

# 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-Ninth Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1959

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Wednesday, March 25, 1959

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

Prayer by Rabbi David Berent of Lewiston.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate**

From the Senate: The following Communication:

**STATE OF MAINE  
SENATE CHAMBER**

March 24, 1959

Hon. Harvey R. Pease  
Clerk of the House of  
Representatives  
99th Legislature

Sir:

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

Resolve Regulating Fishing in Long Pond, Franklin County. (H. P. 348) (L. D. 507)

Senators:

CARPENTER of Somerset  
HILLMAN of Penobscot  
BRIGGS of Aroostook

Respectfully,

(Signed) CHESTER T. WINSLOW  
Secretary of the Senate

In the House, the Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would announce the appointment of the following Conference Committee to confer with the Senate on the disagreeing action of the two branches on Resolve Regulating Fishing in Long Pond, Franklin County, House Paper 348, Legislative Document 507. The members of the House appointed to this Committee to represent the House are the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville; the gentleman from Princeton, Mr. Wheaton, and the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Harris.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of ninth grade Civics students

and twelfth grade students of the Problems of Democracy Class from the Hollis High School, accompanied by instructors Mary Davis and Harold Thayer.

The Chair would also recognize in the gallery of the House a group of Camp Fire Girls of the Horizon Club of Gorham. This group was organized in 1914 and celebrates its 45th anniversary this year. This Horizon Club was the fourth organized in the country and the only one in Maine. They are accompanied by their leaders, Mrs. Brown and Miss Millett, and by their sponsor Mrs. Berrie.

To you ladies and gentlemen the Chair extends a most hearty and cordial welcome, and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit here today. (Applause)

**Senate Reports of Committees  
Ought to Pass**

Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought to pass" on Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Preserve Covered Bridges (S. P. 272) (L. D. 734)

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

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the Resolve read once and tomorrow assigned.

**Ought to Pass with  
Committee Amendment**

Report of the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act Pertaining to Discontinuance of Portions of County Roads when Reconstructed" (S. P. 132) (L. D. 327) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 132, L. D. 327, Bill, "An Act Pertaining to Discontinuance of Portions of County Roads When Reconstructed."

Amend said Bill by adding after the underlined figure "42" in the 10th line, the following underlined words and punctuation:

**'including serving any public utility having facilities located in said portion to be discontinued.'**

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

Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act to Clarify the Maine Mining Law" (S. P. 277) (L. D. 739) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

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

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

**COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"** to S. P. 277, L. D. 739, Bill, "An Act to Clarify the Maine Mining Law."

Amend said Bill by striking out the 6th, 7th and 8th lines and inserting in place thereof the following underlined lines:

**'as heretofore established, shall consist of 7 members, one each from the State Departments of Agriculture, Forestry, State, Economic Development and Inland Fisheries and Game and the Water Improvement Commission, each of whom shall be appointed by the head of his'**

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

#### **Divided Report Tabled Until Later in Today's Session**

Majority Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act Regulating Horse and Ox Pulling Contests" (S. P. 48) (L. D. 81), which was recommitted, reporting same in a second new draft (S. P. 433) (L. D. 1280) under title of "An Act relating to Licensing of Horse and Ox Pulling Contests" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DOW of Lincoln  
HILLMAN of Penobscot  
ST. PIERRE of  
Androscoggin  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. EDMUNDS of Fort Fairfield  
CASWELL of New Sharon  
JEWETT of Pittston  
BROCKWAY of Milo  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HILTON of Anson  
LANE of Waterville  
JEWELL of Monticello  
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted and the second new draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House: Reports were read.  
(On motion of Mrs. Christie of Presque Isle, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for later in today's session.)

#### **Orders**

On motion of Mr. Haughn of Bridgton, it was

ORDERED, that James E. Good and Jeanette A. Good be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort to their places in the front of the Hall the honorary Pages for today. The Chair would also announce that the two honorary Pages are the children of Representative Good from Sebago.

Thereupon, the two honorary Pages were escorted to their seats at the front of the House amid the applause of the House.

On motion of Mr. Plante of Old Orchard Beach, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Kinch of Livermore Falls be excused from attendance for the remainder of the week because of business.

