

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

SENATE

Friday, May 24, 1957

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by Capt. Ash, Salvation Army, Augusta.

On motion by Mr. Butler of Franklin Journal of yesterday read and approved.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox, out of order and under suspension of the rules:

ORDERED, the House concurring that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Monday, May 27, 1957. (S. P. 602)

Which was read and passed.

Sent forthwith to the House.

Subsequently, the foregoing Order was returned from the House, having been read and passed in concurrence.

Papers from the House Joint Order

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is requested to (a) Study State Participation in the federal flood insurance program enacted by the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, Public Law 1016, 84th Congress, Second Session; and (b) Inquire into existing statutes and constitutional provisions concerning the extent to which the state may engage in the flood insurance program and the flood zoning requirements;

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the Committee report to the next Legislature the result of its study with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. (H. P. 1100)

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox, tabled pending passage.

Bill, "An Act Creating a State Administered Probation and Parole Law." (S. P. 552) (L. D. 1542)

In Senate on May 16, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A (L. D. 1591).

Comes from the House, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A and as amended by House Amendment A (L. D. 1604) in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, the Senate voted to recede and concur.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Minimum Wages." (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1583)

In Senate on May 21, reports and bill indefinitely postponed.

Comes from the House, Majority Report Ought to pass accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments A (Filing 492) and B (Filing 494) in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Hillman of Penobscot, the Senate voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference and on motion by Mr. St. Pierre of Androscoggin, the bill was laid upon the table pending motion by Mr. Hillman to insist.

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

The Senate on May 15 accepted the Majority Report Ought not to pass, from the Committee on State Government; but on May 20 receded and concurred with the House in passing the bill to be engrossed.

Comes from the House, Indefinitely Postponed, on passage to be enacted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Low of Knox, indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

House Committee Reports Ought Not to Pass

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Pollution Survey." (H. P. 255) (L. D. 353) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Maximum Grants in Public Assistance Cases" (H. P. 806) (L. D. 1150) reported that the same Ought not to pass

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Increasing Maximum Grants in Public Assistance Cases." (H. P. 806) (L. D. 1150) reported that the same Ought not to pass

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Equity Suit after Period of Redemption in the Collection of Taxes." (H. P. 939)

(L. D. 1332) reported that the same Ought not to pass

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Location of Harness Race Meets." (H. P. 819) (L. D. 1162) reported that the same Ought not to pass

Comes from the House, bill substituted for the report and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A (Filing No. 495)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Reed of Aroostook, tabled pending consideration of the report.

Ought to Pass

The Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Relating to Bank Deposits on Loan and Building Shares in Two or More Names." (H. P. 918) (L. D. 1308) reported that the same Ought to pass

Which report was read and accepted, in concurrence, the bill read once and under suspension of the rules was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Relating to Maintaining Financial Responsibility in Motor Vehicle Accidents." (H. P. 252) (L. D. 313) reported that the same Ought to pass

Comes from the House, report accepted and bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A (Filing No. 436)

In the Senate, the report was read and accepted, the bill read once and House Amendment A was read.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the bill was laid upon the table pending adoption of House Amendment A.

Ought to Pass — N. D. — Same Title

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve for Repairs to Teachers' House at Peter Dana Point, Washington County." (H. P. 458) (L. D. 651) reported same in New Draft (H. P. 1097) (L. D. 1596) Under Same Title and that it Ought to pass.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence, the bill in new

draft read once and under suspension of the rules was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Ought to Pass — as amended

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act Relating to Pollution Abatement." (H. P. 257) (L. D. 355) reported that the same Ought to pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 488)

The same Committee on "Resolve Providing for Survey of Abandoned Agricultural Lands." (H. P. 522) (L. D. 750) reported that the same Ought to pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 487)

Which reports were read and accepted in concurrence, and the bill and resolve read once. Committee Amendments A were read and adopted, and under suspension of the rules the bill and resolve were read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Report A — OTP

Report B — ONTP

Five Members of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Aid Construction of Dormitory at Higgins Classical Institute." (H. P. 527) (L. D. 755) reported (Report A) that the same Ought to pass

(Signed)

Representatives:

BEAN of Winterport
DUQUETTE of Biddeford
EDWARDS of Raymond
DAVIS of Calais
BRAGDON of Perham

Five Members of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported (Report B) that the resolve Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

DAVIS of Cumberland
SINCLAIR of Somerset
LESSARD of Androscoggin

Representatives:

STANLEY of Bangor
WOOD of Webster

Comes from the House, Report A accepted and the resolve passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending consideration of the reports.

**Majority—OTP—N.D.—New Title
Minority—ONTP**

The Majority of the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act Relating to Coercive Practices in Retail Sale and Distribution of Gasoline." (H. P. 935) (L. D. 1328) reported same in New Draft (H. P. 1069) (L. D. 1529) and with New Title: "An Act Relating to Coercive Practices in Trade or Commerce." Ought to Pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

PIKE of Oxford
CHARLES of Cumberland
HURLEY of Kennebec

Representatives:

HUGHES of St. Albans
MORWAY of Fairfield
SHEPARD of Stonington

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported that the bill Ought Not to Pass.

(Signed)

Representatives:

WADE of Auburn
KINCH of Livermore Falls
BLANCHARD of Wilton
HILTON of Anson

Comes from the House, Majority Report accepted and bill in New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Pike of Oxford, tabled pending consideration of the reports.

**Majority—ONTP
Minority—OTP**

The Majority of the Committee on Education on Bill, "An Act Excluding Federal Aid as an Incidental Receipt in State Subsidy Allocation." (H. P. 654) (L. D. 935) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

LOW of Knox
DOW of Lincoln
CURTIS of Cumberland

Representatives:

FULLER of South Portland
MANN of Paris
MATHIESON of Montville
LACASSE of Fryeburg

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported that the bill Ought to Pass. (Signed)

Representatives:

CARTER of Newport
MAYNARD of Portland
CORMIER of Sanford

Comes from the House, Majority Report accepted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Low of Knox, the Majority report was accepted in concurrence.

**Majority—ONTP
Minority—OTP**

The Majority of the Committee on Labor on Bill, "An Act Amending Employment Security Law as to Benefit Eligibility Conditions." (H. P. 778) (L. D. 1111) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

CURTIS of Cumberland
ST. PIERRE

of Androscoggin

Representatives:

LETOURNEAU of Sanford
KARKOS of Lisbon
HANSCOMB of So. Portland
SMITH of Portland
EMMONS of Kennebunk

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported that the bill Ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senator:

HILLMAN of Penobscot

Representatives:

ROSS of Bath
WINCHENPAW
of Friendship

Comes from the House, Majority Report accepted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Hillman of Penobscot tabled pending consideration of the reports.

**Report A—OTP as Amended
Report B—ONTP**

Five members of the Committee on Public Utilities on recommended Bill, "An Act to Promote Safety on Common Carriers by Railroad." (H. P. 720) (L. D. 1042) reported (Report A) that the same Ought to pass with Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 497)

(Signed)

Senator:

LESSARD of Androscoggin

Representatives:

BEANE of Augusta
PLANTE of Old Orchard
ROLLINS of Belfast
HAUGHN of Bridgton

Five members of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported (Report B) that the bill Ought not to pass.
(Signed)

Senators:

MARTIN of Kennebec
ROGERSON of Aroostook

Representatives:

FRAZIER of Lee
ROY of Fort Kent
WALTER of Waldoboro

Comes from the House, reports and bill Indefinitely Postponed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Martin of Kennebec, tabled pending consideration of the reports.

Majority — ONTP

Minority — OTP

The Majority of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill, "An Act Repealing the Prohibition Against Use of Trawls in Waters of Washington County." (H. P. 514) (L. D. 724) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

BROWN of Washington
BAILEY of Sagadahoc
FOURNIER of York

Representatives:

BAIRD of North Haven
TARBOX of Gouldsboro
ANDREWS of Jonesboro
BREWSTER of Wells
RANKIN of Southport
VAUGHAN of Hallowell

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the bill Ought to pass.

(Signed)

Representative

MILLER of Portland

Comes from the House, Minority Report accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A (Filing No. 453)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Brown of Washington the Majority Ought not to pass Report was accepted in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

Communication

STATE OF MAINE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AUGUSTA

May 23, 1957

Honorable Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate
98th Legislature

Sir:

The House today voted to adhere to its former action on Bill, "An Act relating to License Plates for Motor Vehicle Owners who Operate Amateur Radio Stations." (S. P. 139) (L. D. 276) whereby the bill was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 21.

Respectfully,

(Signed) HARVEY R. PEASE
Clerk of the House

Which was Read and Ordered
Placed on File.

Communication

STATE OF MAINE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
AUGUSTA

May 23, 1957

Honorable Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate
98th Legislature

Sir:

The House today voted to Adhere to its former action on Bill, "An Act relating to Gifts of Securities and Money to Minors." (H. P. 9) (L. D. 8) on which the House accepted the Ought not to pass report of the Committee on Judiciary on March 12.

Respectfully,

(Signed) HARVEY R. PEASE
Clerk of the House

Which was read and Ordered
Placed on File.

Communication

State of Maine
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Office of the Clerk
Augusta

May 23, 1957

Honorable Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate
98th Legislature

Sir:

The Speaker of the House today appointed the following Conferees

on the part of the House on the disagreeing actions of the Two branches of the Legislature on:

Bill, "An Act Relating to Portland University." (H. P. 1026) (L. D. 1458)

Messrs. CHILDS of Portland
WALKER of Auburn
BRODERICK of Portland

Respectfully,

HARVEY R. PEASE
Clerk of the House

Which was Read and Ordered
Placed on File.

Senate Committee Reports Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Sinclair from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act Providing for Construction of a Men's Dining Hall at the University of Maine." (S. P. 166) (L. D. 445) reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Animal-Poultry Science Building at University of Maine." (S. P. 143) (L. D. 346) reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation.

Mr. Davis from the same Committee on "Resolve to Construct Dormitory for Women at Gorham State Teachers College." (S. P. 251) (L. D. 690) reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Auto Mechanics Shop at Maine Vocational Technical Institute." (S. P. 252) (L. D. 689) reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation."

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Sinclair from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of a Physical Education and Athletics Field at Washington State Teachers' College." (S. P. 383) (L. D. 1079) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Mr. Davis from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing for

Changes in Heating Systems for Certain Buildings at Farmington State Teachers' College." (S. P. 396) (L. D. 1092) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

(On motion by Mr. Butler of Franklin, tabled pending consideration of the report.)

Which reports were read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Second Readers

The Committee on Bills in the Second Reading reported the following bills:

House

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

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

Senate

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

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

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)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Enactors

The Committee on Engrossed Bills, reported as truly and strictly engrossed, the following bills and resolves:

Bill "An Act Relating to Closed Season on Deer in Towns of Deer Isle and Stonington." (H. P. 160) (L. D. 207)

Bill "An Act to Grant a Council-Manager Charter to the City of Augusta." (H. P. 425) (L. D. 632)

Bill "An Act Relating to Travel by Inspectors of Table Stock Potatoes." (H. P. 497) (L. D. 709)

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

Bill "An Act Prohibiting Dogs Running at Large." (H. P. 601) (L. D. 848)

Bill "An Act to Create a Public Body in the City of Bangor to be Known as the Urban Renewal Authority." (H. P. 1003) (L. D. 1437)

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

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

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

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

Bill "An Act Relating to Geological Survey Publications." (S. P. 232) (L. D. 633)

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

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

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

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

"Resolve, Appropriating Money for Forest Rehabilitation." (H. P. 337) (L. D. 469)

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, Authorizing Funds for Medical and Dental Education for New England Board of Higher Education." (H. P. 581) (L. D. 830)

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, Authorizing Research of Cystic Fibrosis, a Disease of Children." (H. P. 803) (L. D. 1134)

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, Relating to Research and Experimental Work in Relation to the Eradication of Aquatic Weeds." (H. P. 1094) (L. D. 1590)

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, Authorizing Legislative Research Committee Study of the Problems of the Uninsured Motorist." (H. P. 1093) (L. D. 1589)

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending final passage.)

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

Which bills were severally Passed to be enacted and the Resolves Finally passed.

