimum Wages" (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1583) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

DOW of Lincoln
HILLMAN of Penobscot
SILSBY of Hancock
— Committee on
part of Senate.
ROSS of Bath
TOTMAN of Bangor
EMMONS of Kennebunk
— Committee on
part of House.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Report was read.

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it seems that I am arising more times now to defend the kind of legislation that is going down the drain. This thing bothers me particularly that the Committee of Conference was not able to come to any sort of agreement as to passing this particular bill, and this is why. Both parties, both Republican and Democrat had this on their platform, they campaigned under the banner and promised to the people of our state a minimum wage law. I think that if we, and I am including myself in these remarks, please don't misunderstand me, I think that if we as legislators really wanted this particular law to be enacted, I think we could have had that, and I think that the action of the Committee of Conference in being unable to agree, they were only able to disagree on the matter, I think that they are only reflecting somehow or other our—and I am including myself in this if I may—our indifference and our indifference to our promises, both Republican and Democrat. It pains me an awful lot to see this thing go under the gavel so quickly after all the talking that has been done and all the thinking that has been done.

Thereupon, the Report was accepted in concurrence.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Establishing Columbus Day as a Legal Holiday" (S. P. 411) (L. D. 1144) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

BOUCHER of Androscoggin
CARPENTER of Somerset
MARTIN of Kennebec
— Committee on
part of Senate.
BEYER of Cape Elizabeth
STANLEY of Bangor
BRAGDON of Perham
— Committee on
part of House.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

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 Superintending School Committee of City of Portland" (H. P. 835) (L. D. 1191) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

LORD of Cumberland
CURTIS of Cumberland
DAVIS of Cumberland
— Committee on
part of Senate.

MAYNARD of Portland
CHILDS of Portland
TEVANIEN of Portland
— Committee on
part of House.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Report was read.

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

Mr. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hate to take up a lot of time, and I am not going to take up a lot, but I do want to get this on record and I would like to take a few minutes of your time and ask your indulgence. This is about this particular bill which I sponsored.

This bill which started quite bravely with a unanimous "Ought to pass" Report, passed by the House with no dissenting voice, then tragically like so many others, came to grief upon the sharp and fatal reefs and shoals at the opposite end of the corridor.

To speak in further metaphor, the bill suffered through a process much like that which maple sap undergoes, boiled down in part by the Committee, then still more by the sponsor, and what little sugar was left was summarily rejected again by the other indescribable body. Nothing at all remains of it now after the deadly execution work of the Committee of Conference.

Unfortunately, even what little was left of this lonely forsaken bill would in my opinion have been of

great assistance to the City of Portland, its schools and its children. To begin with, the whole bill contained a referendum which would have sent the measure to Portland's voters, but the members of the opposite august body saw fit in their wisdom to withhold from Portland's citizens their seemingly proper right to vote on their own peculiar problems. So be it! But I shall continue to fight the good fight to the best of my ability to help whatever situation involved.

Again for the record, I would like to state that among the somewhat entrenched leadership in my fair city, there is rampant a great fear, a fear of trial before the city's voters. This fear is evident in elected officials' attitudes towards almost all possible change except of their own planning, change that might conceivably give Portland's voters an opportunity to have more representation or more voice in their local government. This attitude filters down to the capitol and is reflected in nervous corridor whispering and in uneasy tiptoeing of certain of the city's legislators on city matters.

The result of such fear of new ideas, of new thinking, is illustrated by the sad lack of industry payroll and of industrial construction in Portland, by the tragically low hourly wages paid in many establishments within the city, by the comparative industrial quiet of the harbor of Longfellow's "Beautiful City by the Sea."

Now Portland is my city and Maine is my state for both of which I have endeavored to do my best as a legislator. I realize I have failed to accomplish my purpose in many instances, but I have always tried to do what I have concluded was right and just for both city and state. I stand on this record.

In conclusion, I venture a humble opinion that many times we as legislators have not shown confidence in the ultimate wisdom and good sense of the people. I say that often times we show fear when confidence would be the better choice.

A famous and not uncontroversial president once said in perhaps his finest hour: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." I believe that if we in our various towns

and cities as well as in our beloved state itself, whatever our political party, could draw strength from such words, whenever the way became difficult, then indeed would Maine truly progress and become a real leader state.

I now move that in order to give this bill proper obsequy, the proper motion be made whatever it is.

The SPEAKER: The proper motion at the moment would be if it is your wish that the House accept the Committee Report.

Mr. MAYNARD: I so move.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Maynard, moves that the House accept the Committee Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report was accepted in concurrence.

The following House Conference Committee Report was taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

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 Sale of Certain Beverages to Minors" (H. P. 381) (L. D. 510) reporting that the House recede from its passage to be engrossed and the adoption of House Amendment "B", adopt Conference Committee Amendment "A" submitted with this Report, and pass the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Conference Committee Amendment "A"; that the Senate recede from its action whereby it accepted the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee, concur with the House in the acceptance of the Minority "Ought to pass" Report, adopt Conference Committee Amendment "A", and pass the Bill to be engrossed as amended by Conference Committee Amendment "A" in concurrence.

(Signed)

PIERCE of Bucksport

BURNHAM of Kittery

BRODERICK of Portland

—Committee on part of House.

CARPENTER of Somerset

WILLEY of Hancock

BOUCHER of Androscoggin

—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The Conference Committee Report "A" is filing 569. If you will notice the amendment on the Conference Committee you will see that the original bill is "An Act relating to the Sale of Certain Beverages to Minors." The Conference Committee amendment will change an entirely different section of the law and will not only relate to minors but will relate to what the actual definition of liquor laws as far as alcoholic content. Now there certainly is some question in my mind about the germaneness of this Conference Committee amendment, but I certainly do not think it is a hopeless situation and I still feel that we can come out with something which will solve the problem the gentlewoman from Kittery, Mrs. Burnham, is interested in. So I move we reject the Conference Committee Report and request that the Chair appoint another Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that the House reject the Committee of Conference Report and that we further insist and appoint a new Committee of Conference.

Will those who favor the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to taking up out of order this Supplement number three? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

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

Majority Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Outdoor Advertising Near Controlled Access Roads" (S. P. 484) (L. D. 1392)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford
—of the Senate.

Messrs. TURNER of Auburn
HIGGINS of Scarborough
NADEAU of Biddeford
ELWELL of Brooks
DENBOW of Lubec
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 570) (L. D. 1574) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. PARKER of Piscataquis
COLE of Waldo
—of the Senate.

Messrs. GRAVES of Mount Desert
CARTER of Etna
—of the House.

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

In the House: Reports were read.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, these reports and this amendment just reached our desks. I think there is another bill pending in the Senate, in the other branch, and if agreeable to the House I should like to table this until later in the day for further study and await the action of the other branch on the other bill.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that both reports be tabled and specially assigned for later in the day pending acceptance of either report.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that the House accept the

Minority "Ought to pass" Report in concurrence.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks.

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I didn't get up in time, but I would like to have this tabled because I have a House Amendment I want to add to this bill. It is very important that it be added to it. It is being prepared now.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks, that if the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, to accept the "Ought to pass" report prevails, the bill will be given its first two readings and be assigned for third reading for this evening's session at which time an amendment would be in order.

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question through the Chair to any member who signed the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report as to whether or not the federal government has rules regulating outdoor signs as to interstate highway systems?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, has addressed a question through the Chair to any signer of the Majority Report who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, at this time I don't think there is any ruling that has come through yet on that.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, I overheard this in the other branch this morning that now at the present time in Congress there is a bill regarding outdoor advertising on interstate highways and non-access highways.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: From glancing over this very quickly and I have only had two or three minutes to do it, it looks to me as if they had taken the portion of the bill, that is L. D. 919 referring to the directional signs to which there is no objection, and they have tacked it on to L. D. 1574 which is perhaps the bill which is reported "Ought not to pass" out of the Committee.

The information that I have is that on the federal controlled highways that there is ample federal regulation to take care of the provisions of this bill, but if this bill passes as a state law it could accomplish something which it is not the intention of this House, I am sure, to accomplish. That is any road could be ruled as an interstate highway, and setting these signs back over five hundred feet they might as well be set back a mile, and it could be very harmful to the resort areas that are interested in the directional signs. In many instances it might prohibit them from advertising their resorts. I would move that 1574 be indefinitely postponed pending action on the other bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that both reports are before the House for consideration and it is not in order to move indefinite postponement of one report. The motion before the House is the acceptance of the Minority "Ought to pass" Report. The proper way to approach the problem as the gentleman evidently wishes it would be to vote down the motion on the "Ought to pass" Report and then move that the House adopt the "Ought not to pass" Report if that is what the gentleman is aiming at.