On motion of Mr. Graves of Mt. Desert, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Dow of Eliot be excused from attendance for the

remainder of the week because of illness.

On motion of Mr. Earles of South Portland, it was

ORDERED, that use of the hall of the House be granted to the Committee on Judiciary this afternoon at 1:30.

#### House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass Covered by Other Legislation

Mr. Carter from the Committee on Highways reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing Area Directional Signs for Bath Area" (H. P. 616) (L. D. 884), as it is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Graves from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Area Directional Signs for Winthrop Lakes Region" (H. P. 285) (L. D. 432), as it is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Nadeau from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Area Directional Signs for Sebago Lake, West Shore" (H. P. 490) (L. D. 703), as it is covered by other legislation.

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Ought to Pass in New Draft New Draft Printed

Mr. Cote from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Licenses for Pari Mutuel Harness Horse Racing" (H. P. 610) (L. D. 870) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 911) (L. D. 1283) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

#### Divided Report

Report "A" of the Committee on State Government reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Reimburse City of Augusta for Loss of Tax Revenue" (H. P. 178) (L. D. 249)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. LESSARD of Androscoggin  
ROSS of Sagadahoc  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. BARNETT of Augusta  
WADE of Auburn

SANBORN of Gorham  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. HILLMAN of Penobscot  
— of the Senate.  
Messrs. PLANTE of Old Orchard Beach

SMITH of Exeter  
COYNE of Waterville  
DENNETT of Kittery  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Speaker, I move this bill ought to pass, and I request permission to speak on it at this time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman to move the acceptance of Report A, the "Ought to pass" Report on the Bill, and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I appreciate this opportunity to bring the real facts of this Augusta bill before you and to squelch some of the unfactual rumors. In the first place, this bill is not the result of some wild dream that I had. This particular rumble has been going on in Augusta for quite a few years and it was brought vividly to my attention when I served as Chairman of the Finance Committee for the City of Augusta the past two years. The then Mayor of Augusta and also Member of this House, H. Lloyd Carey, solicited the support of the planning engineer, the head tax assessor and myself to study this problem. The results of our findings I am going to present to you this morning. However, at the outset let me say that the comment that I have heard that makes my blood boil is "What is the matter with the people of Augusta, if they don't want the capitol city we would be happy to have it in our own town."

Now, in the first place we are pleased that this is the capitol city, we are proud of it. We have no desire to have it moved. But we do ask a fair shake in return for our services. In the second place we would all like to bring new in-

dustry into our respective communities. However, I don't believe there is one of us in this room who would promote an industry for his respective community that once it was presumably established, then over a ten year period would acquire \$354,540 valuation of your strictly residential property at an annual tax loss to your community of \$9,571.

For further evidence that State Government is a big and growing business, another \$170,000 valuation is to be taken from Augusta this year for further building expansion, which constitutes \$4,590 more annual tax revenue loss. Now, you add these two figures together, ladies and gentlemen, and you don't get \$10,000 we are asking for in this bill but you get \$14,161 annual tax revenue loss based on the 1958 tax rate, for which the real estate owner in Augusta has had to continually make up this loss.

Now, immediately when you think of expansion of industry you think of additional revenues to the community. However, in the case of the State Government industry, let me cite a few statistics as gathered by the State Personnel Department at my request. The latest tabulation as of yesterday indicates of 1,950 employees in all of the departments in Augusta who returned their questionnaires, only forty-nine per cent, or 966 employees, claimed residence in this city. Of this number 466, or forty-eight per cent, pay real estate taxes, and the balance of the people rent. Let me emphasize that this 466 employees is less than twenty-four per cent of the total persons employed by the State in Augusta that are actually paying real estate taxes. Now, these same 966 employees claiming residence reported that they had a total of 403 children attending our public schools; 129 of these children, or approximately one-third, were claimed by the people who rent and do not pay real estate taxes. Of the remaining fifty-one per cent of the state employees that work here that claim residence out of town, over one-half of them indicated they spend less than thirty per cent of their salaries in Augusta.

Again let me reiterate at this point that although it is obvious that this brings economy to our City, it

also increases considerably the services we have to provide, which include schools, police protection, fire protection, street, sidewalk and sewer maintenance. Augusta also has one of the few state owned airports in the United States and the City of Augusta also furnishes fire protection for it.