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Hillman of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, "An Act Amending Employment Security Law as to Benefit Eligibility Conditions." (H. P. 778) (L. D. 1111) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending consideration of the reports; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Majority ought not to pass report was accepted.

On motion by Mr. Lessard of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Legal Affairs: ought to pass, on bill, "An Act Relating to Pari Mutuel Horse Racing and the Stipend Fund." (H. P. 748) (L. D. 1062) tabled by that Senator on May 20 pending consideration of the report; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed.

On motion by Mr. Reed of Aroostook, the ought to pass report of the committee was accepted in concurrence and the bill read once; House Amendment B was read and adopted; House Amendment A was read and adopted and under suspension of the rules, the bill as amended was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Transportation: Ought to pass, on bill, "An Act Relating to Maintaining Financial Responsibility," (H. P. 252) (L. D. 313) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending adoption of House Amendment A; and on further motion by the same Senator, House Amendment A was adopted

and under suspension of the rules, the bill was read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Martin of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table House Reports from the Committee on Public Utilities: Report A, ought to pass with committee amendment A; Report B, ought not to pass, on bill, "An Act to Promote Safety on Common Carriers by Railroad." (H. P. 720) (L. D. 1042) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending consideration of the reports; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill and reports were indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Reed of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Business Legislation: Ought not to pass, on bill, "An Act Relating to the Licensing and Distribution of Trading Stamps." (H. P. 831) (L. D. 1187) tabled by that Senator on April 26 pending consideration of the report.

Mr. REED of Aroostook: Mr. President, in order that I may offer an amendment which has the approval of the stamp companies who are interested in this legislation, I would at this time move that we substitute the bill for the ought not to pass report of the committee.

The motion prevailed, the bill was substituted for the ought not to pass report in non-concurrence and read once.

Mr. Reed of Aroostook presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

Which amendment was read and adopted and the bill as amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Cole of Waldo, the Senate voted to take from the table Bill, "An Act Relating to Registration Fees for Farm Trucks." (S. P. 349) (L. D. 929) tabled by that Senator pending passage to be engrossed; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Hillman.

Mr. HILLMAN of Penobscot: Mr. President, I present Senate Amendment A and I would like to assure

the Senate that it meets with the approval of the agricultural interests of the state.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment A was read and adopted in non-concurrence and under suspension of the rules, the bill was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. St. Pierre of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table Bill, "An Act Relating to Minimum Wages." (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1583) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Hillman to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference; and Mr. St. Pierre of Androscoggin moved the pending question.

The motion to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference prevailed.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would note that with reference to L. D. 1062, in the absence of our efficient Secretary, the Chair gavelled through two amendments which had been indefinitely postponed in the House and so the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed moves that the Senate reconsider its former action whereby it passed the bill to be engrossed, and to further reconsider its action whereby it adopted House Amendments A and B.

The motions prevailed and on further motion by Mr. Reed of Aroostook, House Amendments A and B were indefinitely postponed, and the bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Reed of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table House Reports from the Committee on Legal Affairs: Ought not to pass, on Bill, "An Act Relating to Location of Harness Race Meets." (H. P. 819) (L. D. 1162) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending consideration of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Bill was substituted for the report and read once; House Amendment A was read and adopted and under suspension of the rules, the bill was read a second time and passed to

be engrossed as amended in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Pike of Oxford, the Senate voted to take from the table House reports from the Committee on Business Legislation: Majority report ought to pass in new draft (H. P. 1039) (L. D. 1529); Minority report, ought not to pass, on Bill, "An Act Relating to Coercive Practices in Retail Sale and Distribution of Gasoline." (H. P. 935) (L. D. 1328) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending consideration of the reports; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Charles.

On motion by Mr. Charles of Cumberland, the ought to pass report was accepted, the bill read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, "An Act Relating to Disqualifications for Benefits Under Employment Security Law." (H. P. 781) (L. D. 1114) tabled by that Senator on May 14 pending passage to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same Senator the rules were suspended and the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby it adopted Committee Amendment A; Committee Amendment A was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

The same Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption; which amendment was adopted and the bill as amended by Senate Amendment A was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Butler of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs: ought not to pass, on Resolve Providing for Changes in Heating Systems for Certain Buildings at Farmington State Teachers College." (S. P. 396) (L. D. 1092); and on further motion by the same Senator, the ought not to pass report was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Willey of Hancock, the Senate voted to take from

the table (H. P. 424) (L. D. 601) Bill, "An Act Authorizing Sunset Real Estate Corporation to Construct a Bridge Across Medomak River," which was tabled by that Senator on May 13th pending passage to be engrossed.

Mr. BROWN of Washington: Mr. President and members of the Senate: This bill takes away property value on one side of the stream and gives it to a private corporation to develop. It takes away a town landing. If the bridge is built, land owners will close their property to the public. No one living adjacent to the proposed site wants the bridge built. The committee reported 8 to 2 "Ought not to pass." I move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I am sorry I cannot agree with my good friend, the Senator from Washington, Senator Brown, on this matter. I doubt very much if the people in the town of Friendship would vote by better than two-thirds at an annual town meeting to do what the Senator from Washington, Senator Brown, claims they would do.

As most of you know, this was in Article 20 of the town meeting in the town of Friendship last March 12th.

This does not take away the right of the people to the wharf; it takes away part of the wharf. The only reason for this proposed legislation is the fact that the Army engineers come into the matter because there is a sea passage through there, and arrangements are being made with the federal government to satisfy them, inasmuch as the span of this bridge is going to be twenty-five feet above the highwater mark of the channel.

Another thing that we should consider is that it is going to add considerable to the valuation of this town. The corporation that wants to build this bridge is going to build at least fifteen cottages on this island where this bridge connects with the mainland. It will have an effect on the town rate, according to some figures here, of around ten mills. Now that is a big item for anybody, and I think we should go along with the vote of the people of Friendship. I hope that the motion of the Sena-

tor from Washington, Senator Brown, does not prevail.

Mr. DOW of Lincoln: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I regret that I missed the first part of the talk on this particular bill because I have a special interest in this.

Friendship is a bordering town to my town of Waldoboro, and this proposed bridge is on the river which connects our two towns.

Very briefly, I will just state, and will perhaps have to repeat what has already been said, that in the town meeting in Friendship the vote was three to one for this bridge. To me, it is another matter of home rule. In addition, I have received a telegram with two pages of names, some 120 names, and I know practically every individual whose signature is on this telegram, and they are all good, substantial citizens. For the sake of home rule, which I always stand for, whenever I possibly can, I think we should give them this bridge.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator Brown, that the Senate accept the majority "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr. President, as one of the signers of the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee I feel I should explain my stand on the motion which I hope will not prevail.

At the time this bill came to us it was understood by myself that the island in question was not owned by one concern. At the hearing it developed that the entire locality down there, by home rule, had decided that the town wanted to have this done. It does take away part of the town landing but the town itself voted to grant that privilege. This matter is only here before us because under the regulations of the Army and Navy where a bridge goes over tidewater they must have an act of the legislature to do it, and so the measure comes to us for our consideration.

Now it so happens that there are a few people who, if this bridge is going to be built, are going to be damaged in their property in the sense that they are not going to be permitted to continue to enjoy the

freedom of the view or freedom of life which they do have now. We all know there is no inherent right to freedom of air or light or of a view. The reason that I signed the report was that I felt that the island was not fully-owned by one individual, and I did have a letter from one individual who I took at the time to be a resident of the island and who I learned later was not a resident; and for that reason and that reason alone I signed the "Ought not to pass" report, but I feel now that the motion to indefinitely postpone should not be accepted and I trust that it will be defeated.

Mr. BROWN of Washington: Mr. President, when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

Mr. SILSBY of Hancock: Mr. President and members of the Senate: This bill had a very lengthy hearing which was very well attended, before the Judiciary Committee some month and a half ago.

I think you ought to know the circumstances and what this bill will accomplish and what the objective of the bill is. It is asking this legislature for authority to build a bridge down in the town of Friendship from Timber Point to Walsgrover Island, I believe that is the name, consisting of some fourteen acres of land and very valuable property for development. To be sure, there is now a road that leads to the so-called point in question which is known as the Town Landing, and the flats must be crossed in order to approach the channel and the tidewaters, therefore it is required that the legislature grant that permission.

Now the bridge, I believe, is some twenty-five feet in length; it is a narrow bridge. I think the over-all distance above high water is fifteen feet, so that boats of reasonable size cannot be bothered, especially lobster boats.

It appears that at their annual town meeting last, when all of the good citizens of the town of Friendship had an opportunity to be heard — it was not a special meeting — they met and they voted in their democratic way, the way we do here in Augusta, and they exercised their home rule, and the vote was 119 in favor of the bridge and 53 opposed. Now the opposition was not satisfied at the hearing. Believe

me, there were very few, if any opposed from the town of Friendship, but there were people from other communities that were opposed.

I am a firm believer in home rule, and I was well-satisfied perhaps some of the people there did have to yield perhaps a little bit to their view if the bridge was built. I don't know as it would make much more difference than to have the landing place cluttered up with cars, which will not happen if they have the bridge.

Then it developed at the hearing that there were some people who might have profit by reason of this bridge by selling land that they might have title to from the low water to the high water mark. And I recall distinctly of one person who seemed to be accused of owning some of the land and who was interested in the development of the island and in the development of the town of Friendship—and, to be sure, this man did not own any part of the island, that he, if they owned title, would be glad to convey for one dollar; and that again convinced me that the town of Friendship was entitled to this development whereby they could acquire more taxable dollars.

Now I would like to make this point clear to you, and I will stand corrected if I am misinformed as to the law, but I do not think that I am: I think the time will probably come in the near future when the inhabitants of the town of Friendship or the promoters of this development will probably petition the selectment to lay them out a highway; and, believe me, under the law of this land after the selectmen have laid it out then they must have another town meeting to accept that highway; and the people who live in that locality, if they want to change their mind they have an opportunity, because they still must vote again. And then, before this bridge can be constructed, others must pass on the feasibility, and that is the federal government, as to the bridge crossing the tidewater. I am honestly and sincerely convinced that the citizens and the property owners of the town of Friendship are fully protected, and I cannot see any glaring usurpation of their powers.

Again, I want to say to you in closing, that I am a firm believer in home rule, and I think that this is a matter that should be adjusted by the citizens of Friendship and nobody else, and I do not believe that anyone who lives outside of that vicinity and who is not a taxpayer has any right to come over here and interfere with that democratic form of government. I hope that the time will never come when the legislature will see fit to take away from the municipalities of this State the right of home rule when apparently they are abusing no part of their discretion, and I sincerely hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill does not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator Brown, that the bill be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

As many as are in favor of the motion will rise and stand until counted.

A division was had.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will remind the Senate that the Senate rules require that every Senator present vote. The Chair will put the question a second time.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator Brown, that the bill be indefinitely postponed will rise and stand until counted.

A division was had.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair votes to progress the bill. The Chair does that consistent with the proposition that until final enactment the Chair must vote to progress the bill.

Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and seventeen in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, the bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table (H. P. 1015) (L. D. 1445) Bill "An Act Relating to Publication of Specimen Ballots, State Financial Reports, Constitutional Amendments and Referendums in Foreign Language Newspapers," which was tabled by that

Senator on May 21st pending enactment; and on further motion by the same Senator the bill was passed to be enacted.

Recess

Called to order by the President.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair at this time recognizes a group of students from Cutler, down in Washington County. On behalf of the Senate, we extend our welcome to you; we hope that you will have a fine day today, and we will do everything we can to make this Friday a pleasant and instructive one for you and hope that you may derive a little bit of inspiration from being here. Thank you for coming. (Applause)

On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table 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) which was tabled earlier in today's session by that Senator pending passage to be engrossed.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I offer Senate Amendment "A", and will state briefly that this is in reference to the University of Maine.

The committee recommended an appropriation for Completion of Boardman Hall, Steam Line Extension and University Press at the University of Maine in the amount of \$509,800. After discussing the matter with a representative of the trustees of the University of Maine, the committee has felt that the trustees had a very legitimate request, because of circumstances, that they be allowed to substitute a Men's Dormitory and an extension of steam line in exactly the same amount of money.