Mr. BRUCE: What I am really aiming at and I think every other member of the House if they look these things over, is to give me a chance to study it and I should think they would want that chance too, and that is the reason I made the motion to table it.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may make the second motion.

Mr. BRUCE: I will make another motion to table this until later in the day.

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

the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that the House table both reports specially assigned for later in the day pending the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to table did prevail.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Expending Penobscot County Funds for Higgins Classical Institute" (H. P. 646) (L. D. 913) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 14.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: The report was read.

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

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

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

(Cries of "no")

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

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

Thereupon, the House voted to recede and concur.

(House at Ease)

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker, may the gentleman from Rockland approach the rostrum?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may approach the rostrum. The Chair would ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen, to the rostrum to serve as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, Mr. Stilphen assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem amid

the applause of the House and Speaker Edgar retired from the Hall.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at this time I have a matter to bring before the House which is of a serious consequence. Many of you probably do not know that our good Clerk who is here before me this afternoon and before you, likes his cold roast pork very much. And inasmuch as he may be tied up here for many hours during the next few days, we, in order that he might be sure of his cold roast pork at this time would like to present him with a roast of pork.

Thereupon, the Clerk was presented with a complete roast pork dinner by the gentlewoman from Fal-mouth, Mrs. Smith, amid the applause of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tem: I might add that through the cooperation of Mr. George Constantine down in the cafeteria, this was made possible with some of us legislators.

The Chair recognizes the Clerk at this time.

The CLERK: All that is necessary at this time is for someone to supply me with a knife and fork. If someone will just supply me with the necessary utensils that go with this, I will demonstrate just what I think of it. It's my favorite food from my favorite friends. (Applause)

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, the House

Recessed until 4:30 P.M. today.

**After Recess
4:30 P.M.**

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

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. CHILDS of Portland
FRAZIER of Lee

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to taking up out of order at this time supplement number four of the House advance journal? The Chair hears none. The Clerk will proceed.

**Papers from the Senate
Ought to Pass
in New Draft**

Report of the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of James Adams, Inc. of Bangor (S. P. 294) (L. D. 791) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 578) (L. D. 1579) under title of "Resolve Authorizing Jim Adams, Inc. to Sue the State of Maine" and that it "Ought to pass".

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

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read once and, under suspension of the rules, the Resolve was given its second reading, passed to be engrossed in concurrence and sent to the Senate.

Final Reports

Final Report of the following Joint Standing Committees:

Agriculture
Business Legislation
Claims
Education
Highways
Liquor Control
Public Utilities
Sea and Shore Fisheries
Taxation
Towns and Counties
State Government
Transportation

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

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 Employment of Minors" (H. P. 546) (L. D. 773) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

CURTIS of Cumberland
ST. PIERRE of Androscoggin

HILLMAN of Penobscot
— Committee on
part of Senate.

TURNER of Auburn
HATHAWAY of Columbia
Falls

TEVANIAN of Portland
— Committee on
part of House.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Determination of Damages Caused by Taking of Land for Highway Purposes" (H. P. 656) (L. D. 937) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on May 22.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Childs of Portland, the House voted to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House on the reverse side of supplement number four, the first item under matters tabled earlier today and assigned for later today, item number one, Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers", Senate Paper 574, Legislative Document 1577, tabled by the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, pending passage to be engrossed.

On motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number two, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating the State Institutional Emergency Fund and the Personal Services Reserve Account" House Paper 871, Legislative Document 1239, tabled by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, to substitute the Bill for the Report.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, to save the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, the embarrassment of getting up a third or fourth time and asking for his bill to be spared the fate of not having a chance to tie in with the salary bill which is still over in the other branch, I move that we retable this bill until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the Committee Report be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow, pending the motion of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, to substitute the bill for the report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number three, Senate Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" in New Draft, House Paper 570, Legislative Document 1574, of the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act Relating to Outdoor Advertising Near Controlled Access Roads", Senate Paper 484, Legislative Document 1392, tabled by the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, pending the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, I would now move that both reports be indefinitely postponed and if I may speak just a word to the motion, you will find on your desks under filing 573 an amendment to L. D. 919 which will accomplish the purpose of the Senate amendment which is also under another filing, 571. Therefore, I move the indefinite postponement of both reports if the motion is in order.

The SPEAKER: The motion is in order. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that with respect to Bill "An Act Relating to Outdoor Advertising near Controlled Access Roads" both Committee Reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, owing to the uncertainty of the other bill, L. D. 919, I move this item lay on the table until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, that the Committee Reports be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending the motion of the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that both Reports be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

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

A division of the House was had.

One hundred twelve having voted in the affirmative and three having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed, the Reports were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number four, House Divided Report, Report "A" "Ought to pass" and Report "B" "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 by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, pending the motion of the gentleman from Brighton, Mr. Haughn, to indefinitely postpone both reports.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My same reasons are in effect as far as making a decision on this measure now as they were this morning and last night. I certainly dislike prolonging things, but I certainly feel that we

have to legislate as we would if the session were only two weeks long or two months long. I hate to dispose of matters just because we are almost to the last day of the session. So I shall still assume that we would legislate as we would legislate no matter how much time was left, and I shall move this lay on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow. I request a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, that both reports lie on the table specially assigned for tomorrow pending the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, to indefinitely postpone both reports. A division has been requested.

Will those who favor the motion to table both reports please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Sixty-nine having voted in the affirmative and twenty-six having voted in the negative, the motion to table did prevail.

(Off Record Remarks)

House Order Out of Order

Mr. Libby of Camden presented the following Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the House of Representatives have learned of the recent engagement of one of the younger members of the House, Mr. Beane of Augusta, to an officer of the House, Miss Betty Lester, our faithful Public Address Operator;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED, that sincere congratulations are hereby extended to them both and our very best wishes for much happiness in the years to come;

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the Clerk of the House be directed to present to Mr. Beane and to Miss Lester an attested copy of this Order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair declares the order unanimously passed. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The House will now recess for exactly one-half hour.

Please be back in your seats at five-thirty.

After Recess
5:30 P.M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to taking up out of order supplement number five of the House advance journal? The Chair hears none.

For the moment item number one will be passed over and the Clerk will begin with item number two.

Papers from the Senate
Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act to Eliminate Discrimination Between Purchasers" (H. P. 1070) (L. D. 1530) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 9.

Came from the Senate 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 York, Mr. Hancock.

Mr. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adhere.

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

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: To further facilitate this matter I move that we recede and concur with the other body.

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

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, I have read these amendments and they seem to practically take the sense out of the bill. I would be glad to hear from someone who is in support of these amendments who could tell us what they mean or what the bill will do. Otherwise, if this motion fails I would certainly like to go along with the previous motion

of the gentleman from York, Mr. Hancock, that we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, has requested an explanation of the two Senate amendments if there is anyone in the House feels in a position to explain them. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles.

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker, I won't qualify as an expert on explaining this, but if I may refresh your recollections. A number of days ago this bill came up before you for your consideration, and other than speak for the bill, I said nothing more, it was late in the ball game and there were several people, there were two that I recall who spoke in opposition to the bill, and they specified their opposition, in one instance as to language and in the other instance as to the question as to whether or not the phrase "in good faith" should be included. I thought that they probably had a justifiable position, I wasn't positive, but I didn't want to claim something that I was not certain of, so I remained silent thereafter realizing that it would go to the other body, and at that time there would be a chance to attempt to accomplish a meeting of the minds between those that were proposing and advocating the bill and also those that were the principal opponents. And there have been a series of discussions, conferences, and resulting therefrom House Amendment "A" which clarified some of the questions that had been previously raised, was presented for adoption and adopted by the other body a short time ago. And shortly thereafter Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was also adopted by the other body. I believe the objections that had been vocally raised when this bill was initially considered here in the House were eliminated. That is the reason, as I understand it, for the present status for the inclusion of these two amendments. I hesitate to go into detailed and line by line discussion of the amendments unless the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, feels that his concern has not been eliminated.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In considering this bill this is what it proposed to do in the first place. Now, the oil companies have the thing pretty well under control, and they are in cahoots with one another, and there is an agreement amongst them all for a certain way to handle the situation. Now, take a dealer, a small dealer who is selling his gasoline, he has to sign up and he can't get out, and he can't do much about it, he has to just do as they tell him to.