Now, if a private industry expands by acquiring more land and constructing new buildings it not only brings more economy but it pays an increased real estate tax and carries its share of the load. It is apparent that this is definitely not the case with State Government industry. This problem is not a unique one to the capital city of Maine, but in response to a questionnaire sent out to forty-eight state capitals we received the following results: thirty-five and one-half per cent of the states give aid to their capital cities; twelve and one-half per cent are attempting to receive aid; twenty-two point nine per cent do not give aid, and some of those indicated that the reason is that they don't have the problem that we have, there has been no land taken in their respective cities; twenty-nine point one per cent did not answer our questionnaire. Now, of the six New England States, three of the New England States are presently giving aid annually. Two of them, including Maine, are attempting it. One of the New England States, Rhode Island, did not answer our questionnaire.

I might add that I was informed about a week ago that the legislation pending in Vermont is in the form of a sewerage treatment plant for its capital city and stands a fair chance of passage.

Although no one appeared at the public hearing to oppose this bill, the major opposition I have heard voiced in the corridors is that they do not want to open the doors to something that there is no limit as to where it might lead, not only in Augusta, but in other cities or towns where there are state owned institutions. I can only answer this line of reasoning by stating that we are here to legislate all bills on their merit and not on their precedents. If there is merit and the case is justified it should be passed. As to how far Augusta might go with

this thing, again let me compare it with any of the requests that you receive each session from, for example, your land grant university or your state teachers colleges. You hear their needs, you do not necessarily give them all they ask. Such would be the case of Augusta, if another \$200,000 valuation or any sizable amount is taken from them in the next two years, it would be justification to ask for more, but again it is your prerogative to grant it or not as you see fit. As for other towns, again may I say they should be weighed on their individual merits.

Now, Augusta feels that it has a unique case in that it is asking for a partial restitution on only that portion that has been taken since 1948, which in turn was some of our good residential property involving a great many homes. Augusta's operating costs are continuing to rise the same as in other municipalities, but if their valuation continues to be lopped off which means a decrease in tax revenue, there are but two alternatives: Either decrease the services the public demands or continually ask the real estate owner of this city to make up the deficit, and believe me, when I tell you that the real estate owner in Augusta is fast reaching the taxable limit.

So, in conclusion let me emphasize a few points: First, we don't want the capitol moved, we want you to continue to be proud of our capitol city, the same as we want to continue a high calibre of departmental services. We are not asking for an exorbitant amount. Private industry has to carry their share of the tax burden for services, the State on the other hand, since 1948 has and is infringing on our residential areas to the extent of \$524,500 valuation which we feel justifies some assistance on their part. Fourth, if this bill were passed, it would tend to ease the strain on the remaining real estate owners who continually have to make up the deficit. Other states are aware of the situation and, as I said, thirty-five and one-half per cent are now offering restitution to their capitol cities.

And finally we ask you to judge our case strictly on its own merits. I thank you for your courteous at-

tention and, Mr. Speaker, I request a division when the vote is taken.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am speaking on this bill as House Chairman of the Committee on State Government. The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, made a splendid presentation of Augusta's problem in this matter to the Committee. The Committee felt that it was the kind of thing that should be brought to the attention of the whole Legislature, so we brought out this five and five divided report and arranged for the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, to make this presentation you have heard today. However, the Committee feels that the State of Maine cannot at this time adopt the policy that is embodied in this proposal and we assume and expect that the motion to accept the "Ought to pass" Report will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The chair recognizes the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I appreciate the position of Mr. Barnett, the gentleman from Augusta, but I rise in opposition to his motion that Report A ought to pass. I feel that we are opening up a new field of expenditure for the State Government of the State of Maine. There is not only Augusta where there is taxable property owned by the State, but there is Thomaston, Gorham, Portland, South Portland, Presque Isle, Naples, Machias, Fort Kent, Skowhegan, Bangor and a dozen or so others that I could mention at this particular time.

We are working on a close budget. We may have to go into additional taxation. The City of Augusta alone is asking for \$10,000, not only for this year but for every year, which will be a continuing expense as we go from year to year and, of course, the other towns will come in asking for additional money too.