In connection with the construction of the Men's Dormitory, it is necessary that the legislature authorize the University to borrow sufficient funds for the construction of this dormitory, which we have done many times in the legislature, the University absorbing half of the construction of the Men's and Women's Dormitories.

Mr. President, I present Senate Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

Senate Amendment "A" was read and adopted, and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent down for concurrence.

Mr. MARTIN of Kennebec: Mr. President, I ask, under suspension of the rules, that the Senate reconsider its action whereby Bill "An Act Relating to the Licensing and Distribution of Trading Stamps," (H. P. 831) (L. D. 1187) was assigned for second reading on the next legislative day.

The motion prevailed and reconsideration was voted; and the Senate voted to reconsider adoption of Senate Amendment A.

Mr. Lessard of Androscoggin then presented Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was read and adopted, Senate Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A thereto was adopted; and under suspension of the rules the bill was read a second time and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto in non-concurrence and sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table the 13th tabled and unassigned matter, (H. P. 304) (L. D. 421) House Report "Ought not to pass" from the Committee on Agriculture on Bill, "An Act Relating to Policy of the Milk Commission," which was tabled by that Senator on May 13th pending consideration of report.

Mr. Boucher then moved that the bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Bailey of Sagadahoc, the bill and accompanying papers were retabled and specially assigned for Monday, May 27th, pending the motion of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher that the bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee.

Mr. SILSBY of Hancock presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that there be recalled to the Senate from the engrossing department, H. P. 418, L. D. 595, "An Act relating to repossession of Property subject to conditional sales agreement."

The order received passage and was ordered sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox,
Recessed until 12:30 P.M.

Afternoon Session

Called to order by the President.

On motion by Mr. Ferguson of Oxford, the Senate voted to take from the table the 26th tabled and unassigned matter, (S. P. 389) (L. D. 1085) Bill, "An Act Relating to Operation of Diesel or Diesel-Electric Locomotives in Reverse," which was tabled on May 17th by that Senator pending enactment; and on further motion by that same Senator the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Bailey of Sagadahoc, the Senate voted to take from the table Bill, "An Act Relating to Policy of the Milk Commission," (H. P. 304) (L. D. 421) which was tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session, pending the motion of Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin that the bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee.

Mr. BAILEY of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, I move that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate: All the debate I shall make on this bill is to read the bill itself:

"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 the representatives of the industry in devising market-

ing programs to implement such policies."

Now, Mr. President, the bill is pretty clear. The milk law was passed in 1935 when I first came to the legislature. It was passed at that time to correct evils in the milk industry. After twenty-two years it seems about time that the doctor starts to prescribe something to correct it. Here we have an industry which enjoys something that no other industry in the State does. We guarantee milk producers, milk dealers and everybody else that they will sell milk at a profit. If that is good business, I intend to introduce a bill, if I come back here in two years, whereby contractors will be protected from losses.

I have always believed in the old American process of competition, and I think it is about time that we found ways and means, or at least the commission were told to make a study so that the milk industry can come back on its own feet and come back in competition. We have protected the milk industry for twenty-two years and I have seen no improvement in those twenty-two years.

All this bill requires is that they study ways and means of cleaning their own house, and that is why I made the motion to substitute the bill for the report, because I believe this is a good bill, and I believe that something should be done about the milk industry.

The Research Committee, as you know, Mr. President, spent several months on that milk question, made a thorough study of it, and their recommendations have been practically all thrown out of the window. I think we should impose a duty upon the milk commission to try and clean its own house.

Mr. President, when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

Mr. BAILEY of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I do not wish to have any long debate. As the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher says, it has been in operation for twenty-two years. That is true. At the present time I am willing to compare it with any other industry which we have in the State. If it is not the most stable industry that we have at the present time, I would be will-

ing to admit if anyone can show it. We know that the milk industry has protection. It assures that milk is put on the market at a reasonable price, as reasonable as any other state in New England. It is of the best quality, and those connected with it are not making big profits but they are managing to get along and make a living.

As for the big profit which has been referred to, we see that many of the producers who are not efficient in their operation are going out of business, just like any other industry; but by being efficient they can operate. I know it would be the disposition that we would not ask for protection if we did not feel that it was something that was needed for the consumers as well as for the producer and the dealer. I hope that the members of this Senate will see fit to vote in favor of the indefinite postponement of this bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in defense of the Legislative Research Committee in making a study of this problem.

This bill, as pointed out by the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher, merely asks that 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. It is merely an attempt to have the milk commission continue in operation, but in their administering of the laws that they keep in mind to perhaps work to the end that there may not be need for administering the laws as they now exist.

I will support the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, we have cuddled this industry long enough; it is about time it stopped crawling and about time it got on its feet and started to walk. It is twenty-two years old and it should be able to take care of itself.

Mr. CURTIS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: Just a brief word that, in my opinion, this is one of the most refreshing bits of legislation to come before the 98th Legislature. The rea-

son that I say that it probably marks somewhat of an era; maybe it is the beginning of the millennium, I am not sure. But how refreshing it is to see legislation which tries to set up a procedure whereby a semi-government agency might eventually look forward to eliminating itself. Everything we do these days seems to be for enlarging government and moving government into private enterprise fields. Here is a piece of legislation which, although it does not have much in it as far as teeth are concerned and I do not think it will affect the industry at all, I am sure it won't harm the industry, still has a wonderful aim in it which ought to be the aim and goal of all of us: to decrease the size of government rather than increase it. I hope the motion does not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Bailey, that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. The Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher, asks for a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Bailey, that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed will rise and stand until counted.

A division was had.

Eleven having voted in the affirmative and twenty in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the bill was substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee in non-concurrence, and was given its first reading and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Cole of Waldo, the Senate voted to take from the table the 20th tabled and unassigned matter, (H. P. 179) (L. D. 242) House Reports: Report "A" "Ought to pass in New Draft "B" (H. P. 1080) (L. D. 1554) under New Title, "Resolve Authorizing Engineering and Economic Survey of Ferry Service for North Haven, Vinalhaven, Islesboro and Swan's Island."; Report "B" "Ought to pass in New Draft "A" (H. P. 1081) (L. D. 1555)

under same title; and Report "C" "Ought not to pass," from the Committee on Highways on Bill, "An Act to Authorize Ferry Service for North Haven, Vinalhaven, Islesboro and Swan's Island," which was tabled on May 13th by that Senator pending consideration of reports.

Mr. COLE of Waldo: Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I feel quite highly honored in being referred to as being from a larger county, especially in population, I won't say it is any larger in size.

Mr. President, could I ask that the reports of the committee be read, so that each one of us can know what Report "A" and Report "B" are.

The reports were then read by the President.

Mr. PARKER: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I know of no bill that came before the Highway Committee that caused us to use any more time or effort in trying to arrive at what we considered a fair and just consideration of what should be done by the Highway Committee.

As has been stated by the President, Report "A" which calls for a survey, had five signers. They were the majority. Report "B," which simply voted "Ought to pass" on the present bill, had four signers; and one of the committee said that he was against everything and he was not going to vote for either the survey or the bill.

To me, as one of those that signed the Report "A" which calls for a survey, a real honest-to-goodness survey, so that the next legislature might have an opportunity to have a real down-to-earth knowledge of the conditions and what it will cost to correct those conditions, both in terms of ferryboats and wharves and many other necessary things that go along with the operation of the ferry. I believe that we have not that knowledge at the present time, and that was my reason for signing Report "A".

To me, this resembles to a large extent an experiment in State socialism; I cannot believe that it is anything else.

First, we have in operation between the mainland and these various islands an existing ferry service that is allegedly inadequate. If it is inadequate it is inadequate because the existing ferry service requirements have not and cannot justify the grant scheme proposed by this two and a half million dollar venture. I think if an adequate economic and engineering survey supported the general proposition that any such system would be self-supporting, my objections would disappear; but it is on the lack of sound proof that I have my second serious doubt.

The proponents of the measure have assembled some figures which, as I see it, represent nothing more than wishful thinking. They have no engineering data that tells where the terminal facilities will be built; they have no engineering or contractor estimates, nor do they have any evidence that I have seen of marine design for these ferries. Quite unlike the ferry terminal at Bar Harbor and quite unlike the year's study by the Canadian National Railway prior to the institution of the Yarmouth-Bar Harbor Ferry, their estimates and statements are without foundation in sound, unbiased engineering statements. And probably of more interest to every member of the Senate is the fact that they seek by this bill to place a first mortgage, irrevocable, on not only the two and a half million dollars that they require in full faith and credit debt, but by the very wording of the bill itself they impose upon the State agency, supported by general fund appropriations, the financial responsibility to make up by mandatory legislative appropriation every penny of the difference, if it exists, between income and expense.

The history of ferries along the entire Atlantic coast bears out the proposition that ferries must be subsidized with public funds. I offer no objection to the proposition that the people resident in these islands have public subsidy with public funds, but such of you having real conscience in the matter of dedicated public funds for experiment in socialization of State services should, in all fairness to you, have full knowledge, supported by sound

engineering studies of the extent to which general funds must be taken from institutions, educational facilities, operational and capital in order to subsidize this type of venture.

I would warn you further that if you buy this type of philosophy, just as sure as I am standing here in this Senate today, the people in Portland Harbor will be up here at the next session of the legislature telling you that their ferries are in a sad state and that they too must serve many people demanding State socialization of that system within Casco Bay.

Mr. President, I move that Report "A", which is covered by L. D. 1554, be adopted.

Mr. LOW of Knox: Mr. President and members of the Senate: If land connected Vinalhaven, North-haven, Swans Island and Islesboro with what is now the coast, the state would long ago have recognized their right to transportation and would have built roads connecting them at a cost of millions of dollars. The maintenance of these roads after they were built would have by now run into far more money than the ferries will cost, and there would never have been any hope of a return on the investment. So it seems a little strange to me that there should be such extreme concern as to whether these boats will return to the state every penny that the Port Authority might put into them.

To those of us who are familiar with the situation on these islands, the need for larger ships is so evident that it hardly seems necessary to talk about it. Perhaps it is enough to say that there are fourteen hundred people on Vinalhaven and that these people own over four hundred cars. So if each of these cars were taken to the mainland just once a year it would require half of the capacity of the boat, which is about eight hundred cars a year. Certainly any substantial tourist business or even any small industry is out of the question. The requirements of the other islands run along the same lines and are likewise inadequately taken care of.

Report A of the Committee proposes to spend about twenty-five thousand dollars and two years time to try to find out whether larger

boats will attract enough additional business to insure their being self-supporting and self-liquidating. At best this sounds to me like a real honest-to-goodness guessing contest, but certain facts stand out. Islesboro, which has most nearly been able to carry the traffic which was available, transported 19,000 cars during 1956. Against this, Vinalhaven had eight hundred, North Haven about four hundred, and Swans Island very few. No one can do anything but guess how much more business would be done with adequate boats. A lot of money and good deal of time will not produce a better guess than can be made right now. But we do know that if the other island traffic comes anywhere near that existing now at Islesboro that much larger boats can be justified, and paid for.

Fortunately the Maine Port Authority has two members who have had extensive experience in both operating and building boats. I believe that they will make an adequate study of the real necessities of each community, and build for them boats which will take care of their needs in a sensible way. I have no doubt that these ferries will pay for themselves in the long run both as to interest and principal, as have the present vessels.

The settlements on the islands of Penobscot Bay are among the oldest in New England, and many descendants of the original settlers still live there. For many generations they have taken their hard living from the sea. They are among the strongest and most self-sufficient people in this State. For the first time in their history they feel that they must have help, and are asking us to give it to them. Sincerely, I hope that we do.

I ask that you help me in defeating the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, which I hope does not prevail.

Mr. COLE of Waldo: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in support of my colleague, the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker. He has given you the facts in regard to the thought and time that the committee has put in on this bill. Being one who is living near the center of the object of this bill, and also representing one island

that is in the ferry bill, I feel that in fairness you will agree with me that I have tried to take a stand on good, sound business principles all this session. Had I agreed as the good Senator from Knox, Senator Low, has said, it was a guess,— I am glad he admitted it was a guess —and for political expediency I too would have gone along with Report "B" which gives the Port Authority permission to operate these ferries.