Now, what this bill would provide—we will say now that somebody comes in and can sell gasoline cheaper, some company, and they set up beside me or you who are selling, and they reduce their price two cents. It might be perfectly legitimate that they could. Well, we couldn't unless they said that we could. But what they do they start to drive this man out. And so they would come in and they would allow us to go two per cent lower to meet their competition or maybe one per cent. And everybody in that area, what they would do, we will say it is the Shell people or any of these big companies that I am selling for, they just simply reduce the price right around in this particular area within half a mile or such a matter of all the gas stations and they will put this fellow out of business, because some of the other fellows selling Shell in the farther part of the city, they say well Curtis is selling gas over there for 24.9 and we are paying 29.9 so we will go over there. And I will get a whale of a business and I wouldn't have to suffer because the Shell Company or whatever company I was selling for would pick up the tab, I would be making mine just the same. So eventually they would drive the fellow right out of business. That is competition with a vengeance. Now, the amendment adopted in the other body, that says it would have to be in good faith, that if they started to reduce these prices as you understand the bill first it says that if they reduced my price and picked

up the tab they would have to do it for everybody here in Augusta, no matter where they were, if they were in the farther part of the city, if they let me sell for 24.9 they would have to let them sell for 24.9 the same as I was.

Well, it certainly takes the teeth out of it, this does, I think it does still, the amendment of this bill I think is the same as the Robinson-Patman Bill I think it is, that is in effect in Congress now, national effect. And I understand there is a change being considered in Congress to make it the same as this bill here is. But the purpose of this amendment, they would have to act in good faith. They couldn't do it just simply to drive somebody out of business. And if that was their point then the courts would decide what they would do. I think it is a very good bill as it has been amended, and I hope that we do concur.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill to me doesn't seem to make any more sense than it did when we killed it the other day, and I rather hope that the motion to recede and concur does not prevail.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have done quite a lot for the little businessman, we have gone to work and increased the sales tax, automobile license fees and so on, and why not let him do business as he sees fit, let's not tell him just how he has got to do business. I hope that we do adhere.

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I appreciate the remarks to kind of whittle away at this, with particular reference to letting it sort of go along as it is now, and done a lot for them and so forth. But the reverse side of that argument pertains too. The retail gasoline dealers, small grocery store operators, drug store owners, they are all faced with either the potential or the ac-

tuality of a situation wherein a wholesaler will make a preferential sale to one particular retailer and depress the retail market in that particular locality. So that the other store owners or the other gasoline station operators in some instances are faced with the problem, and the ironical, the unfair situation of selling their merchandise which they have purchased from this same wholesaler or supplier selling it, either marking it up and selling it lower than other retailers in the area, or selling it at the price that they pay for it, because one other in this particular area has been given this preferential price and therefore can sell it for X dollars less than the others in that group. And this simply gives them a chance, these store operators, these gasoline station operators, a chance if they feel that this situation is going on, that it is contrived, that it is purposeful, to eliminate competition amongst the retailers, free unregulated competition amongst the retailers. If these retailers feel or a lot of them feel that such is the occasion then this particular retailer or others, may seek to prove that this was done, this effort to destroy competition was done and was done in bad faith. It gives these people a chance to complain, it gives adequate protection for those that are complained against. And for those reasons I feel that there is value and desirability in passing legislation of this sort.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will be just as brief as I can because it is getting late. I take exception to my good friend the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, who I know is a small tractor operator and salesman and wholesaler. And I think this amendment would help him tremendously. Because, for example, I will say this, if my good friend, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, has to buy just two tractors and pay \$1200 for them, and I buy six from the same firm that he buys them from, and I only have to pay \$900 for them naturally I am going to sell them much cheaper than my friend is.

That is the whole sum and substance of this, it is to protect him. He has got to buy them at the same price that I buy them for and he has got to sell them at the same price. It really protects a man, the little fellow, and I think it is a very good amendment and I hope that we will go along with it.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to second the comments of the gentleman who just spoke, the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call. As you remember earlier this session we were authorized by joint order to investigate the gasoline situation, the report will be on your desks tomorrow. The net substance of that report was that the problem of gasoline prices is far too large and difficult for the legislature to attempt to dig into without a special interim committee. However, I do think without any particular survey that you people have noticed how many gasoline stations have gone out of business and are back into business simply because the manufacturers for some reason or another may subsidize a local station. And I certainly think, contrary to the statements of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that we are trying to hurt the little fellow, if he would read this amendment carefully I think he would see that we are trying to help him. And I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Earles, does prevail.

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

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Somewhat in answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, I would point out that the amendment specifically states that nothing in this section shall prevent price differentials which make only reasonable allowances for the differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from different methods or quantities in which such commodities are sold. In other words, they can make an allowance on the basis of the quantity purchased.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, one of the objections that I have to this amendment is that it apparently is an extension to all sorts of trades in commerce of an effort to correct the situation in the retail gasoline business.

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

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, gave a good down to earth illustration of what is going on here so that we could weed out some of the legal language. It does protect the small retailer and it does not act in restraint of trade. So I hope that we will recede and concur as is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Earles. And at this time I would 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 House.

Will those who favor the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count. Obviously more than one-third having arisen, the Chair is authorized to entertain the motion for the previous question. The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? That question is debatable with a limit of five minutes for each member.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I request a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. The Chair understands the gentleman requests the division on the main question. The question at the moment before the House is, shall the main question be put now?

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

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

Seventy having voted in the affirmative and thirty-seven having voted in the negative, the motion to recede prevailed, Report "A", the "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report was accepted and the New Draft read twice.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1070, L. D. 1530, Bill, "An Act to Eliminate Discrimination Between Purchasers."

Amend said Bill by striking out everything after the amending clause and inserting in place thereof the following underlined section:

**"Discrimination Between
Purchasers.**

Sec. 54. Discrimination between purchasers. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between 2 or more purchasers of a commodity of like grade and quality competing in the sale of such commodity, where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly, or to injure, destroy or prevent competition with any person who has received the benefit of such discrimination.

Nothing in this section shall prevent price differentials which make only reasonable allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodity is sold or delivered to such purchasers. Nothing in this section shall prevent persons engaged in selling a commodity from selecting their own customers in bona fide transactions and not in restraint of trade. Nothing in this section shall prevent price changes from time to time where in response to changing conditions affecting the market for or the mar-

ketability of the goods concerned, such as but not limited to actual or imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court process, or sales in good faith in discontinuance of business in the goods concerned.

Any person, firm or corporation violating the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than 11 months, or by both.

On complaint of any person, the Superior Court shall have jurisdiction in equity to restrain and enjoin any act declared illegal by this section and it shall be the duty of the several county attorneys in their respective counties to prosecute all violations of any provision of this section.' "

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker, I move indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "A" and the bill also.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that a motion to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A" is in order, but a motion to postpone the bill is not at the moment in order because it is the amendment that is now before the House.

Before putting the motion to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A" the Clerk will read Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A".

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to Senate Amendment "A" to H. P. 1070, L. D. 1530, Bill, "An Act to Eliminate Discrimination Between Purchasers."

Amend said Amendment by inserting at the end of the 2nd underlined paragraph of that part designated "Sec. 54" the following underlined sentence:

'Nothing in this section shall prevent a lower price made in good faith to meet competition.'

The SPEAKER: Before putting the motion of the gentleman from

Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed, the question before the House must be on the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A". Is it the pleasure of the House that Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" shall be adopted?

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A", if I can read the English language, takes the teeth out of the entire bill, and I move it be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have discussed this matter on several occasions, the pros and cons. It is back with us again. I don't think it is our purpose or our intent here in an attempt to get at one particular problem which we are concerned about, to pass a law such as this which is all inclusive, which will affect all of the businesses in our state and may have ramifications we can't anticipate at this time. Now, if you wish to accept Senate Amendment "A" without Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" you are going to be imposing a great deal of hardship on every business that we have in this state. For example, if you are a supplier and you have jobbers in Bangor and down in the other end of the state in Kittery, and there is someone in New Hampshire selling a similar product that you were supplying and offers to your jobber in Kittery a lower price, under this bill you would be unable to meet your competitive price unless you also reduced in Bangor which apparently would be meeting competition in that area and progressing well. Under this measure you would have to reduce your prices all over the state or all over the area that you operated in to meet

one competitor in one district. Now this would not only affect the gas industry but would affect your groceries, any type of product which you had for sale. I personally am opposed to strangling competition. Now there may be areas from time to time that we have to look into, but let us not pass something which is going to strangle competition across our state in an attempt to get at a particular isolated instance. I certainly am opposed to the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" if it is our desire to adopt the original Senate Amendment "A".