I realize that the City of Augusta must provide police protection and fire protection; however, there are thousands, yes, millions of dollars that are spent here because the State capitol buildings and office buildings are in this city. There-

fore, there is a greater income to the people who are handling or operate the businesses in this city. Therefore, they should be able to pay a higher tax because they are getting a far greater income, and to apportion an amount of only \$10,000 among the many businesses and property owners in the City of Augusta would be only a small amount. Therefore, I hope that you will oppose the motion as made by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I felt, as a Committee member, that we should give my good friend, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, his day in court, however, I did reserve the right to speak in opposition to this particular legislative document. I felt that we should seriously consider all of the State institutions in all of the communities that we have in this State, in addition, the State Forest Commissioner's facilities, the Fish and Game Hatcheries, Highway storehouses and garages. Pineland State Hospital, for example, is located in four towns within the boundaries of three counties, and in the past they requested some relief, and it was the desire of past legislative bodies to come out with an "Ought not to pass" Report on that particular instance.

Also before us in this session are similar requests from the communities of Thomaston and Warren. However, this is just an indication of how many other communities would come and in all sincerity request that they receive some relief. This would be a new switch in State and municipal policy, a minor governmental unit would be taxing a major governmental unit. This is a novel departure from present policy, and a very serious one for us to decide on, and I now move to have this motion indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, moves that both reports be indefinitely postponed. The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach,

Mr. Plante, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. BEANE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: There is not much that I can say to give you more information on this and the position of the residents of Augusta in addition to what the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, has explained. However, I have noted what the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good, and the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, have said in regard, among other things, to other towns having that problem.

Now, we are aware that there are several other towns in the State of Maine that have a similar problem, and we are also aware that in a sense this is a new departure for the State of Maine. As the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, has pointed out, there are a considerable number, I don't have the exact figure, I believe around thirty-six states that either have done something for the capitol city along this line or are planning to. I may not be exactly correct in the number of states but I think you can plainly see that many of them have really done quite a bit, considerably more than we are asking.

Now, this \$10,000 annual figure that we are asking actually is, to use the vernacular, it is just a drop in the bucket to what the City of Augusta loses every year in tax loss. Now, we are fully aware that many of the other cities and towns in the State of Maine have State property in them and Federal property and face a similar problem. I personally don't begrudge them any favoring they might receive, but I do question whether this is a question for unlimited requests of this nature.

However, I don't think there is any question that Augusta has away far more, not only in relation to our total area and assessed valuation but in relation to the built-up area which is the basic taxable portion of the city. The State House and the State House parking area, some of your State offices outside of the State House, the State office building, the new one, are all right in the best part of Augusta for residential or business purposes where the assessed valuation would be the



highest if the State were not using the land, and in relation to the City of Augusta there is no benefit tax-wise, so it is placing the load, as the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, has said, on all the taxpayers of Augusta.

Now, I was here two years ago when the bill authorizing the Governor and Council to take land for this parking area around the State House was put in. I think everyone in this House had the problem of having conflicting loyalties in their duties as Legislators, on the one hand to think of the interest of the State as a whole, on the other hand to think of their constituents, in some instances to think of party alignments and in other instances to think of their own convictions even though they disagreed with their own constituents and others. I think you can all understand that it was a very difficult thing for the legislators from Augusta two years ago. In view of lapses on the part of the State in the past to acquire land for such purposes when there was land available around the State House not being occupied as homes by Augusta residents, it put us in a very difficult position two years ago when the request for the parking area and the reservation of the land that would be used, it wasn't made too clear but we were told it would be either for the parking area or additional State buildings when needed around the State House, and to protect the State House from encroachment by commercial enterprises which apparently was the basic theory that initiated that legislation at that time. We were in a very difficult position to reconcile our interest in the State's overall welfare, and particularly in the State House, where it was our interest in protecting Augusta people who were being moved out of their own homes, other Augusta people who were having their own tax load increased by taking up what the State takes away from us. At that time I voted, after considerable thought, I voted in what I felt was the interest of the State as a whole at the risk of upsetting many of my own constituents in authorizing the passage of that bill.