Regardless of all these things that I have mentioned, and regardless of all the pressure that has been brought to bear upon me, I still want to stand on the same principles that I have been standing on all the session.

If you members of the legislature had in front of you the same type of data that the Toll Road Authority is forced to assemble before it sells its bonds in the money market, then I would have no objection. I might vote against the bill if the State subsidy was in excess of what was fair and reasonable. But until this legislature knows specifically what it is buying—and remember this: this bill calls for a debt that would be spread over a period of fifty to a hundred years—you are imposing a burden on the future taxpayers, that is just about as unfair as anything that I can imagine.

Five of the committee, I believe with complete justice and with complete wisdom, suggest the use of sufficient State dollars to make this survey so that the next legislature can, in its good wisdom, with full knowledge of what we are leading ourselves and our successors into, pass rightfully upon this question. Certainly there is nothing in the economy of this area or any area of the State that is going to be damaged by a two-year study to determine just what are the facts. I think the acceptance of the survey report on the bill represents good solid, honest conclusion, free of sympathy that may impel some of you into believing that this is a good, sound legislative procedure.

I would also remind you that, except for a very small airport issue and an equally modest Bangs disease issue, both in the early forties and soon paid off, the State has followed the very wise procedure of financing

general fund ventures out of general fund surpluses. At this session of the legislature the University of Maine asked for a twenty million dollar self-liquidating bond issue to finance needed dormitories, and I believe you will agree with me that this is one of the soundest ventures we have ever gone into and has always been repaid. Both branches accepted an "Ought not to pass" report, in spite of the fact that liquidating factors had been well-established at Orono, by that treatment of similar loans authorized by the legislature without the benefits of full faith and credit of the State of Maine.

I personally believe that the ferries would do well if they took in sufficient revenue to pay their actual operating and maintenance expenses, and I think it is obvious that debt retirement is out of the question.

I would also call to your attention that this and every other bond issue approved by two-thirds vote of this legislature must go to the people in referendum. I have a personal conviction, with a knowledge that a twenty-four million highway bond issue will serve to support at least sixty-five million dollars of a one hundred and sixty-five million four year program, that that bond issue will be approved; but if the voters are faced with the proposition of several bond issues, only one of which is certain of payment — and I refer of course to the highway bond issue, then disaster may fall upon all of these referendum questions relating to debt. I refer also to the popular Passagassawaukeag bridge that was defeated here yesterday, a very, very sound and logical bond issue.

I don't know that you particularly noticed it, but the Bangor-Brewer bridge has been in operation for some time; it serves a population of well over fifty thousand people — consider it, fifty thousand people — yet, if you turn to L. D. 1503, you will note that even in the next two years gas tax revenue of \$80,000 must be used to augment net earnings of that venture. Just think of this one! And you will find in that same L. D. 1503 several others which are taking close to half a mil-

lion dollars of highway money to finance these bond issues that are not paying their way. I doubt that anyone in this Senate has even the remotest hope that the Jonesport-Beales bridge will ever be paid out of tolls.

Now I realize that I have made mistakes in the past. This is one of them. But I cannot believe that anyone in good, sound business judgment can support the ferry bill as presented in Report "B" by the Highway Committee.

Now in the summary that the ferry group presented — and I want to congratulate them on the fine presentation they gave the Highway Committee; it was very orderly, and we certainly appreciate all of the facts that they gave us — but in that they make the very statement, taking each town by itself: "We are making an estimate of what we believe we can do with the ferry business."

Are we going to present to the people of the State of Maine "a guess", as the good Senator from Knox, Senator Low, said, or "an estimate"? Shouldn't we have something good, sound and constructive that was put out by a good, reliable engineering firm? To me that makes good, sound logic. I thank you.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate: This question of state ferry service did not come before the Appropriations Committee, so therefore it is not an appropriations bill; but the minority report of the Highway Committee would make this one hundred per cent a general fund obligation, therefore I rise particularly to speak in the interests of the general fund.

The minority position of four, as presented in L. D. 1555, provides these definite things: The Maine Port Authority shall have the duty to operate ferry services. That means that boats, landing places, wharves and so forth must be procured, and, as quoted by the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole and as quoted in the act, "at an estimated cost of \$2,500,000." The Port Authority must so operate the venture as to retire the bonds, pay the interest, and meet the cost of upkeep, maintenance repairs and op-

eration, "provided," the bills says, "that the tolls must be limited to the value of the service." And as stated before, the bill has no time limit on the bonds. The serial issue can be for a ten-year debt, a twenty-year debt, a fifty-year debt or a hundred-year debt under the terms of this bill.

The bill makes it very clear in Section 9 that every penny of principal and interest shall be an obligation of the Treasurer of State regardless of whether or not the venture earns any profit after paying operating costs.

Section 9 says that \$2,500,000 in bonds to finance the capital cost of the service, as provided in Section 5. Section 9 says that we must use debt money to pay debt retirement and debt interest until such time as revenues are sufficient to meet all of these costs.

Supposing they have to use the two and a half million to build these wharves, ferries and so forth; suppose the bonds come due and interest comes due and profits do not exist; Section 9 makes it very clear that the Treasurer of State shall make good on the full-faith obligations.

First, I object to this bill because of the very statements in the bill itself. It refers to it as an estimated cost of \$2,500,000. I feel that too few facts are known at the present time. Certainly I do not feel that the service can be self-supporting unless tolls are so high it is going to limit the use.

I cannot help but feel that with a good engineering survey as to the cost and needs and so forth, that the next legislature will be in a much better position to take a good look at this proposition. I feel there is great potential in the development of our off-shore islands, and I think that something could very well be done after we had a thorough survey as to what the proposition was going to cost, and then if we know it is going to cost us \$2,500,000 or any amount of money we can look at it objectively then and decide if what we are buying is worth what we are paying for it.

I recognize the fact this is not a highway bill, and the \$25,000 requested from the State does come from the general fund, and

I certainly would have no objection to the use of \$25,000 from the general fund to make this study. I am very much afraid of what the prospects might be and what the drain on the general fund might be if this proposition does not operate in such a way as to pay its own way. I shall support the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker.

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise to support the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, and I am going to give you my reasons:

Those of you who were here in the last Legislature will recall the "bailing out" that the Legislature had to do with respect to the Westport-Wiscasset Bridge. Here was the case of an enthusiastic Senator from Lincoln County selling the Legislature the proposition that the island of Westport could exist only if given authority to build a toll bridge. Recognizing the economic uncertainty of the venture, the whole county of Lincoln and towns of Westport and Wiscasset were tied in as guarantors of the bond issue. What happened? Westport comes to this Legislature on its knees and says that a toll bridge was killing the economy of their island and they could no longer afford to pay the rates, and the cost of toll-keepers alone was a terrific burden. The situation was so bad that bonds were in default as to principal and interest. What did the Legislature do? It said in effect, "Had you first asked for a bridge act procedure, the Legislature would probably have turned you down, but to bail you out of the impossible situation that the two towns and Lincoln County find themselves in, the State will put up bridge act dollars to "bail out" the ill-conceived venture of this enthusiastic Senator from Lincoln County.

I am very much afraid of this venture here. I do not think that we should go beyond the survey at this time. I am afraid that this very same thing might happen, not two years from now but possibly five or ten years from now, and this legislature would have to use general fund money. To be sure, this

is a general fund appropriation bill as of now. The Committee on Highways heard this bill, gave it quite a lot of consideration, and they did not think that it was a sound investment in its present form, or the redraft which put it under the general fund. So I say again that I hope that the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, prevails.

Mr. LOW of Knox: Mr. President, when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr. President, I hesitate to get into this discussion, being from an inland county, but I do feel that the thing that Maine has to sell is its coastline. Regardless of where we go in this nation, whether we are going to consider the Great Lakes or the Smokies or any of our wondrous parks, the coastline of Maine bears a love, an enchantment, a desire of others to come and visit this State. Such being the case, should not we consider it worthwhile to encourage people to come in here? We are going to consider assisting business to come in and by doing that to amend our Constitution to do the things which we cannot do, yet here is something from our general fund to promote the general welfare of the State and to improve our islands and draw our visitors to a spot like which there is nothing on the entire New England or Atlantic Seaboard. I feel that this is a good investment for us to make in this State.

Now it has been mentioned that if we have too many bond issues the people will not be able to decide what issues to vote for. I have been accused of many things, but I still believe that the people can decide what issues they wish to act upon and can act intelligently; and so I am not afraid of sending out too many bond issues or other issues for the people to decide.

Perhaps one of the best promotion deals that we have in the State of Maine is that little Yankee magazine "Down East," and the letters which are coming in to that magazine and which are printed consistently from all over the world show the uniqueness which our coastal region has for the American citizen. What of it if it is not going

to completely pay for itself? There are many items in our Highway Department which have not paid and we think nothing of it. This is not highway funds; it is general funds. What of it if we are unable to make it pay? We don't know; but we firmly believe in the welfare of this State.

And then we speak of the fact that perhaps we have made a mistake in the past. I do not think it is a mistake for us to feel we should do something which would help develop the State. I certainly trust and hope that you can have faith in the future of the State of Maine and be willing to back our State and permit the people to have an opportunity to say whether or not they have faith in the State.

Now in regard to this survey. We have had many surveys. Last session we had a delightful survey on the Gardenspot of Maine. Here on the coast we need no survey to determine the beauty, the attractiveness, the potentiality of this spot, not only to the coast, but to the entire State, because when people come they must come by automobile, by train or by air, and they have got to stop along the way and as they stop they are going to increase business along the way. They say we are not a vacation state and we have other things. We are a vacation state, and if we are to be a vacation state then let us promote the facilities and let us not be afraid to promote them. I trust that we will give this consideration and that we will ultimately do what is right, and I hope that the motion for indefinite postponement will not prevail.

Mr. DOW of Lincoln: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I would first like to correct the record in respect to the origin of this bill. It is Knox County and not Lincoln. However, Lincoln County is going along with the good Senator from Knox on this bill because we folks in the coastal region feel that this piece of legislation is necessary for us to maintain and improve our economy.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, that the Senate adopt Report "A", which is "Ought

to pass in New Draft "B" under New Title, "Resolve Authorizing Engineering and Economic Survey of Ferry Service for North Haven, Vinalhaven, Islesboro and Swan's Island," and the Senator from Knox, Senator Low, has asked for a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, will rise and stand until counted.

A division was had.

Nine having voted in the affirmative and twenty-two in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox, Report "B" was adopted in concurrence, and the resolve given its first reading.

On further motion by Mr. Low, under suspension of the rules the resolve was read a second time and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence, and was ordered sent forthwith to the engrossing department.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair at this time appoints as Senate conferees on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the legislature on Bill "An Act Relating to Minimum Wages," (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1583) the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Hillman, the Senator from Hancock, Senator Silsby, the Senator from Lincoln, Senator Dow.

On motion by Mr. Woodcock of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table the 24th tabled and unassigned matter, (S. P. 381) (L. D. 1077) Senate Report "Ought not to pass" from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Reporter of Decisions," which was tabled on May 16th by that Senator, pending consideration of report; and on further motion by the same Senator the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

At Ease

Called to order by the President.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox, the Senate voted to take from the table the 37th tabled and unassigned

matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers." (S. P. 574) (L. D. 1577) tabled by that Senator on May 22 pending passage to be engrossed; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman.

Mr. WYMAN: Mr. President and members of the Senate, in the areas of disagreement on this bill, we have compromised with the various counties involved and I think the amendment is satisfactory now to all involved and also to those who disagreed with the bill when we debated it a few days ago. I present Senate Amendment C and move its adoption.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment C was adopted.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President, I present Senate Amendment B and move its adoption. May I just outline to the Senate the provisions of this amendment. I have had requests to introduce other amendments pertaining to county salaries and the amendment I am presenting strikes out the retroactive feature in the section that I read which applies to certain counties and does not apply to others.

I personally do not favor retroactive salaries and this would remove the retroactive feature which made it effective January 1, 1957 and now makes all salaries effective on July 1, 1957.