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I concur with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Browne, and some of the things that he has said, but I do not concur with the idea that if it was sold in one part of the state it would have to be all over. By reading it it says, "It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between 2 or more purchasers of a commodity of like grade and quality competing in the sale of such commodity." Now, I submit to you in Augusta if you were selling some things and up in Fort Kent there was any difference, why I wouldn't drive to Fort Kent. It would just mean in the area. But I do agree with him that if you adopt it and don't adopt this other amendment, nothing in this section shall prevent a lower price made in good faith to meet competition and it would upset the apple cart entirely. So I hope you go along with the bill and the amendment as has been done in the other body. I think they did a good job.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether or not I am in order in talking against the entire amendment at this time. I attempted to before but I was shut out by the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brewer, on the motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Buxton, that the subject now before the House is Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A". The House will have to return to the subject of Senate Amendment "A" after Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" —

Mr. BRUCE: That is what I thought Mr. Speaker, but I did hope to get my word in before the previous question is moved when we come back to the other question.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to hurt the passage of a bill, and I have just checked with the people who are interested in the bill, and they have assured me that the amendment will not do what I had feared, and therefore I withdraw my motion to indefinitely postpone this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, now withdraws his motion to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A". The pending question is as to the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A".

Will those who favor the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that the House indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very much opposed to this type of legislation. Number one, I do not think it is workable after reading if over, it cannot be policed. If it could be policed it would cause a police state within our state which we would all object to living under. And in answer to the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, worrying about Mr. Turner, I assure the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, that he

need have no concern. I have been doing business with the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, for a great many years and I am certain that he does not need the protection of this bill in any way, shape, form or manner. In addition to the other items mentioned by the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, is also a cattle dealer of no mean proportions. And I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, to indefinitely postpone this amendment prevails.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The other day on the unfair sales act I was clobbered by the House and took it very agreeably, and we took the last thing that the small businessman had to take him before any court to appeal to protect his interests in his business. And I feel here as the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Browne, that if we kill this other amendment here we might as well kill the whole bill. And I hope you will go along with both amendments, and that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I feel that when you go and try to make laws to back supply and demand and hold a fellow up from trying to do business it's just kids' play. I have sold quite a little stuff in my life and sold it for less than what it cost me and made money when I did it, because if I had kept it longer I would have lost more money. I believe that when you have got a customer and he has got the money, get all you can but sell it. You can't make any money unless you sell it. I will go along with indefinite postponement of this bill because it is no good.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to inform my good friend, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that this bill was designed to help the little businessman, and if he so desired, although the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, said he is a big businessman, I just wondered.

Now, in all seriousness, I will not mention the company's name, but one of the big companies are selling gasoline in Aroostook County, because I was up there and got it, for 37 cents a gallon. And down in my area they were selling it for about 30 cents. And one of the big boys from this big company said to this man down in my area, he said, "We are going to have a real gas war this summer, and it is going to start in Aroostook County." And he said, "I don't know if I would hold too much sympathy for those people up there because they have been charging all out of sense or reason—" Now, mind you this is one of the biggest companies. And he said "I have known men who have made as high as eight, ten and twelve thousand dollars this winter over the regular amount they should have made with this high price of gas." And he said, "There is going to be a real war because there is another company coming up in there, an independent company, and they are going to start selling gas for what we should have been selling it for, and we are going to have a real war." That is just what this bill is trying to do, is to try to get them to sell gas reasonable without a real war and stop trying to put some of these little fellows out of business. And when the vote is taken I request a division.

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

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that the House indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act to Eliminate Discrimination between Purchasers", House Paper 1070, Legislative Document 1530.

Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A", please rise and

remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-eight having voted in the affirmative and sixty-three having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" was adopted, and under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Appropriating Money to Aid Construction of Dormitory at Higgins Classical Institute (H. P. 527) (L. D. 755) on which the House accepted Report "A" reporting "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, and passed the Resolve to be engrossed on May 23.

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

In the House:

On motion of Mr. Rich of Charleston, the House voted to recede and concur.

Senate Report of Committee Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Natural Resources, acting by authority of Joint Order (S. P. 605) reporting a Bill amending Chapter 322 of the Public Laws of 1957, under title of "An Act Classifying a Portion of Saco River" (S. P. 609) and that it "Ought to pass."

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill given its several readings under suspension of the rules and passed to be engrossed.

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

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Leeman Grant of Columbia Falls (H. P. 435) (L. D. 611) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 17.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Registration Fees for Motor Buses Used for Transportation of Passengers for Hire" (H. P. 1084) (L. D. 1558) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 7.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. HERSEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: Filing 576 seems to me to be related to an entirely different bill than the title of this bill, but I may be in error.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Hersey, that the copy of filing 576 is an exact copy of the amendment which came from the Senate attached to the bill and which was adopted in the Senate.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I question the germaniness of that amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is advised that a question of germaniness raised in the House to a Senate amendment is not in order. The action if so desired would only be to reject the amendment. The question of germaniness cannot be raised in the House to a Senate amendment.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can answer some of the question that is apparently confusing some of the members of the

House. It so happens that two or three different bills affecting registration costs including the farm plates that we passed in this House the other day fall within the provisions of Chapter 22, and it is simply to get the two or three different bills that have gone through this legislature in concurrence that this amendment was found necessary. I would like to repeat, that the meat of this amendment has already been passed in a bill that this House passed giving farmers a special farm plate bill. There is nothing new in this amendment that was not passed in that original bill.

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, I just don't understand it, whether it is misprint or what, the first four lines of the last paragraph on page one on the amendment under filing 576. I wonder if someone in the House could explain to me what that is supposed to say.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, requests explanation of the first four lines in the last paragraph of the amendment. If there is anyone in the House who can explain to him he may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to answer the gentleman's question if I understand the question properly. Did he say the lines on the reverse side or the front side, the front side, under section four which deals with the annual fee, beginning "The annual fee for registration of farm motor trucks,"?

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, it is the last paragraph which begins with the words "The term 'agricultural commodities' "

Mr. TOTMAN: Last session we introduced a bill for the first time to allow certain farm trucks to have a special plate. This session you have already passed a bill which reads exactly as this amendment which broadens the scope of that farm bill and to refer explicitly to the lines requested, "The term 'agricultural commodities' shall include logs, lumber cut on a farm or farms owned, operated or occupied

by the registrant". Now the point of that is, there may be a little bit of garbling there or a word left out, but basically last session the farm plate bill did not allow farmers to haul their own logs and lumber. This year you passed a bill allowing them to do that, and this amendment tries to get this bill in concurrence. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

Mr. FRAZIER: I do thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will not attempt to explain anything about what has happened in this mix-up. There has been more or less of a mix-up, but I was assured just before I came in here that this amendment is satisfactory to the farm interests who are looking for this type of legislation and I think the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, meets with my approval.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused yet on that first sentence in that last paragraph that the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, has talked about. It says: "The term 'agricultural commodities' shall include logs, lumber and cut on a farm or farms owned, operated or occupied by the registrant pulpwood." and that doesn't make sense to me. Is that supposed to be an apostrophe s after registrant or what? "registrant pulp wood" doesn't make sense. Maybe somebody can explain it to me.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair can readily understand the puzzlement of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, and the Chair will advise the House that the Clerk will make a clerical amendment whereby the words "pulp wood" on the third line will be elevated to the second line

and placed after the word "and" and before the word "cut".

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1084, L. D. 1558, Bill, "An Act Relating to Registration Fees for Motor Buses Used for Transportation of Passengers for Hire."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning of the 1st line, before the headnote, 'Sec. 1.'

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

"Sec. 2. P. L., 1957, c. 330, §2, repealed; limitation. Section 2 of chapter 330 of the public laws of 1957, heretofore passed by this Legislature, amending subparagraph 2 of paragraph C of subsection I of section 16 of chapter 22 of the Revised Statutes, is hereby repealed and shall not be printed as part of the Session of Laws of 1957.

Sec. 3. P. L., 1957, c. 330, §5, repealed; limitation. Section 5 of chapter 330 of the public laws of 1957, heretofore passed by this Legislature, amending the 2nd paragraph of section 19 of chapter 22 of the Revised Statutes, is hereby repealed and shall not be printed as part of the Session Laws of 1957.