As the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, has pointed out, a new

bill has come in now, there was no inclination at the time that there would be anything of this sort, and a new bill has come in changing the wording of that bill which authorized the Governor and Council to take land adjacent to the State House, changing that wording to in the vicinity of the State House, which can mean anywhere from Sidney to Manchester to Hallowell in the south, Chelsea and Windsor and other towns in the east, it could be anywhere in this City. We don't know where it is all going to stop. We are very much disturbed about it. We have a Planning Commission in this town being supported by both, it is receiving contributions, I believe, from both the Federal Government and the State of Maine. The Planning Commission has been working very hard for a number of years now drawing up a land use survey as a basis for a zoning act which we hope someday will be possible here, very soon if possible, an equitable zoning law, which in itself would be a protection to State property. We feel that unlimited taking by the State without compensation in any way cuts right across the whole theory of that Planning Commission which the State is helping support.

Now, as to the land now, I would like to point out, Ladies and Gentlemen, you can go right out on the front porch of this building and look across to the State Hospital. You could see a pretty large area. There are very few people, I think even quite a few Augusta citizens don't realize it, that what you can see over there, going all the way from the river up to the top of the hill on the other side is just a fraction of the land that the State Hospital occupies over there. On the other side of the road over there where the State Police Headquarters is, the land goes away out almost to the Togus Veterans Administration Facilities. It is right on the edge of an area which is a new residential, brand new residential development area if that land were not there occupied by the State of Maine, and as far as I know not being used for too much of anything, some agricultural purposes probably, that would be a growth area in this state which

would be a very important benefit to the City of Augusta.

Now, under this new amendment that the Bureau of Public Improvements apparently is endorsing, enlarging the vicinity of their taking in the vicinity of Augusta or of the State House, it is my understanding that they have now planned to go all the way back to Sewall Street beyond the State House parking area, taking in one of the finest residential areas we have in the incity part of Augusta. There is no question in my mind, we are not asking something merely for the benefit of Augusta, we feel very strongly that the State has a definite interest in this situation for its own good.

In addition to this, the protection we supply, I would like to illustrate a point. The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, spoke of the police and fire protection we provide. The State provides next to no police protection for the State House and the State office building or any of these other buildings, no fire protection. The State Airport, which takes a very large area and has some good residential and some industrial property around it, every time a plane comes in and lands on that field, this is just an illustration, every time a plane comes in and lands on that field and is having some apprehension that they will be able to make a safe landing, if they have a stuck landing gear or an engine smoking or something, the Augusta Fire Department has to run up to the State Airport on a standby basis whether there is a fire or not. The State doesn't provide their own fire protection on their own State Airport. And you have a lot of valuable National Guard property up there, you have your State Armory, the Augusta Fire Department supplies the protection for all of that State property, the State does not.

Another thing, there is no question but that the existence of the State House and all these offices around here creates a very difficult traffic problem in Augusta, which is a hub road center for the whole State of Maine. We have several State highways intersecting where Augusta is the central point of intersection. Now, you have all had to drive through this traffic circle over here when you have left the State House

on many occasions. The traffic circle, of course, was built by the State Highway Commission, it was designed by State Highway Commission engineers. Your own Maine State Police are now very much disturbed that that traffic circle was not designed adequately to handle growing traffic. This is a problem that we feel year around, whether the Legislature is in session or not. It not only affects the area over there but it affects all the surrounding streets in the City.

I am a member of the City Government myself here now, as the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, has been in the past, and we have had a very difficult situation in trying to rearrange the streets. Chapel Street over here, Melville Street, Sewall Street, Western Avenue, as well as State Street and all the streets running off from it, they are all affected by this problem, a large part of which is caused by traffic to and from the State House. When the State House gets out in the afternoon it is almost impossible for anyone who may be using those roads, any citizen of Maine that is traveling through almost necessarily has to go through that rotary traffic circle to follow the State Highway route to wherever he is going, finds it almost impossible to get through the traffic circle because of State Highway traffic coming from the State House. I think that is a hindrance to people having business with the State House too.

There is no question, the State has been lax in many ways in not taking land when it was available. The Governor's Council was asked a few years ago, the Governor and Council were asked when the building over here, where this bank is located, was an empty lot to take that land for State House parking. They didn't do it, they refused to do it, they said the price was too high, they could have taken it by eminent domain when the building had been just recently torn down and it wouldn't have cost a cent fee, it wouldn't have cost the State much of anything. They refused to do it, they felt it was unpolicy to dabble in such things apparently, they didn't do anything about it.