Thereupon Senate Amendment B was adopted and on motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending passage to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Reed of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report from the Committee on Highways, Ought not to pass, on "Resolve Authorizing Survey and Plans for a Maine-Quebec Highway." (S. P. 235) (L. D. 635) tabled by that Senator on April 24 pending consideration of the report.

Mr. REED of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I now move that the resolve be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee, and in support of that motion I would

like to give you some information regarding this particular project which has been known for some time now as the Maine-Quebec Highway.

First, some history regarding this proposed road. It was first conceived back in the Governor Brann era when there were many Works Progress Administration projects going on all over the country. In fact, at that time the project had reached the stage where a survey had been made and plans were made for the road to be built. However, before construction started better times began to come over the country and these government projects were shelved, so that was the reason that the road was not started at that time. The idea lay dormant for many years, until, back in 1954, a group of business men in central Aroostook began to realize the great potential that this road would mean to Aroostook County and to the entire State of Maine. It was through their efforts that renewed interest and enthusiasm went into this particular project, and a committee was formed, known as the Maine-Quebec Highway Committee, which was comprised of leading citizens from all over Aroostook County. After a great many meetings as a result of that committee a resolve was introduced at the last session, authorizing a study of the road by the State Highway Commission.

Now we have a report of the Highway Commission on that road, and in that report, as I know all of you have had copies distributed to you, I will just mention a few of the results.

First, they estimated that at least a hundred vehicles would use this road each day. This does not, incidentally, include Canadian traffic; no Canadian traffic estimates were made. This is merely the estimate of traffic generated in Maine. They also laid out the tentative route, which would run, according to their recommendations, from the town of Ashland westward to the town of Daaquam on the Quebec border in Canada, a distance of some eighty miles. There is now a woods road through much of this area and some of that road could be utilized when this road is finally built. They estimated the cost of the highway to

be around eight million dollars. Now of course we do not propose in this resolve to raise money to build the road; it is merely a matter of getting a survey on the project and to get construction plans.

Now what about the advantages of this highway? What will it mean to Aroostook County and the State of Maine as a whole? I have here a copy of Fact Sheet and Resolutions of the Maine-Quebec Highway Committee, and I would like to tell you some of the advantages we have itemized in this book.

First, it would provide a shorter route from northern Maine across the west central area of Aroostook County to connect with Quebec at Daaquam, making it possible to save mileage to Quebec City, Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa and United States cities of the Middle West.

No. 2. An increased flow of traffic through this part of Maine between the Maritime Provinces and to shorten the mileage distance to and from the major cities of these Provinces.

3. An increased flow of tourist traffic from Quebec via Daaquam and from points further West that would remain in Maine a longer time, thereby helping in the economy of the area.

No. 4. Usefulness of the Maine-Quebec Highway for defense by the military of the entire northeast in relation to Presque Isle Airforce Base, Loring Airforce Base and other military installations, both in the United States and Northeastern Canada.

No. 5. It would provide an added outlet to the West for more orderly and faster evacuation of all civilians in the event of sudden enemy atomic attack which would require more than one escape route.

No. 6. It would provide a shorter route to the St. Lawrence Seaway for commercial use, both to and from; also make it possible for potatoes to be shipped to middle western points by use of the Seaway facilities and shorter distances for trucking.

I am sure that all of you are aware of the tremendous potential of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The Canadian government is extremely enthusiastic, construction is under way, and before many years this seaway will be a tremendous artery

of economic development for Canada, and can be used by the State of Maine if we make the proper access routes to it, and certainly the Maine-Quebec Highway would be a very logical, practical and constructive step towards this end. I can very easily visualize potatoes being transported to a port on the St. Lawrence and there being taken by the cheaper waterway routes through to the Great Lakes area where we could very easily take advantage of larger and more expanded markets by the use of this seaway in connection with the Maine-Quebec Highway.

Another advantage would be to provide easier access to the huge deposits of manganese and other minerals which in the very near future might become so vital to the nation's defense, and the need for a shorter route to ship and transport the processed ore to the steel plants in the middle West.

Another advantage is the probable use of such a highway by commercial trucking firms, farm owners and other commercial users who might haul products and freight both to and from the St. Lawrence Seaway. And in regard to that I might mention that at the hearing it was brought out and we have a letter from a large processing firm in New Brunswick, a large trucking company there that handles french-fried frozen products with a large fleet of trucks and who say that they would definitely use this route in preference to the one they are using, which would mean, of course, increased traffic and more gas tax for the State of Maine if this road becomes a reality.

Also, because Northwestern Maine is a vast wilderness, an additional year-round highway to the West is needed to further develop the pulpwood and lumber industries.

Such a highway would ease the labor situation for the pulpwood and lumber operators by providing an easier access to the pulp and lumber camps for the laborers, both from the United States and Canada.

The wilderness would become more easily accessible to the average sportsman who is unable to pay the expenses of flying to the areas now accessible only by air; thereby saving a great amount of

time that otherwise would be spent travelling by boat or on foot.

By this Highway following along many lakes, a great new scenic territory would be opened up.

Also this road would allow easier access into this woods area for fire-fighting apparatus and equipment in times of threatened conflagrations.

It would be much easier for better and more rapid supervision of the area by Game and Fire Wardens in covering their respective districts.

In addition, it would bring about a much greater expansion of Northern Maine, particularly Aroostook County, and by so expanding Aroostook County the whole State stands to benefit also.

Now as far as my particular participation in the project: back in February the Ashland, Maine Chamber of Commerce promoted a caravan trip over the existing route along the tentative line where the Maine-Quebec Highway would go. Obviously we could not follow the line as described and recommended in the Highway Commission study; we had to follow woods roads. There was a caravan of some twenty-five cars and some fifty or sixty people from all over Aroostook County that made this trip, and we experienced no difficulty, the roads being open at that time of year and we covered the distance without too much trouble.

Upon reaching the Quebec border—and I have had this question asked me: What about the roads in Quebec? Well, I can say to you very sincerely and very honestly that they certainly are roads of a high standard. From Daaquam through to Montagny there is a stretch of just eight miles that is not hot-top or hard-surface pavement. Quebec officials tell us that this road will be completed and hot-topped in the coming year, so as far as the road conditions in Quebec, they certainly are A No. 1 in respect to this highway, and there would certainly be a connecting link as far as going over to there.

I have heard some criticism to the effect that Quebec officials would not be in favor of this. Well, it was our privilege to talk to some of the officials of the Quebec government

while in Quebec City, and they assured us, and I have a communication in my files, stating that they are very much in favor of this road. They can envision a great new era of cooperation and working back and forth between the great State of Maine and the great Province of Quebec.

I was tremendously impressed with the progress that the Province of Quebec has been making. Coming back from the trip that I made, I noticed a mine. This happened to be a lead mine in Quebec, and it was quite a thriving business there, and you could look over from that mine into the State of Maine. In addition to the lead mine, in the neighboring area along the border there is a copper mine. So I say to you I do not feel that these natural resources we have in these mineral deposits stop at the Maine-Quebec border; I think that in addition to the many, many advantages of this road that by opening up this area we are quite apt to find valuable deposits that would help in industrialization and help the economy of the State of Maine. I point that out because that is something I have seen myself, and I do feel very confident that we do have valuable mineral deposits in the State of Maine.

Now over on the Canadian side, we have had Premier Hugh John Flemming of the Province of New Brunswick up to a meeting at Presque Isle, and he and his staff are very enthusiastic over the road. They too are planning a new road, known as the Renous Highway that is going to come in to the Maine border and would be an ideal link-up with the Maine-Quebec Highway through to Quebec and then through to the Maritime Provinces.

Obviously the Canadians are certainly going to benefit a lot by this road, and as they benefit so too will we here in Maine benefit. We know the tremendous amount of tourist business we receive from Canadian citizens, and many of those are from Quebec. And that is why they are very glad to see this new route into Maine, because it will make it much more accessible for them to come into the State and thereby assisting our economy by traveling and spending their dollars

here. So you see we have the evidence very preponderately in favor of the fact that both Quebec and New Brunswick are in favor of this particular highway that we now propose.

As I say, the Resolve, L. D. 635, calls for a survey and construction plan with complete cost estimates. We have been told by our Congressman, Clifford G. McIntire, that when we have perused the possibility of having this become a federal project, and we have perused many of the aspects of the problem, he says that in his experience his advice to us is that as far as these projects are concerned they have seen them come in from other states, and the states in which the project would be located in practically every instance have had completed construction surveys and plans. So that is why we are here today asking the 98th Legislature to condescend to pass this resolve so that we can, without further delay, promote the interests of the Maine-Quebec Highway and have survey plans made, so that as soon as this is done we can turn this over to our Washington delegation to further follow up and see if we cannot make this great road become a reality.

We have checked with military officials and they tell us that they are one hundred per cent in favor of the road. They do have defense funds to build short stretches, such as the road from Loring Airforce Base to the town of Caribou, but they do not have money available in their various appropriations to build long stretches of road, therefore we are unable to obtain funds from that source; but we do feel that through the joint efforts of the State of Maine and the Federal government we can find it possible to build this road in the not too distant future.

So I ask you to consider the facts, consider the great potential value that this highway would be to us here in the State of Maine, and I earnestly ask you to support me in my motion to substitute the resolve for the report of the committee.

Mr. PARKER of Sebec: I rise in opposition to the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed, because of several reasons.

I would like to point out that this resolve came before the Highway Committee early in the session. I would also like to compliment the Senator for the orderly manner in which the group from Aroostook County that attended the hearing presented their evidence. He had a large delegation and all the facts were brought out pertaining to the resolve as far as we were able to ascertain at that time. The committee wished to have all the facts that were possible because we realize that this is something very dear to the hearts of the delegation from Aroostook County and to all of those who live in Aroostook County. However, after giving this careful consideration, every member of the committee were unanimous in coming out with an "Ought not to pass" report. Now you may wonder why that happened.

First, let me say that we were very well aware, from the letters and telegrams that we received, that there was a great deal of divided opinion as to where such a road should be constructed and first surveyed. We had letters and telegrams that suggested that the cost of construction would be much less farther north in the Allagash region; we had letters and telegrams that were greatly in favor of surveying and constructing a road from the Allagash region in Aroostook County and Canada. We had letters from different places in Canada that suggested some other route that would reach Canada, rather than the proposed one starting in Ashland. We also had several telegrams from different Chambers of Commerce in Aroostook County that objected to having this road surveyed at the tremendous cost as was estimated to us of two thousand dollars a mile for the survey, and there is eighty miles, before some of this amount of money was first spent on making the roads that are now being used in that area more serviceable and in much better condition than they now are.

I would like to read three such telegrams. The first one is from the Fort Kent Chamber of Commerce: "This chamber is opposed to the bill seeking appropriation for survey of Maine-Quebec Highway until existing roads in northern

Maine are improved. (Signed) Fort Kent Chamber of Commerce."

Another one: "We oppose L. D. 635 due to conditions of existing used highways. We feel surveying and planning for new highways unfeasible at the present time. Respectfully, Caribou Chamber of Commerce."

Another one: "Van Buren Chamber of Commerce strongly opposes passage of the bill pertaining to the Maine-Quebec Highway. We feel available funds should be spent on existing Maine roads and that other highways are available for direct traffic to the St. Lawrence Seaway."

Members of the Senate, the only alternative we had as a committee, and I think we acted very wisely under the conditions, was to come out with an "Ought not to pass" report on this bill. I am very sure that there will be a time come probably when we should make a survey and possibly construct such a highway as called for here, but it is my honest opinion that this is not the time. We have such a divided opinion even in their own county where the road will be constructed that even if the survey was made immediately you would hear dissenting opinions from other areas in the county that it should not have been surveyed and constructed where the present one is laid out to be surveyed and constructed. Therefore, Mr. President and member of the Senate, I certainly hope that the motion does not prevail.

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I hate to rise in opposition to my good friend, the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed, on this matter.