Sec. 4. R. S., c. 22, §19, amended. The 2nd paragraph of section 19 of chapter 22 of the Revised Statutes, as enacted by section 1 of chapter 383 of the public laws of 1955, is hereby amended to read as follows:

'Provided that the The annual fee for registration of farm motor trucks, when such trucks are used primarily for transportation of agricultural commodities, supplies or equipment to be used in connection with the operation of a farm or farms owned, operated or occupied by the registrant, shall be as follows:

From 9,001 pounds gross weight to 11,000 pounds gross weight \$20 \$21
 From 11,001 pounds gross weight to 14,000 pounds gross weight \$20 \$32
 From 14,001 pounds gross weight to 16,000 pounds gross weight \$40 \$43
 From 16,001 pounds gross weight to 18,000 pounds gross weight \$50 \$64

The term "agricultural commodities shall not include logs, or lumber and cut on a farm or farms owned, operated or occupied by the

registrant pulp wood. Farm motor trucks registered under this section may receive a short-term permit in accordance with the provisions of this section by paying a percentage of the difference between the amount paid for farm motor truck registration and the annual fee for the desired tonnage in accordance with 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 Secretary of State shall issue a registration plate or plates so designed that a farm motor truck registered under this section may be distinguished from commercial vehicles otherwise registered under the provisions of this section. 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. Trucks which are used on a substantially daily delivery schedule on established routes are not included as "farm trucks".'

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, that the House recede and concur.

Will those who favor the motion to recede and concur please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did prevail.

Order Out of Order

Mr. Quinn of Bangor, under suspension of the rules, presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, requested to study the desirability and economy of consolidating the state-owned garages and cars under one agency and furnishing state-owned cars to State employees traveling on business of the State in their privately owned cars on a mileage basis; and be it further

ORDERED, that the Legislative Research Committee report the results of its study to the 99th Legis-

lature with its suggestions and recommendations. (H. P. 1107)

The Order received passage.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, the House recessed until eight-thirty tonight.

After Recess
8:30 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

On the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to Purchase of Milk for Redistribution in Maine" (H. P. 309) (L. D. 426) the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Messrs. CURTIS of Bowdoinham
BROCKWAY of Milo
PRUE of Ashland

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act Relating to Bank Deposits or Loan and Building Shares in Two or More Names (H. P. 918) (L. D. 1308) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 28, and passed to be engrossed on May 23.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Childs of Portland, the House voted to recede and concur.

Ought Not to Pass
Senate Report of Committee

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of a Classroom, Library, and Auditorium Building at Washington State Teachers' College (S. P. 382) (L. D. 1078)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the House that the Senate now is in session and is acting on papers which we will be receiving as they act on them. The House will now have a short recess, but please

do not wander out of hearing of the bell in the corridor, we will be back in session very soon.

After Recess

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

House Rule 26 was suspended in order to transact business after nine o'clock P. M.

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

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read item two out of order.

Senate Order
Out of Order
Indefinitely Postponed

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that there be recalled to the Senate from the Office of the Governor, House Paper 647, Legislative Document 916, "An Act relating to Limitation of Financial Responsibility Law" (S. P. 610)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House:

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

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

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Legislative Document 916 "An Act relating to Limitation of Financial Responsibility Law", is a piece of legislation that I have had personally a great deal of interest in. I have followed this piece of legislation from the time of its inception through the Committee on Judiciary, back to the House, from the House to the unmentionable body, on the table in that particular body where it laid for a period of perhaps six weeks. This particular bill puts some teeth into the present financial Responsibility Law. We have heard discussed by a great many people the necessity of looking into the matter of the uninsured motorist. Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this particular bill would strengthen our present law to the point where it would not be

necessary to look into the problem of the uninsured motorist. This particular legislation would bring us in line with forty-seven other states within the United States. Maine currently is the only state in the United States and among the territories that have a financial responsibility law that entertains petitions and waives the posting of security when an uninsured motorist has become involved in an automobile accident.

I welcome the chance to discuss and point out to you the problems involved here. When it went through the Committee on Judiciary unanimous "Ought to pass", I thought I might have an opportunity to discuss it on the floor of the House. It was good law and good legislation and recognized as such. It passed without the necessity of discussion. It passed the unmentionable branch at the other end of the corridor without the necessity of discussion. For some reason or other it has been brought back to us tonight, and an attempt has been made to scuttle the bill as presented to us. It has been, ladies and gentlemen, amended to death.

I am going to suggest, in view of the action taken in this matter, that we indefinitely postpone the order. And my reason for doing that is to force the issue. It is my feeling that this law is something that is badly and seriously needed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, that the House indefinitely postpone Senate Order to recall to the Senate from the Office of the Governor House Paper 647, Legislative Document 916, Bill "An Act relating to Limitation of Financial Responsibility Law."

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

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I arise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, because I have spent considerable time working with this measure and with the problem which this covers. Throughout the United States as well as here in the State of Maine we are becoming concerned with the problems of the uninsured motorist. Many of the

states throughout our country have made studies and surveys to determine what is the best possible way to handle this problem. And in the majority of all the surveys the results arrived at were to strengthen their financial responsibility laws. Here in Maine we have one of the better financial responsibility laws, but we do have this serious loophole, which this bill would correct. I heartily endorse the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, to indefinitely postpone the order.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would also like to concur with the two previous speakers. I don't think that we need such an order as this, and all that we have to do is look at our neighboring State of Massachusetts to know why we do not want it. And I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, does prevail.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I put this bill in, it was prepared largely by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, and I concur heartily with his proposal with regard to the bill.

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

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that the action which was started in the other branch certainly must be motivated by the desire to reconsider certain parts of this bill, which if they were to correct it might otherwise make it a better bill than it is. I think in the interests of considering these specific weaknesses that we should go along with the idea of spirit of compromise and go along with the Senate Order and reconsider the measure.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly feel that if the other branch has taken measures to bring this bill back, I think we should do it. I arise in opposition to the mo-

tion to indefinitely postpone. This bill was heard by the Judiciary Committee and I was one of the members who did not object at that time. I do not feel that this bill solves the problem of the uninsured motorist that has here been stated by my two friends and colleagues from Bangor and Auburn.

Let me explain to you how I look at this particular piece of legislation. In our state today there is a law, the financial responsibility act. If any uninsured motorist is involved in an automobile accident, he must then file a bond and the bond—there are certain manners in which he can avoid filing the bond, and one of them being if he can prove that the accident was not caused by him.

This bill, all it does after the accident is if he can show his car was legally stopped he doesn't have to comply with the financial responsibility act. I was not too warm over the bill at the time it was before Judiciary but I had no serious objections. I do not feel that it solves the problem that has here been stated to definitely exist. As proof of that I was the only signer of the Minority Report on compulsory insurance, and I feel that if the Senate wants to recall this bill from the Governor's office, they must have a good reason in so doing, but to blindly sit back and say we should not call it back I think that is not good judgment and I am definitely opposed to the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would remind the House that under the rules action taken in the other branch may not be cited or used to influence action in this House. In discussing any issues please refrain from using action in the other branch to influence action in this House.

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

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to read to you a portion of the law as it now exists in connection with the matter presently in controversy. We are speaking now of the financial responsibility law: "Limitation:" Section 5, under Chapter 22, Section 77, "The provisions of sub section 2", and incidentally that is the penalty, the require-

ment section of the financial responsibility law, "of this section shall not apply, A, to the owner of a motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer operated by one having obtained possession of control thereof without his express or implied consent." I have no quarrel with that section of our present law. "B, to either the owner or licensed operator of a motor vehicle trailer or semi-trailer involved in an accident when the Secretary shall be satisfied that neither such owner nor operator caused the accident." That, ladies and gentlemen, is the section that I do quarrel with, and I quarrel with it to this extent, and the law that the proposed legislation that is currently before us reads as follows: "To either the owner or licensed operator of a motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer involved in an accident when the Secretary shall be satisfied that", and this is where the change comes, "that the automobile was in a lawfully stopped or parked position when the accident occurred." We have no desire to penalize the uninsured operator when his car is lawfully stopped or parked.