Now another industry has gone up which has complicated traffic and

parking for the State House and for the school up here, which is the Nash School for strictly third grade children and under, little children who are not capable of taking care of themselves in the added traffic. And by not taking that they have put us in the position of taking additional land that is occupied by people as their residences, not empty houses.

I am sorry I have taken so much of your time, but I feel very strongly about all of this. I do feel that it is a thing that both the State and the City of Augusta have a beneficial interest in, and I hope that the motion for indefinite postponement will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, on Bill "An Act to Reimburse City of Augusta for Loss of Tax Revenue," House Paper 178, Legislative Document 249, that both Reports be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

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

A division of the House was had.

One hundred and seven having voted in the affirmative and twenty-one having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Bill with accompanying papers was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of pupils from the Governor Baxter State School for the Deaf, accompanied by Neil F. Lowell. On behalf of the House the Chair wishes to extend to you ladies and gentlemen a most cordial welcome. We are delighted to have you with us and we hope that you will enjoy yourselves here today. (Applause)

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

### Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Exemption from Taxation of Certain Property Owned by Municipalities" (H. P. 508) (L. D. 721)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington  
WILLEY of Hancock  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. PARSONS of Hartford  
MAXWELL of Jay  
WALSH of Verona  
COUSINS of Bangor  
BAXTER of Pittsfield  
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. FOURNIER of York  
— of the Senate.

Messrs. CYR of Augusta  
ROLLINS of Belfast  
— of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Desmarais.

Mr. DESMARAIS: Mr. Speaker, with respect to my good friend, Mr. Letourneau, who has been excused and is also the sponsor of this bill, I would like to table this bill a week from today.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Desmarais, moves that both Reports be tabled and specially assigned for one week from today pending acceptance of either Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the Reports and Bill were tabled and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 1.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort to the rostrum the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, to serve as Speaker pro tem.

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

**Passed to Be Engrossed**

Bill "An Act relating to Duties of State Liquor Inspectors" (S. P. 348) (L. D. 975)

Bill "An Act relating to Hours of Selling Liquor" (H. P. 120) (L. D. 175)

Bill "An Act relating to Local Option for a Certain Liquor Question" (H. P. 213) (L. D. 304)

Bill "An Act Permitting Certain Public Utility Corporations to Hold Stockholders Meetings Outside the State" (H. P. 440) (L. D. 646)

Bill "An Act relating to Acceptance of Surety Company Bonds in Lieu of Bail Bonds or Other Sureties" (H. P. 556) (L. D. 790)

Bill "An Act relating to Use of Prior Convictions in Motor Vehicle Registration and License Suspensions" (H. P. 558) (L. D. 792)

Bill "An Act Increasing Payment to Washington County Law Library" (H. P. 617) (L. D. 885)

Bill "An Act relating to Cost of Furnishing Copies of Insurance Laws and Related Information" (H. P. 682) (L. D. 982)

Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Tavern under Liquor Laws" (H. P. 695) (L. D. 995)

Bill "An Act relating to Local Option for Sale of Malt Liquor in Clubs and Part-time Hotels" (H. P. 722) (L. D. 1027)

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

**Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act relating to Expending Aroostook County Funds for Ricker College" (H. P. 777) (L. D. 1095)

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

(On motion of Mr. Edmunds of Fort Fairfield, tabled pending third reading and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 1.)

Bill "An Act relating to Loan and Building Associations" (H. P. 803) (L. D. 1142)

Bill "An Act relating to Local Option for Sale of Malt Liquor by Hotels and Clubs" (H. P. 909) (L. D. 1281)

Bill "An Act relating to Credit between Malt Beverage Manufac-

turers and Wholesalers" (H. P. 910) (L. D. 1282)

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

**Amended Bills**

Bill "An Act relating to Superintending School Committee of Town of Freeport" (S. P. 217) (L. D. 556)

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

**Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act to Revise the Dealer Registration Law" (S. P. 342) (L. D. 918)

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

(On motion of Mr. Brown of Ellsworth, tabled pending passage to be engrossed, and specially assigned for Friday, March 27.)