This is one of the bills that the Committee on Highways gave very serious consideration to. As I sat here in my seat listening to the debate, particularly from the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed, it occurred to me that if the road was surveyed and built and I was in Portland or Augusta or in Calais or in any part of Maine or the Maritime Provinces and wanted to get to Quebec I certainly would not drive several hundred miles out of my way in traveling to Quebec City. There are a lot of shorter routes to Quebec City, Montreal and western

Canada than the proposed route we are discussing at this time. If this survey was made I think it would be a dangerous thing because if they actually construct the highway it would be at a tremendous cost. We have had an estimate from the Highway Commission that it would run anywhere from \$150,000 to \$250,000. That would be for the survey. If they went on to construct such a highway it would cost eight millions of State dollars. We would not be eligible for any federal funds on this type of highway because it is not designated as a highway in the Federal primary or secondary highway system. I think that is one of the things that this body should consider today before they act on this resolve.

If we build this road it wouldn't go anywhere; it would not serve the purpose of the people in Aroostook in shipping their product inasmuch as the St. Lawrence Seaway, so-called, is frozen for three months out of the year, January, February and March. There is another thing that should be taken into consideration, and that is the time that the main product of Aroostook County would be shipped. If they wait until April when the river would be clear of ice to ship their product to the middle and western states, then the potatoes are all on the market, and I doubt very much if any of the farmers of Aroostook County would want to hold their potatoes back until the first of April for the St. Lawrence Seaway to be clear of ice.

I hope that the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed, does not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed, that the Senate substitute the resolve for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. BRIGGS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: "Give the roads back to Aroostook," has been the chant all through the session. Now some of us would like to give the roads back to Cumberland. I want to make sure that everyone here at least is well apprised of the fact that this road is not something that is very dear to the hearts of all the people of Aroos-

took; as a matter of fact it is a road over which there is a very great deal of disapproval and dissatisfaction. I have been aware of the interest in this scheme for a road through the woods to Quebec under a lot of different guises under which it has been proposed for some time, and I would like to take this opportunity to discuss some of these merits with you.

In the first place, as you know, there is no settled area which would be served by this road. It is eighty miles from Ashland through to the Quebec boundary approximately at Daquam, New Brunswick, which is really from wilderness to wilderness, and the Ashland side is much less wilderness than the other side.

Now one of the great schemes or plans that has been used in promoting this road has been that it could tie up with the St. Lawrence Seaway; that it would be a great chance, that we could ship our potatoes to the middle-western states and all over. Along about last summer it became apparent to some of the spokesmen who are promoting this worthy plan that the Seaway was frozen up for most of the winter. As a matter of fact, they take up their navigation devices in November. This being the time that we ship most of our potatoes, obviously we would not have very much of an opportunity to use the Seaway. Also at the end of the place where the road is proposed to come out to the St. Lawrence there are no port facilities. A couple or three or four or five million would probably relieve that. This road travels through an expanse in a generally east to west direction that is already paralleled by existing highways, making approximate points no more different in distance than twenty-five or fifty miles. Existing highways serve all sorts of farm-to-market and home-to-market people. Quebec is taking tremendous steps to improve a road down through Escourt and Blue River with a beautiful hard-top road that will to an extent parallel this road and will serve everybody.

It is no secret to most folks in Arnostook County, I can assure you, that we have got a tremendous amount of area that needs road

money, any amount of road money. One of the roads that suffers most is the road between Caribou and Van Buren. It is also bad between Caribou and Washburn and between Caribou and Fort Fairfield. There are many, many other areas that are not as immediately adjacent to my own particular town that need a lot of improvement on their highways. One is from Presque Isle to Ashland, which is in desperate condition.

There has always been mentioned in connection with this thing what a handy thing it would be for Civil Defense. We have got some pretty big military installations up there now, and you folks know that if some enemy should come here and drop a hydrogen bomb on us we could all get onto these roads that go into Canada; we have got a lot of them already and this would be another one and would help us in our flight to Canada. I do not think if we get into any such desperate circumstances as that we will need to be having a road to run to anywhere.

So far as the interest of the pulp and paper people, speaking in a general way, most of the land area in there is owned by the Great Northern Paper Company and the International, and neither of them are especially eager to have a State Highway or any kind of highway that they have to pay taxes on to haul wood out, because they have a very good woods road in there now on which they can haul their wood out to the loading point at Ashland for nothing.

One of the most fantastic promotions for this dreamy scheme is that this vast area of wilderness will indeed be opened up so that people could go in there and enjoy themselves: plenty of access for all. But I am sure it is plain to all that once you open up the wilderness it is the wilderness no more; it is merely a sandwich-wrapper and beer-bottle boulevard, and that doesn't interest anyone very much, I do not think.

Now Mr. President and members of the Senate: least of all in importance perhaps is the fact that here in this area is one of the largest remaining wilderness areas in

the whole eastern part of the United States. This area is serving its purpose mighty well by growing timber; we do not need any more agricultural land, and I do not think that at this point we need a new road through the woods to Quebec that is going to cost us approximately \$180,000 for the study and survey that is requested, and which is going to cost an estimated twelve or thirteen million for the construction of it. I move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs, that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. ROGERSON of Aroostook: Mr. President, I find myself in a very difficult position. The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed, has given you, I think, a very able and a very sincere presentation of the facts as he sees them, and certainly the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs has given you an equally sincere and able presentation of the facts as he sees them.

I think I would be something less than candid if I tried to suggest to you that we in Aroostook were unanimous in support of this Aroostook measure. I think the spokesman for the Highway Committee and the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs, have established the fact that there is some disagreement.

In the southern part of the county there is some interest in this highway. I have found, however, that there is more interest in the northwestern section, and because I have been approached by a number of my good friends in that area whose opinions I respect, and because I have substantially less information on this than the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed and the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs, I have taken the position that I would like to endorse this measure because I feel that the people in the northwestern section have very amply demonstrated that they believe that this has great economic potential for that area. There is a limited amount of recreational activity in the area, which would be

expanded, they feel, if this highway were put through.

Some mention has been made to water-shipping through the St. Lawrence Seaway and the St. Lawrence River. It has been pointed out to me too that in the winter months that shipping is not possible and therefore we should discount that reason for building this highway. It has also been pointed out to me by proponents of this measure that modern ice-breaking, in existence or proposed, would make it feasible to ship by the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I feel that since there is enough evidence, in my opinion, to justify my support of this measure, that I would like to endorse the stand of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed.

Mr. COLE of Liberty: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I feel that this bill has been very well covered, both pro and con, and most of you have made up your minds as to how you are going to vote.

I would like to give you a little history of this project. I know there are some new members here that were not here two years ago, and for their benefit I would like to say that I stood by this very seat and debated with the good Senator from Aroostook who is not now a Senator but who has my highest respect and admiration. That is Senator Collins of Aroostook. I was defeated in my attempt to kill the original survey for which \$10,000 was asked, and my reasons at that time were as they are now: that I feel that these things sort of creep up on you, that once they had the survey this very thing that we are debating now would be forthcoming. We spent ten thousand for the survey and now we have another one for a more adequate survey for complete construction, which calls for \$175,000 or more.

Now let me ask the Senators this question: We have made the original survey and now they are asking for a more complete survey, and what is next? Wouldn't it be possible that the next thing would be a project for eight million or more for construction of this highway, which, as the good Senator from Oxford, Senator Ferguson, has told you would be all State funds? And it has also been stated here that Aroostook County still has some

roads that need attention. Wouldn't it be better, in your opinion, to take some of this money for improvement of our present roads? I think so.

This has been referred to as "a scheme." Now I have the deepest respect for the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed, and for all of the proponents of this measure, and also for the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs, and his version of this project. I would like to ask you another question: Once we build this road with eight or more million dollars of State money, what is next? It has been known that in some years Aroostook County, the Gardenspot of Maine, does have some snow. What will be the cost of winter maintenance of this road, which I am sure will not be used to any great extent? I can see some summer visitors using it across the wilderness. I do not know whether you have seen this map, but this road is right directly through the woods of Maine. Do we want to go that far with our highway? It would seem to me that this is one chance where we can give consideration to our future and present highways which number 20,000 miles in a State as large as Maine with only 930,000 people. I ask you to think of some of these things that will be coming before you or our successors in the future.

Mr. REED of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: There are a few points I would like to clear up regarding some of the items that have been raised by the opponents of this measure.

First, we envision this thing in three steps. First, a study. We have had the study. Second, this is a survey, not another study. I want to point out we are not asking for duplication of effort. This is the survey, construction plans and cost estimates. The next step obviously is not what next; the obvious answer is: building the road. I thought I pointed it out, but apparently I did not make it clear to my good friends on the Highway Committee, that we anticipate that this would be a federal project, not all State dollars. I repeat, not all State dollars.

I like to consider myself as being

fairly sound and fairly conservative, but still with a progressive attitude.

Now as far as the other routes: we were very careful on the Maine-Quebec Highway Committee not to indicate where this road should go, in fact if you hark back to the original resolve, we left it entirely in the hands of the Highway Commission to decide where this road should be built, not taking an arbitrary point of view. We have members on this committee representing every community and area in Aroostook County, and we definitely did not want to show any favoritism whatsoever. The results of the study have shown that it should run, according to Highway Commission recommendations, from Ashland to Daaquam at the Quebec border.

Now as far as the northern route: all through this promotion we have tried to point out that we are not looking for a route north; we are looking for a route west. The other alternative that has been suggested, to have it in the Allagash area—I am certainly as interested as anyone else in good roads all over Maine and Aroostook County and the Allagash as well, but up in that area you would be going north and northwest. In addition to that, the Canadian government is planning on more power projects in the north which would flood the St. Johns river back quite a ways toward where these folks propose this road to go. Now if they back the St. John river up because of these dams they put in obviously the cost of bridges to jump the St. John are going to jump tremendously. That is another mighty good reason for locating it in the place we propose now.

I fully agree with my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs, that not all of the people in the area are a hundred per cent satisfied with it; but I ask you to search your minds as far as projects you have had back in your own area, in your own home town: were they all in perfect agreement with them? I would be the first one to say that in my town that was not the case. I think we like to go along with the feeling of the majority, and in my

own honest opinion I feel that the majority is in favor of this highway.

Now as far as the St. Lawrence Seaway being closed when most of the potatoes are shipped. It has been pointed out in fairness that ice-breakers would be used. When we were up there in February the St. Lawrence was open at that time, and the Canadian officials assured us that they are working on an atomic process to keep this St. Lawrence Seaway open the year round. Now I know that we are progressive folks here, I know that we are thinking of the future and the tremendous progress that is being made in the atomic field, and I think it is not beyond the realm of possibility that in a few short years we will see this become a reality and that the St. Lawrence will be open for year-round shipments on this waterway.

Another point I would like to bring out: it was estimated that the study would cost \$10,000. I have in my files a letter from an official of the State Highway Commission, an attache, that the study actually cost in the neighborhood of \$3500. I am not doubting a bit the estimate put on by the Highway Commission, but I just bring that out as a fact to show that it may not cost as much as has been proposed here this afternoon.

As far as the Civil Defense angle that has been brought out, that it is just an argument that has been used: I point out that at the hearing General Heschich of the Federal Civil Defense in Washington happened to be up here at the time, and he heard about the project and volunteered to come in, and I know that the members of the committee will remember that he endorsed whole-heartedly this project as a tremendous asset in the evacuation of personnel in the case of enemy attack in northern Maine.

In addition to that, I would like to have you ask yourselves: Has any road ever hurt an area? We have heard it mentioned here that it is going to hurt an area. I have talked with many people about it and I can find nobody who has said that if a road is built in a certain area it actually hurt that area. I do not believe there is any basis

or any foundation there. As I say, I realize that naturally everybody is not in accord. I would point out that, as was brought out, two years ago we had three gentlemen here occupying these three chairs, gentlemen I know you have tremendous respect for, namely Senator Paul Crabtree, Senator Charles Jamieson, and Senator Sam Collins; I know that you have the utmost respect of those gentlemen, and I would point out that Senator Collins is a resident of the town of Caribou. I have talked with a great many people in the town of Caribou, and just a few weeks ago I was talking with one of the most progressive citizens in that town, who said: "I just hope that the opponents of this measure live long enough to see how wrong they are about this road." I just point that out to indicate the feeling of some of the folks in that area. I say it is a progressive action, I hope you will support me in it, and not for the pending question. I would, Mr. President, request a division when the vote is taken.