Now the difficulty with the law was the words "neither such owner nor operator caused the accident." It merely then became necessary for the individual to sign a mimeographed petition that had been furnished to him by the Deputy Secretary of State inviting him, if you please, to sign such a petition that caused the difficulty. When the petition was received, the security was stayed. On January 1, 1957, there were 1,276 hearings pending on petition. In 1956, 353 cases were relieved for various reasons. Without hearing, 261. That merely means that a petition had been filed, when a year went by an affidavit was also furnished showing that suit was not pending and the uninsured driver went scot free. I maintain and will continue to maintain that if we do not strengthen our financial responsibility law we will find ourselves in a position similar to that enjoyed by our neighboring State of Massachusetts. They had before their legislature this year over two hundred bills affecting automobile insurance alone. It is my feeling and my position that we

must strengthen and bolster our law in order to bring our insurance situation within the same confines as that enjoyed by our sister states that have financial responsibility. I will point to New Hampshire, ninety-three per cent of their cars are insured under a similar law except that they do not entertain the petitions. They do not waive the posting of the security. They do not excuse people from complying with their financial responsibility law.

The thing that has disturbed me greatly about this particular matter is that a Deputy Secretary of State here in our State House has lobbied this bill from one end of the State House to the other. Every member of the Judiciary Committee has been lobbied and this matter has been discussed to such a point that it is a crying shame, it has been my opinion and my understanding that we, here in the legislature, made the laws and that the employees, the Secretary of State and his deputies were required by law to carry out our wishes. If we are going to come here to rubber stamp their ideas, I think we might as well all go home tonight and not bother to come back tomorrow.

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

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker, in getting at the so-called "at fault driver," I would like to feel sure in voting for this that we are not hurting the innocent drivers. I personally would like to hear the amendments, that I understand are being considered, debated inasmuch as we have heard one side of the debate handled quite ably and fully here, and it seems to me that to foreclose the further debate on the matter by the indefinite postponement of this order would preclude the proponents of the amendments from presenting their case.

Personally I have quite a lot of confidence in our Deputy Secretary of State. While I haven't been lobbied on this particular thing, I haven't heard the other side. I still would be very definitely opposed to the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If the purpose of the order before us is for the presentation of possible amendments to be considered, I certainly, personally, would be for that and would and do support the order. And the reason is simply this. As a member of the Judiciary Committee I signed the unanimous "Ought to pass" report because I felt that because of the serious and always imminent accident rate in the State of Maine, that people should be obligated to carry insurance. But I had one reservation and I could not quell it into non existence because I realized that if you and I, taking you as one person and I as another, were driving cars in opposite directions, and I was insured and you were not, and my car struck yours, because of the fact that you did not have insurance, you would be required to post a bond in the amount of the determined amount of the accident damage, and file thereafter insurance. And that aspect of it disturbed me and still does somewhat.

I found that insurance companies under the law as it now exists when people have been required to post a bond, have not been able to do so because the amount in which the bond was set, for example, if they said the assessed damage was \$1500 then the face amount of the bond would have to be \$1500 and in order to get the bond, as I understand it, they would have to put up \$1500 to get that bond and of course the purpose of the bond is to put up something in lieu of putting up cash from the bank of \$1500 or place securities with the Secretary of State. And so for that reason, I still am somewhat disturbed. And because of the fact that I am disturbed, I am perfectly willing, in fact I urge the members of this body to concur in the passage of this order. I don't feel that any harm can be done to the excellent presentation of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker. It may quite conceivably improve the administration and the efficacy of the bill to which he has devoted so much time, so much competent time.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I don't seem to get exactly what the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, is aiming at. As I understand the law, I have talked it over with the Deputy and I never heard him say that he was opposed to this. In fact I always thought he was for it. Evidently he isn't. But this is the way I understand the law as now, and why the bill presented by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, is a good bill is this. Everybody I have talked with about insurance whether they had insurance or not said they know they ought to have insurance. If you don't have he says "I know I am a fool for going without it", and I usually concur, but not saying he is a fool but saying he should have it. Now this is what happens when he doesn't have insurance, he comes down and he bangs into me, and I may be on the right side and I may not. Well he can go right away and get insurance even if he has damaged me and continue to drive. This is another thing that will happen when damage is done to me. But with the existing law he can go further. He may have damaged me but he goes to work and signs this bill or this thing that has been prepared by the Secretary of State and until such time as there is a hearing and it is brought out in court that he is to blame, he doesn't have to have insurance. He can keep right on. He might have been drunk when he hit me, I don't know, or maybe asleep or whatever he may have been. He don't have to have any insurance at all, he can just keep right on, and there are so many of them that the Deputy Commissioner told me this winter here that they were something like two years and a half behind before they ever could catch up, so this fellow who has damaged me or you or done us a lot of trouble or may have hurt us why he just goes on his happy way until such time as the court can say that he was to blame.

Now as I understand this bill, this is just going to correct that situation. He has got to get insurance. He can't simply waive this

idea and keep tearing around the streets in any old sort of way for a year or two until the court decides that he was to blame. This is what this bill means, it seems to me, and I don't see how any amendments could help it and if it hasn't done that it hasn't done anything.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I learned a great deal about this piece of legislation in my travel in the car of the gentleman from Auburn during this session. I already knew a great deal about it because many years ago one of the members who is now in the upper branch was then a member of this branch and on four different occasions since he fathered the financial responsibility law as a member of this body, he was involved through his children in four different accidents. The protection of the innocent is fine, but the protection of the innocent on the other side should certainly be entertained. In my opinion if any piece of legislation as drawn up so carefully, having reached the door of the Governor's office, should certainly merit its final passage.

Not being an attorney nor an insurance man, as I have stated previously, I know of this bill, and no amendment that would come before us could do anything but take teeth out of what this measure intends to do, and I would wholeheartedly concur with the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker.

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

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't feel that you are getting the true facts in this matter. Now this law will not do away with the necessity of the plaintiff bringing suit within one year from the date of the accident. He is still entitled to move to have his license restored without having put up the cash bond if the plaintiff doesn't bring suit within one year. Another point to remember here, the damages claimed may make it prohibitive for a person to put up a bond and you could use it blackjacking settlements. By a plaintiff bringing his suit late and then stalling it

in court as long as possible, you could blackjack a man into settlement with this particular bill. I don't say that this is bad legislation necessarily, I don't mean to say that. I merely wish to take issue with the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, when he says that no amendment could possibly do anything but take the teeth out of this bill. He is wrong. He is definitely wrong. I would like to point out to you that even if the Secretary of State decides that the accident was not occasioned by the uninsured motorist, the Secretary of State under the financial responsibility act still has the power for him — for the uninsured motorist to show proof of financial liability in the future, and I would think that this law was pretty well moulded in its original instance to protect all of the people, not just the insured motorist. And if there are amendments to be here considered, I submit to you that there is room for amendment and room for improvement and room for protection of the insured motorist, and I have certainly shown that I believe in protecting the insured motorists when I signed the compulsory insurance bill.

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

Mr. BEYER: Mr. Speaker, after that very excellent presentation by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, I am quite sure that I will vote with him when the time comes if we do consider the amendments, but until then I have a rather insatiable curiosity to see what the proposed amendments would be and therefore I would hope that some of you who might concur with that opinion would go along with this order so that we might consider the amendments.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, I have been very enlightened by the discussion on this measure; however, I see no need for further debate on this bill in its present position. I think the real issue is whether the bill shall be recalled or whether it shall not be recalled. Therefore, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Carey, has moved the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the previous question the Chair must have the approval of one-third of the House.

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. EMMONS: I ask for a point of information.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will have to defer his request until after the previous question motion has been dealt with.

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

Obviously more than one-third having risen, the Chair is authorized to entertain the previous question. The question now before the House is shall the main question be put now. That motion is debatable with a time limit of five minutes to each member.

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

Mr. EMMONS: I would like to inquire on this bill 916 at present whether Committee Amendment "A" —

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will have to confine his discussion to the motion, shall the main question be put now.

Mr. EMMONS: I am not discussing it, I just want to know whether that amendment was adopted or not, filing 174.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is advised that the gentleman's question at this time is out of order. The only question now before the House is shall the main question be put now.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. TOTMAN: To debate the question of whether the main question shall be put now.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is evident from what the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, just asked, that he would like a chance to speak, and while it is late and while I am anxious also to go home

as everyone else, there were two or three other members who arose to speak or would like to speak, therefore I hope that the motion to put the main question now in deference to a few more questions will not prevail.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER: The motion cannot be withdrawn in view of the fact that one-third of the House has approved the previous question.

The question before the House is still the main question be put now. Will those who favor the main question being put now, please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, informally I have my answer, it was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Kennebunk has secured the information he desired.

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

Mr. BRODERICK: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to concur with my good colleague from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Beyer. As a member of the Judiciary Committee who heard this bill, I am entirely ignorant of these proposed amendments and I myself would like to see them before passing judgment on them. I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone the order does not prevail.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is the second occasion on which I have sat here this session and heard a certain department accused of exerting undue influence on legislation. Perhaps in sympathy with the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, I should go along with his motion. However, I have very mixed feelings on whether I criticize or whether I admire a department for

feeling strongly enough about a bill to be willing to point out that it may be wrong. That particular department was very much opposed to two bills I was interested in. I suspect time will prove that they were right and I was wrong.

I certainly concur with the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Beyer, and the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Carey, that the issue at stake is not so much the bill but the point, shall we recall the bill to see what imperfections or see what amendments might be added. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Beyer, if we don't like the amendments we can then kill them and send the bill right straight back to where it came from, and I sincerely hope that the order does receive passage.

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I just want to highly concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman. If the proponents of this bill wish to kill any amendment, they can do it after the rest of us get to see what the amendment is. The statement has been made that everybody in this House has been lobbied. I haven't been lobbied on this bill by anybody from the Secretary of State's office. I think we should have a right to see what the amendment is before we make our final decision, and for that reason and that reason alone I certainly am opposed to indefinite postponement of this order.

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

Mr. CALL: Could I ask a question through the Chair, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, I think the House would be interested to know how this came out of Committee, was it "Ought not to pass" or "Ought to pass" or was it a divided report?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, has addressed a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill came out of Committee unanimous "Ought to pass"

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I still don't know the parliamentary procedure, whether I would be right or wrong or not, but I would like to know would it be possible to table this order until tomorrow morning and then find out what the amendments are. I will ask that question—so we could peruse the amendments.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, that this Order be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, that the order be indefinitely postponed.

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

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

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

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I don't know of an occasion where a bill has gone as far as the Governor's desk in this session as yet that has been found to be unconstitutional, and I am not saying that this bill is unconstitutional. There is nothing unusual about bills receiving a unanimous "Ought to pass" report and going through both branches of the legislature and reaching the Governor's desk and then finally found when it got that far that there is something wrong with the bill, it being unconstitutional, or something else may be wrong with it. The mere fact that it has reached the Governor's desk does not mean that it should not receive further consideration.

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the question of any member of the Committee on Judiciary, who must be familiar with this bill, if they know of any good and valid reason why this action should be taken in recalling the bill.

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

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

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, personally I know of no reason why this bill should be now back for amendment. We were perfectly satisfied with it at the time, there were no questions in our minds —

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will have to confine his remarks to answering the question.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Tevanian, but must advise the gentleman he has already spoken twice to the motion and must have the permission of the House to speak further.

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker, I arise only to answer the question as propounded by the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may answer the question.

Mr. TEVANIAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is my opinion that this bill can be improved. I do not know whether the amendments that I first heard of this evening will do that, but it is my honest opinion that the bill can be improved upon for the reasons that I have stated earlier.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I would feel ridiculous in suggesting that there are other means by which this bill can be returned to us rather than the one here suggested. The Governor can return it if he sees fit.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise for information, why are we asked to accept an order like this and the

amendments, if someone has them in mind they are not on our desks. Why ask us to take an order like this blind?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is advised that the Clerk knows of no amendments.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell, but must remind the gentleman that he has already spoken twice to the motion and he must have the consent of the House to speak further. Does the gentleman wish consent?

Mr. ELWELL: I do.

Thereupon, Mr. Elwell of Brooks was granted the consent of the House to speak further.

Mr. ELWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Like the other members, I have not seen the amendments which have been discussed, but I have heard of certain criticisms of the bill. To repeat, that in getting at the "at fault drivers" there is some concern that we are depriving the innocent drivers of some of their rights that exist under the present law, and perhaps in clarifying this if I could ask a hypothetical question to the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, who gave a good explanation, of his feelings, it might clarify this particular point.

Assuming that I were driving along the road on a main highway and a car were to come past a stop sign and hit me in the side, it is my understanding under the present law that I have an opportunity to petition the Secretary of State, convince him that I am not at fault and thereby be relieved from the responsibilities of this law. The question that I would direct to the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, would be, does not this bill deprive me of that right?

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: In answer to the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Elwell, as I understand the law now unless you entirely are not to blame and it is very evident that you are not to blame why you wouldn't be

required, but if it looked as though you were to blame and you might know you were to blame, yet you could get the petition out and you wouldn't have to furnish evidence of responsibility until such time as you could have a hearing in court. Now that is just why I am for this bill because so much of that is being done. You are piling up so many cases that you just can't get to them and if you were to blame or this other fellow was to blame, whoever it was, he could go along for a year or two and keep hitting people and just keep going on until the court caught up with him, and it takes a year or two to catch up with him there are so many ahead. In answer to the question, if you were not to blame and it was evident that you were not, that would be it, you wouldn't have to furnish responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Walker, that the House indefinitely postpone this Order on An Act relating to Limitation of Financial Responsibility Law, House Paper 647, Legislative Document 916. The Chair is going to order a division.

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

A division of the House was had. Seventy having voted in the affirmative and thirty-five having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Order was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence, and sent forthwith to the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers" (S. P. 574) (L. D. 1577) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" and Senate Amendment "C" in non-concurrence in the House earlier in the day.

Came from the Senate with House Amendment "B" indefinitely postponed, and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and Senate

Amendment "C" in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Walter of Waldoboro, the House voted to recede and concur.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees" (H. P. 892) (L. D. 1278) on which the House accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on May 17.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adhere.

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

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

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that we recede and concur and I would like to speak briefly to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Lovell, Mrs. Harriman, that the House recede. The gentlewoman may proceed.

Mrs. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you undoubtedly know by the amendment it leaves the salary received from — the salary that state employees, rather the payment that state employees receive for automobile travel is only up one cent on the first five thousand miles. The rest of the bill is left just exactly as it was in the first place. Now I voted against this bill when it came to the House the first time, but I did that because I wasn't fully informed. The bill as it came to the House the first time I thought it would not apply to wardens, but I find that the game wardens are paid according to the rate established for other state employees. And for this reason I move we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Lovell, Mrs. Harriman, 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 SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to concur in substituting the Bill for the report?

The motion prevailed, the Bill was substituted for the report and the Bill read twice.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 892, L. D. 1278, Bill, "An Act Relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees."

Amend said Bill by striking out the underlined figure "9c" in the 4th line and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '8c'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the stricken out figure "6c" and the underlined figure "7c" in the 6th line and inserting in place thereof the figure '6c'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the stricken out figure "9c" and the underlined figure "9c" in the last line and inserting in place thereof the figure '8c'

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Members of the Legislature" (H. P. 1023) (L. D. 1456) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 24.

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

In the House:

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bucksport, Mr. Pierce, that the House recede and

concur. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mrs. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would be ashamed to vote for this increase, percentage increase to the members of the legislature in view of the small increase, percentage increase, that we have made to the lower paid employees of our state.

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees (H. P. 405) (L. D. 582) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on May 27.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At this particular time in the session you hear the word "reluctantly" used frequently. You probably will from now on. So without using the word, I would move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not wish to prolong the debate on this particular Senate amendment, but if the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, would be kind enough, would he please tell the House exactly what this Senate amendment which he reluctantly wishes to re-

cede and concur would do to the original bill?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This particular amendment would strike out the emergency clause in the bill and start the four and one half per cent increase for employees pay plan July 1, 1958. There would be no increase for the first year of the biennium.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, would I be out of order if I moved to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A"?

The SPEAKER: This being a non-concurrent matter, the motion to indefinitely postpone would not be in order at this time.