Mr. BRIGGS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I feel obliged to point out again that this study was produced following the last session and the money was made available. The study has shown conclusively that this scheme is no good. The Highway Committee has heard this question, I assume at great length, and they have reported unanimously that this scheme is no good. Everyone north and a good many people south of a line comprised of Ashland, Fort Fairfield and Presque Isle feel that the plan is no good. It seems to me that a good many of these reasons offered are presented in a way that makes them appear more like excuses than reasons. I hope that the motion for indefinite postponement will prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs that the resolve and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs, will rise and stand until counted.

A division was had.

Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and fourteen in the negative, the motion prevailed and the resolve was indefinitely postponed.

Additional House Papers Conference Committee Report

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill, "An Act Relating to the Taking of Quahogs." (H. P. 14) (L. D. 13) reported that they are Unable to Agree.

Which report was read and adopted in concurrence.

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

In Senate on May 23, Indefinitely Postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 362) and as amended by House Amendments A (Filing No. 383) and B (Filing No. 517) in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mrs. Lord of Cumberland, the Senate voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Compensation of Medical Examiners for View and Autopsy." (H. P. 954) (L. D. 1355)

In Senate on May 23, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A, (Filing No. 242) and as amended by Senate Amendment A (Filing No. 538) in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, receded from passage to be engrossed — Committee Amendment A Indefinitely Postponed. Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, tabled pending further consideration.

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

In Senate on May 22, reports and bill indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having Insisted upon its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Com-

mittee Amendment B (Filing 244), now asks for Committee of Conference.

In the Senate on motion by Mr. Carpenter of Somerset, the Senate voted to insist and join in the Committee of Conference; and the President appointed as Senate conferees, Senators: Carpenter of Somerset, Briggs of Aroostook and Silsby of Hancock.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Registration of Farm Trucks." (H. P. 404) (L. D. 534)

In Senate on May 23, report and bill Indefinitely Postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having Insisted upon its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, now asks for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Reed of Aroostook, the Senate voted to adhere.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Hunting with Bow and Arrow." (H. P. 742) (L. D. 1056)

In Senate on May 23, report and bill Indefinitely Postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having Insisted upon its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, now asks for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Carpenter of Somerset, the rules were suspended and the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby it indefinitely postponed the bill; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was substituted for the report, given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

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

In Senate on May 23, Indefinitely Postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having Insisted upon its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing 378), now asks for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Parker of Piscataquis, the Senate voted to insist and join in the Committee of Conference, and the President appointed as Senate conferees, Senators: Parker of Piscataquis, Ferguson of Oxford and Davis of Cumberland.

House Committee Reports Leave to Withdraw

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act to Authorize Construction and Installation of Certain Capital Improvements at the State Teachers' Colleges and the Fort Kent State Normal School." (H. P. 634) (L. D. 894) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Funds for a State Police Garage at Augusta." (H. P. 44) (L. D. 79) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Construction of Physics Building at the University of Maine." (H. P. 260) (L. D. 358) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Providing an Organic Chemistry Laboratory and Chemistry and Chemical Engineering Equipment at the University of Maine." (H. P. 197) (L. D. 284) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw — Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Completion of the Library, Science and Classroom Building at Gorham State Teachers College." (H. P. 339) (L. D. 471) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on "Resolve Completing Residence of President of Farmington State Teachers' College." (H. P. 524) (L. D. 752) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw — Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Education and Administration Building at Fort Kent State Normal School." (H. P. 528) (L. D. 756) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for a Multi-Purpose Building at Aroostook State Teachers' College." (H. P. 580) (L. D. 829) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw—Covered by Other Legislation.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Construction of an Airport in Washington County." (H. P. 1024) (L. D. 1457) reported that same be granted Leave to Withdraw — Covered by Other Legislation.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve Appropriating Funds for Addition to State Police Headquarters Building." (H. P. 154) (L. D. 202) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve for Installation of Sprinkler Systems in Certain Dormitories at Farmington State Teachers' College." (H. P. 523) (L. D. 751) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Construct a Drill Hall at Maine Maritime Academy." (H. P. 585) (L. D. 834) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

The Committee on Highways on Bill, "An Act Providing for Funds for State Aid Highways." (H. P. 158) (L. D. 205) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

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

Comes from the House, bill substituted for report and passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate,

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President, I move that the Senate accept the Ought not to pass report in non-concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the bill was tabled pending motion by Senator Sinclair.

Ought to Pass—N.D.—Same Title

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Arbitration to Collective Bargaining Contracts." (H. P. 972) (L. D. 1372) reported same in New Draft (H. P. 1099) (L. D. 1599) under same title and that it Ought to pass

Comes from House, report accepted and bill in New Draft passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A (Filing No. 522)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, the Ought to pass report was accepted and the bill read once; House Amendment A was adopted and under suspension of the rules, the bill was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

Majority—ONTP**Minority — OTP as Amended by Committee Amendment A.**

The Majority of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating an Advisory Committee on Poultry within Department of Agriculture." (H. P. 1022) (L. D. 1466) reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

SINCLAIR of Somerset
LESSARD of Androscoggin

Representatives:

DAVIS of Cumberland
BEAN of Winterport
WOOD of Webster
BRAGDON of Perham
STANLEY of Bangor
DUQUETTE of Biddeford

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported Ought to pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A.

(Signed)

Representatives:

EDWARDS of Raymond
DAVIS of Calais

Comes from the House Majority Report ONTP Accepted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, the Ought not to pass report was accepted in concurrence.

**Majority — OTP
Minority — ONTP**

The Majority of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill, "An Act Relating to Definition of Redevelopment Project under Slum Clearance and Redevelopment Authority Law." (H. P. 136) (L. D. 174) reported that the same Ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senator

WOODCOCK of Penobscot

Representatives:

TEVANIAN of Portland
HANCOCK of York
BROWNE of Bangor
EARLES of So. Portland
NEEDHAM of Orono
BRODERICK of Portland
WALKER of Auburn

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

SILSBY of Hancock
BUTLER of Franklin

In House, the Majority Report (OTP) Accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate:

Mr. SILSBY of Hancock: Mr. President, I move that the Senate accept the Minority Ought not to pass Report.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Charles of Cumberland, tabled pending Mr. Silsby's motion.

Majority — OTP — New Draft — New Title**Minority — OTP — As Amended by Committee Amendment A.**

The Majority of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill, "An Act Relating to Aid from Federal Government Under Maine Housing Authorities Law." (H. P. 8) (L. D. 7) reported that the same Ought to pass in New Draft, (H. P. 1098) (L. D. 1598); New Title, "An Act Amending the Maine Housing Authorities Act."

(Signed)

Senator

WOODCOCK of Penobscot

Representatives:

BROWNE of Bangor
EARLES of So. Portland
HANCOCK of York
NEEDHAM of Orono

TEVANIAN of Portland
WALKER of Auburn
BRODERICK of Portland

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the bill Ought to pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 496)

(Signed)

Senators:

SILSBY of Hancock
BUTLER of Franklin

Comes from the House Majority Report Accepted, and bill Passed to be Engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Curtis of Cumberland, tabled pending consideration of the reports.

Majority—ONTP

Minority—OTP

The Majority of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill, "An Act Relating to Sale of Certain Beverages to Minors." (H. P. 381) (L. D. 510) reported Ought Not to Pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

CARPENTER of Somerset
BOUCHER of Androscoggin
WILLEY of Hancock

Representatives:

DOSTIE of Winslow
COUTURE of Lewiston
PIERCE of Bucksport
CROCKETT of Freeport

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported Ought to Pass.

(Signed)

Representatives:

CHRISTIE of Presque Isle
RICH of Charleston
ANTHOINE of Windham

Comes from the House Minority Report Ought to Pass Accepted and Bill Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by House Amendment B (Filing No. 512).

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate accepted the ought not to pass report in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill, "An Act Regulating Public Utilities Engaged in Non-Utility Business." (S. P. 276) (L. D. 735)

The Senate on April 25 accepted Majority Ought Not to Pass Report

from the Committee on Business Legislation.

Comes from the House, Minority Ought to Pass report accepted in non-concurrence and the bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Butler of Franklin, the Senate voted to adhere.

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolve at this time without reference to a committee.

The resolve was read by title: "Resolve Authorizing the State of Maine to Convey Certain Land in Bangor."

Mr. BUTLER: In explanation of this resolve and the reason for my asking its introduction at this time: As we have already passed an act which incorporates part of Bangor for development, this particular bit of land is now owned by the State of Maine; it was deeded by the City of Bangor to the State of Maine; it is now occupied in part by the military authority in the State for barracks. Part of this land, about one acre, is not needed, but it is desired to be used by the authority which has recently been created by this legislature. The resolve provides that the property should be used only by the State with the consent of the Military Commission of the State, the Governor and Council and the Adjutant General, they being the only ones that are directly affected by it. In view of that, I would recommend that this be referred to no committee, and under suspension of the rules it be permitted to be introduced, have its first and second readings and be passed to be engrossed.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Franklin, Senator Butler, asks unanimous consent for the introduction of a resolve. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the resolve is received.

On motion by Mr. Butler, under suspension of the rules, the resolve was given its two several readings without reference to a committee, passed to be engrossed and sent down for concurrence.

The same Senator also moved that the resolve be printed in document form.

On motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table the 16th tabled and unassigned matter, (S. P. 572) (L. D. 1575) Bill, "An Act Relating to Salaries of County Attorneys and Assistant County Attorneys," which was tabled by that Senator on May 13th pending assignment for second reading.

The same Senator then moved the pending question; and under suspension of the rules the resolve was read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table Bill "An Act Relating to Salaries and Clerk Hire of Certain County Officers," (S. P. 574) (L. D. 1577), which was tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending passage to be engrossed.

The same Senator moved the pending question and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" and Senate Amendment "C" in non-concurrence and sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table the 42nd tabled and unassigned matter, (H. P. 258) (L. D. 356) House Report "Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment 'A'," from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act Increasing Pensions of Elderly Teachers," which was tabled by that Senator on May 23rd, pending consideration.

On further motion by the same Senator, the "Ought to pass as Amended by Committee Amendment 'A'" report of the committee was accepted in nonconcurrence. The bill was then given its first reading; Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted in non-concurrence and House Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence.

The same Senator then presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment "A" was read and adopted in non-concurrence, and on further motion by Mr. Sinclair, under suspension of the rules the resolve was passed to be engrossed

as amended in non-concurrence and sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Charles of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table the 33rd tabled and unassigned matter, (H. P. 1070) (L. D. 1530) Bill "An Act to Eliminate Discrimination between Purchasers," which was tabled on May 22nd by that Senator pending motion by Senator Low of Knox to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. CHARLES of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in opposition to indefinitely postpone.

This is a bill that came out of our Committee on Business Legislation with all three Senate committee members favoring it; it came out with Committee Report "A" which we accepted. It was given a complete hearing and redraft accepted by Report "A" members after suggestions and amendments were proposed and presented in writing to us.

After the redraft, legal and proper attention was sought out by myself to help clear up some of the terminology so as to give the measure a clearer meaning without deterring from its intent or purpose.

This bill is not only of state-wide interest but also of national interest, and I may rightfully report that this bill is strictly in line with the aims and purposes of the interstate Robinson-Patman Act adopted by Congress on June 19, 1936. Since this, the Robinson-Patman Act covers legislation on an interstate basis in interstate commerce, no such law affects the discriminatory practices that may be prevalent within the bounds of our State by those engaged in interstate commerce. I will also say that this bill as presented before this body would correct any discriminatory practices by those engaged in interstate commerce in this State which are carried on through loopholes in the Robinson-Patman act.

Discrimination in trade is a very serious element in maintaining free competition on the open market, both to trade and the consuming public. Discrimination exists when traders in the same field and under the same conditions are given a trade or price advantage over other

customers in the same class whereby the difference granted to one casts some burden or disadvantage upon the other.

Discriminatory practices in our state can be retarded by serious consideration of this bill. I do acknowledge the fact that opposition to this bill in effect would, no doubt, come from companies who are trying to dominate the competitive market by making it as difficult as possible for small business to prosper and keep abreast of competition.