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

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker, is it alright if I give a little data on that?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Since 1953, I am talking now on Pownal State School alone, since 1953 they were allowed 663 employees which is three hundred per cent of the '53-'55 employees quota and more than two hundred per cent of the present number. Recruiting has been very expensive and unsuccessful. I would like to read a couple of letters here. "Pownal, Maine, May 18, M i n n i e Knapp, Representative. Dear Madam: We at Pownal State School are asking you to act in our behalf in Augusta. The meeting we understand is to take place concerning the raise for state employees. We had hoped by the different people from the legislature visiting our grounds would see the situation we are in but it seems they were not looking in the right direction. I wonder if they realize in Busch Hall where the cripples are there are two hundred children. A full staff means twenty-six attendants, two cottage

supervisors and two assistants. We have now two supervisors, two assistants and twelve attendants to two hundred inmates. In other words, we are less than half staffed. We drive to work some of us as far as seventeen miles. It is not fair for the people of Maine to expect us to work double shifts and sometimes more for such small wages. None of us feel we can continue to work unless we get a substantial raise. In this building if the raise doesn't amount to four and one-half per cent over there will be at least ten resignation slips in Dr. Bowman's office tomorrow morning. These children need care but we need cooperation from Augusta too. We will appreciate it if you will speak in our behalf."

I don't think I need to say any more on this situation. As I told you, this is something that I haven't read about or I haven't had to be told. I have seen it. Now I think it is up to us to do something. If we don't get some pay for these people at Pownal you will not have any help, and the children have to be taken care of, fourteen hundred and seventy-five to be taken care of by three hundred and sixteen on three shifts. That is about a hundred and five to take care of Valley Farm, Hill Farm, two floors in the hospital and eleven dormitories. Now I leave it up to you people.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The answer here is very simple. If members of this body who profess that an increase for the state employees was needed and they feel it is needed now, it is for us to kill the motion to recede and concur and we can move to adhere to our former action. It is a question of whether we feel the state employees need a pay increase now or whether it can be delayed until 1958. That is the question which will be answered if we accept or reject this amendment.

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

Mr. QUINN: Through the Chair I would like to address a question to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley of the Appropriations Com-

mittee. I would like to ask him what Senate Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" under filing 581 does to the bill?

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the question of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, was what does Senate Amendment "A" do to House Amendment "A". Senate Amendment "A" removes the emergency clause because it won't go into effect until July 1, 1958. It cuts out the \$550,000 for the pay plan which would have gone into effect with the emergency clause July 1, 1957.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, my asking the question and getting the answer would emphasize to the members of the House that this amendment would not make it available to the people in 1957 which I feel the House wanted to do.

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

Mrs. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think we were told on the floor of the House yesterday that we should not touch this general fund for highway purposes, that it should be kept for education and for the help of our institutions. I see no reason why we should not use some of that as we had planned here in the House and it is the work that we have desired most of all in this session. I can see no reason why the unmentionable body in the other end of the House should upset all of the plans of one hundred and fifty people.

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

Mr. STILPHEN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was very much amazed when I saw this amendment. I stood here the other day on the simple little matter of neglected children trying to weasel a little bit of money out of the Appropriations Committee

and they were not reluctant to stand up here and oppose that particular measure, but the reluctance with which they display opposition to this tonight, they don't go together. I feel that we bought a bill of goods here in this House the other day and yesterday, and we were given to understand that there was money enough to take care of this particular increase by that same Appropriations Committee.

Now, tonight, for some other unknown reason we are short of money. I heard here the complicated talk the other day relative to nine hundred thousand, ninety thousand, and millions and all those figures on one item, and now we all at once show up short. I can't go along with this amendment.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, we debated this very seriously and at length the other day and we were of the opinion we wanted to help these people and do it pronto, and that is one of the reasons we went along with this three per cent sales tax. Now I think we still feel the same way, so I hope that we vote down this motion to recede and concur and then we would be able to vote to adhere.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I made a remark here about ten days or two weeks ago of a shell game. I believe that is what they are trying to put over on us tonight. And I say if this shell game materializes, that there will be very few people working in our institutions because they just can't exist. This idea of this amendment, holding their raise up for over one year, penny wise and dollar foolish. Somebody had a bright idea, but I don't know, I can't call it bright.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, frankly after having listened to both sides, my oratory or anyone's else probably wouldn't change one vote. I think we all know what we want

to do on this thing and I humbly move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The previous question has been moved. In order for the Chair to entertain the previous question, the Chair must have the approval of one-third of the members of the House.

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

Obviously more than one third having risen, the Chair is authorized to entertain the motion.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The main question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, that the House recede and concur.

Mrs. BURNHAM: I request a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to recede and concur on Resolve Appropriating Monies to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees, House Paper 405, Legislative Document 582, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. None having voted in the affirmative and one hundred six having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur did not prevail.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I move we adhere to our former action.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand the gentleman moves that the House insist on its previous action?

Mr. QUINN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman request a Committee of Conference?

Mr. QUINN: No.

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

gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that the House insist.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, am I in order to ask for a Committee of Conference?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentleman that the motion to insist must be dealt with before the gentleman can request a Committee of Conference.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, I will amend my motion if I may to include the Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands now that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, moves that the House insist upon its former action and request a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. Speaker, I concur with that motion, but I also would like to move that you change the number from three to one hundred and fifty-one on that Committee of Conference. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that the House insist upon its former action and request a Committee of Conference.

Will those who favor the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair will appoint the Committee of Conference requested in connection with the item just disposed of, Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees. The Chair will appoint to that Committee the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp, and the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Stilphen.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor, under unanimous consent the matter just dealt with was sent forthwith to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to take up out

of order supplement number eight on the House advance journal? The Chair hears no objection and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: It is my understanding that there is a House Amendment being printed for distribution now on this supplement eight here, and I would like if possible to delay action on it until that arrives.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that item one has not been laid before the House and the gentleman's request regarding an amendment would more properly be deferred until we have dealt with the primary question on item one.

**Senate Report of Committee
Ought Not to Pass
Bill Substituted in Senate, Amended
and Passed to Be Engrossed
Tabled and Assigned**

Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Area Directional Signs on Turnpikes" (S. P. 340) (L. D. 919) which was re-committed.

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

In the House: Report was read.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Baldwin, Mr. Sanborn, moves that the House concur in substituting the Bill for the report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, 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 S. P. 340, L. D. 919, Bill, "An Act Relating to Area Directional Signs on Turnpikes."

Amend said Bill by striking out of the Title the words "on Turnpikes"

Further amend said Bill by striking out the Emergency preamble.

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

" R. S., c. 23, § 149-A, additional. Chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section, to be numbered 149-A, to read as follows:

Sec. 149-A. Area directional signs. In order to guide the users of the state turnpike system to the exit leading therefrom to the 8 major recreational areas of the State, there shall be erected and maintained at strategic points on the rights-of-way beside the lanes of traffic approaching the said exits, separate descriptive and directional signs of such design that each sign will be conspicuous and readable when traveling at the maximum lawful speed. The State Highway Commission shall erect and maintain said signs on the state constructed and maintained interstate system and the Maine Turnpike Authority shall erect and maintain said signs on the highways constructed by said Authority; and said State and Authority shall cause the wording of said signs to be sufficiently descriptive of the area to identify it clearly to the traveling public.

The 8 major recreational areas of the State are:

- I. Kittery to Portland Beaches;
- II. Sebago Lake-Bridgton;
- III. Coastal Route One (Falmouth exit);
- IV. Belgrade & Rangeley Lakes Region;
- V. Mid-Coastal Area (Route 3 - Augusta to Belfast);
- VI. Moosehead Lake Region;
- VII. Katahdin Park Area & Aroostook County;
- VIII. Hancock & Washington County Coastal Areas, including Bar Harbor and Passamaquoddy."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Palmyra, Mr. Emery.

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman defer until we have finished dealing with Senate Amendment "A".

The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Palmyra whether or not his amendment is an amendment to this amendment?

Mr. EMERY: It is an amendment to L. D. 919.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk advises the Chair that the amendment mentioned by the gentleman from Palmyra is an amendment to the bill and not to the amendment which is now before the House. If the gentleman will defer for just a moment.

(Off Record)

The SPEAKER: The Clerk advises the Chair that Senate Amendment "A" is by way of a substitute bill, and for that reason the motion of the gentleman from Palmyra, Mr. Emery, offering House Amendment "A" to the original bill is in order before we deal with Senate Amendment "A". The gentleman may now offer his amendment if he chooses.

Mr. EMERY: I offer House Amendment "A", filing 573.

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker, I request permission to approach the rostrum for a minute?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may approach the rostrum.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. BRUCE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At the suggestion of the Clerk, I would request permission to table this item until tomorrow morning. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Buxton, Mr. Bruce, that Bill "An Act relating to Area Directional Signs on Turnpikes" be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending the motion of the gentleman from Palmyra, Mr. Em-

ery, that House Amendment "A" be adopted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was so tabled.

On motion of Mr. Totman of Bangor,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.