Prior to the enactment of such type of legislation on a national basis, an investigation by the Department of Justice found that over a hundred manufacturing firms had been granting rebates and trade allowances only to favored buyers which ran into about \$6,000,000 in one year. Since the control of such practices on an interstate basis, small business has been able to breathe a little better and make some progress. However, there now develops certain loopholes that would permit a price advantage to a selected buyer over another customer to pay a lower price for his merchandise in order to meet the competitor across the street or in the competitive area. While this may be a help to that buyer, it means discrimination to the similar class of buyer, say within the trading area. Dealer "A" who received the discriminatory price now has the advantage over Dealer "B", and it now develops that the consumer customers of Dealer "B" find it to their advantage to stop trading there and go to Dealer "A". This apparently is the primary disadvantage in the retail gasoline business but it certainly has the same effect on all businesses, whether it be the druggist, restaurant, independent or chain grocer or appliance dealers.

I certainly hope that this body will understand that this is a measure to help small business grow and to consider those merchants who were once small that are now grown into sizeable establishments. It is my intent and purpose to emphasize that discrimination in price concessions is not in the good interest of the consuming public. If we are going to have price reductions for one outlet, let us, under this bill, make it available to all

buyers so that consumers everywhere will benefit from the same and preserve the purpose of free enterprise against the dangerous unfair trading that may some day limit our purchases in the hands of monopoly and higher prices.

I certainly hope that you will oppose the motion for indefinite postponement.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator Low, that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CHARLES of Cumberland: Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: As many as are in favor of the motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator Low, that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed will rise and stand until counted.

A division was had.

Nine having voted in the affirmative and seventeen in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is the passage of the bill to be engrossed as amended.

Mr. MARTIN of Kennebec then presented Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

Mr. CHARLES of Cumberland: Mr. President, I move that this amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Charles, moves that Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MARTIN of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate: Perhaps many of you do not realize this, but this is a new draft from this committee and it is really the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Robinson - Patman Act has this amendment which I have introduced in it. I do not think the State ought to follow any different procedure than the federal government, so I would strongly oppose the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Charles.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Charles, that Senate Amend-

ment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CHARLES of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I would also like to explain that if this amendment is adopted it practically means the bill is no good and you might just as well vote to indefinitely postpone the entire bill. I want to explain that to you, because if this amendment is adopted it is going to permit discrimination in one area over another.

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I move that the bill be laid on the table.

The motion prevailed and the bill and accompanying papers were tabled, pending the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Charles that Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Cole of Waldo, the Senate voted to take from the table the 19th tabled and unassigned matter, (H. P. 19) (L. D. 24) House Reports: Majority "Ought not to pass"; Minority "Ought to pass," from the Committee on Highways, on Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Construction of a Causeway, Connecting Cousins Island with Littlejohns Island, and a Bridge and Causeway Connecting Littlejohns with Chebeague Island," which was tabled by that Senator on May 13th pending consideration of reports.

Mr. COLE of Waldo: Mr. President, I yield to the Chairman of the Highway Committee, the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I want to say first that this act calls for the issuance of three million dollars in State bonds that may run over a fifty-year period, to be retired by a proposed toll charge of \$1.25 per vehicle. It came out of the committee with a six to three majority "Ought not to pass" report. It was the thinking of the committee, even after the presentation of the traffic and revenue report on the proposed toll bridge, as many of you have seen, that there was grave doubt on our part that this bridge would ever be self-supporting or would ever pay off its

bonds, or over the long pull even pay the interest on those bonds.

This island has a population of 300. When you consider the possibility or the feasibility of constructing a bridge costing three million dollars to an island with a population of 300, it really stretches your imagination to the breaking point as to whether it would or ever could retire the bonds from the tolls. We believe this is just another Westport-Wiscasset bridge and that it would eventually have to be bailed out by the State taxpayers.

It was recognized that while this survey was made by reputable engineers, there was grave doubt that it could ever pay off these bonds. The actual figures of the vote by the committee I now find is not six to three but it was six to four, the majority in favor of the "Ought not to pass" report.

I move, Mr. President, that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CURTIS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise to oppose the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, and to explain very briefly what is meant by this particular legislative document and what it proposes to do.

The title in one sense is self-explanatory, "An Act to Authorize the Construction of a Causeway, Connecting Cousins Island with Littlejohns Island, and a Bridge and Causeway Connecting Littlejohns with Chebeague Island." There are two islands just off the coast—actually there are three, one having just recently been connected by a power company bridge, opening up the possibility of connecting the other two islands to make a roadway from the mainland to Chebeague Island. Now this is a dream of the area for some years, a dream that has been very carefully looked over, planned and finally surveyed, in order to determine its feasibility and to assure the success of the project if undertaken.

On Chebeague Island there is a matter of some 2300 people year round, the year-round residency is small, but with the summer visitors it adds up to that. The island has been one of the most popular vacationland islands in the Casco Bay

area, and in fact Chebeague Island is the largest island in that area; but it has been declining in the last few years, and most of the evidence points to the fact that it is the lack of transportation, which makes it so difficult to get to the island, that has caused the decrease in population.

Now a couple of years ago, in order to determine once and for all if this project was feasible, one of the outstanding engineering firms in the country was hired to make a thorough study of the best way to lay out the route, the population, the economy, and the possibility of tolls on a bridge and causeway system such as this that would pay for itself. The engineering firm of Fay, Spofford and Thorndike, of Boston, was hired. And I might say that after their survey they came to the conclusion that this would pay for itself with the tolls proposed in a matter of forty to forty-five years. In fact, I will read you their conclusions on Page 10:

"The proposed bridge with fifty-foot clearance causeway and connecting roads can be constructed at a cost of \$2,700,000. A bond issue of \$3,000,000 will be required to cover this construction cost and interest payments during construction and the year's operation. The estimated traffic and income will be sufficient to cover operating costs, interest at 2½ per cent, and bond amortization within a period of fifty years."

This, gentlemen, is not guesswork. These people have the finest engineering brains in the country at their disposal, and they have seen fit to put their name to this report, and have made a very extensive study of all of the conditions surrounding the island and this proposed building.

Now I won't go into any lengthy discussion of it at this time unless need be in rebuttal, but suffice it to say that a project such as this will be of benefit not only to the island which serves a population of some two hundred thousand people within a fifteen-mile radius and will obviously allow the economy of the island to be increased. It also will be of great benefit to the area, because as you know, not too far dis-

tant are the cities of Portland, South Portland, Westbrook and the greater Portland area, highly industrialized, with a great need for room to expand. Chebeague Island should be a perfect place for this population growth to spread. At the same time this should be tremendously important to the State of Maine for two reasons: One, it will be a great attraction to summer visitors. The island has enjoyed a very high reputation for vacationland settling for some years. We have every reason to believe that the construction of this causeway and bridge system would substantially increase the influx of visitors to the island area and therefore to Maine, to help the economy of the State; and at the same time the increase expected in buildings and land valuation would substantially help the State of Maine.

I point out that this is one project that is entirely approved by everyone in the area; I have as yet to hear from anyone who is opposed to it. The town itself, the town of Cumberland, the Yarmouth Chamber of Commerce, have wholeheartedly endorsed this. Even the Portland Regional Planning Commission has given its enthusiastic endorsement to this as being of vital interest to the region and very necessary. It has a referendum tacked onto it so that your people will have an opportunity to express themselves regarding it.

In summation, I might say that this is a project which is entirely feasible, has been very carefully surveyed, engineered and approved, and it should be a project that will pay for itself. I feel that it is completely in line with Maine's long-time reputation for down-to-earth commonsense preference for progress with a pay-for-itself approach. The project, in my estimation, is an economically sound investment in Maine's future, and I sincerely hope that the motion for indefinite postponement does not prevail.

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise to support the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker.

I will admit that they had a very excellent survey made of this pro-

posed Chebeague Island bridge and causeway, but I sincerely question the feasibility of having such a large sum of money for such a small island. This island is four miles long and a mile and a quarter in width, and as I understand at the present time the population is around 300. The Committee on Highways and I are very firm in the belief that this would not be a good deal, and I certainly would not want to go into it at this time. I think the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, has covered the matter very well, and I go along with his motion.

Mr. DAVIS of Cumberland: Mr. President, when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

Mr. COLE of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: This seems to be the Highway Committee's day in court.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that previously we came up with a lot of guesswork, and now we come up with a big dream. We have a little island here, as has been stated, a very, very small island that has real estate value of \$500,000, that is half a million, and has a tax rate of 76½ mills. It would seem to me that we again are dreaming if we think that a three million dollar bridge can be amortized by a town with a population of 300 people. It would seem to me that this really would be dreaming.

Now I have the greatest respect for the engineering firm that made the survey. I think it has done it very well and accurately. I would question the projected figures of income which is on Plate 4 in the survey. It is a fifty-year deal and they have projected the income, in my estimation, way out of reality. As has been previously stated, we have a toll of \$1.25 each way, and on an island with a population of 300 people that means \$2.50 each time they leave and come back. With the dollars as they are valued today it would seem to me that \$2.50 is certainly going to deter many people from going on joy-rides.

In the survey they stated that as soon as the bridge construction is undertaken and it is apparent that the existing transportation system is

being replaced people will start moving back to the property that they own on the island. It is estimated that during the two years that the bridge is under construction the Chebeague Island traffic potential will increase at least fifteen per cent over that of 1955. Just think of it: fifteen per cent on a three million dollar deal! I ask you as senators to give this your serious consideration.

Mr. CURTIS of Cumberland: Mr. President, in answer to my good friend, the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole, may I point out that this engineering firm, I do not believe are likely to spend their time in dreaming. If they had they would not have achieved the reputation in the industry which they have now. And I do not think that anyone was standing at their back with a gun to make them come up with conclusions that someone wanted; I have an idea they came up with completely independent conclusions based on facts.

For example, they say "It is believed that a \$1.25 toll for passenger cars and a slightly higher rate for trucks is reasonable and consistent with the fares being charged by the existing carrier."

My good friend, the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole, did not mention the price of the boat trip, but it is excessive.

Also, although there is a year-round figure of 300 that stay there on the island the year round, they have a summer increase of about two thousand more people that go back and forth. Many of the businessmen in Portland have their summer homes there and they travel back and forth every day.

Now you might think that a cost such as that would be excessive, but for the island people it is not, and the convenience that they would have from this bridge would certainly make it feasible for them to pay for it.

If you have read this survey, I think you will agree that it is quite a piece of work and that it has gone into the subject thoroughly from all aspects. I might say that even the Highway Commission has seen fit to praise this particular study as being very accurate and

very thorough. They feel that it is entirely realistic.

I might read just a paragraph here from this report which was submitted to the legislature:

"In short, we thoroughly believe that such construction will make a significant contribution to the growth and development of the State of Maine in general and the Portland area in particular. Moreover, the project will, over a period of years, be self-liquidating."

Gentlemen, let's keep that in mind and let's not overlook any part of our population or any project of our citizens that has the potential that this does and allow ourselves to be swayed by the thinking of people not based on the facts that are presented in this particular report.

I hope that the motion for indefinite postponement does not prevail.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President, I hesitate to add any more to this debate we are having, but I believe that it should be pointed out that under this proposed survey we have been quoting here this afternoon that under the chart in the back part of the pamphlet you will find an estimated revenue after twenty-five years of \$165,000 from tolls. I wish to point out that from all the figures I have been able to see that the present Augusta Bridge tolls that are taken in each year here on our bridge, that it certainly does have a tremendous amount of traffic, only amount to \$150,000.

Mr. President, when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, that the bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone will rise and remain standing until counted.

A division was had.

Fifteen having voted in the affirmative the bill was indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Hancock, Senator Silsby, asks if there is in the possession of the Senate H. P. 418, L. D. 595, "An Act Relating to Repossession of Property Subject to Conditional Sales Agreement." The Chair will state that it is in the possession of the Senate, having been recalled by joint order on this legislative day.

On motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, under suspension of the rules, the Senate voted to reconsider its joint order on this legislative day, whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

The same Senator then offered Senate Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment "B" was read and adopted in non-concurrence and the bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox,

Adjourned until 10:00 o'clock on Monday next.