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would like to thank the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, very much for her excellent services.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms conducted the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, to her seat on the Floor, amid the applause of the House, and Speaker Edgar resumed the Chair.

Bill "An Act relating to Planting Forest Nursery Tree Seedlings" (H. P. 127) (L. D. 185)

Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Fisher in Certain Counties" (H. P. 606) (L. D. 866)

Bill "An Act relating to Pre-arranged Payments for Funerals or Burial Plans" (H. P. 631) (L. D. 923)

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

Bill "An Act relating to Dissolution of Corporations for Non-use of

Corporate Powers" (H. P. 645) (L. D. 936)

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

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on this item, L. D. 936, when this came out of Committee, there was a Committee Amendment and there were two corrections to be made. The Committee Amendment showed only the first one and this House Amendment which I now offer makes the second correction that the Committee should have had in its Committee Amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 645, L. D. 936, Bill, "An Act Relating to Dissolution of Corporations for Non-use of Corporate Powers."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning of the first line, the following abbreviation and figure: 'Sec. 1.'

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

'Sec. 2. Application. Domestic insurance companies incorporated prior to the effective date of this act shall be deemed to have been incorporated on said effective date for the purposes of this act.'

House Amendment "A" was adopted, the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Bill "An Act relating to Transfer to State of Maine of Portland Bridge, Cumberland County" (H. P. 745) (L. D. 1064)

Bill "An Act Pertaining to Fire, Marine and Inland Marine Insurance Rate Regulation and Casualty and Surety Insurance Rate Regulation" (H. P. 787) (L. D. 1119)

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

Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Members of the Legislature" (H. P. 15) (L. D. 24)

Bill "An Act relating to Speed of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 375) (L. D. 533)

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

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair recognizes the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of students from Gorham State Teachers College, Philosophy of Education Department, accompanied by Professor James Whitten. On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you ladies and gentlemen a most cordial welcome, and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit here today. (Applause)

#### Finally Passed Constitutional Amendment

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide Continuity of Government in Case of Enemy Attack (S. P. 143) (L. D. 333)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being a Constitutional Amendment and a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a division was had, 129 voted in favor of the same and one against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

#### Emergency Measure Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

Resolve for Laying of the County Taxes for the Years Nineteen Hundred Fifty-nine and Nineteen Hundred Sixty (H. P. 906) (L. D. 1275)

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

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this for one week from today.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, please approach the rostrum? The House may be at ease.

### House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my motion to table this item for one week, and move that it be tabled until later in today's session.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, withdraws his motion to table this matter for one week.

The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, now moves that this matter be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Special Dog Training Areas (S. P. 23) (L. D. 3)

An Act relating to Apportionment to Municipalities of Tax on Railroad Companies and Telephone and Telegraph Companies (S. P. 219) (L. D. 558)

An Act relating to Nonforfeiture Benefits and Valuation Standards for Life Insurance Policies (S. P. 270) (L. D. 732)

An Act relating to Disposition of Funds Received by State Park Commission (S. P. 281) (L. D. 743)

An Act relating to Rates under Automobile Assigned Risk Plan (H. P. 629) (L. D. 921)

An Act to Incorporate Sagadahoc Finance Corporation (H. P. 632) (L. D. 924)

An Act to Incorporate City Finance, Inc. (H. P. 633) (L. D. 925)

### Finally Passed

Resolve Authorizing Forest Commissioner to Convey a Right-of-way Across the Public Lot in Township D, Range 2, WELS, Aroostook County, to United States of America (H. P. 214) (L. D. 305)

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

### Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House item number one

under tabled and today assigned matters, An Act relating to Distribution and Sale of Publications Depicting Crime and Torture, Senate Paper 249, Legislative Document 632, tabled on March 18 by the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Porell, pending passage to be enacted; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. PORELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The magazine wholesalers of the State of Maine feel that this is a very dangerous bill and they haven't had a chance to study it thoroughly, but if we can table it for one more week they guarantee to come in here with something that will meet their approval.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Porell, moves that Bill "An Act relating to Distribution and Sale of Publications Depicting Crime and Torture", be tabled and specially assigned for one week from today pending passage to be enacted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, the Bill was tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 1.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number two under tabled and today assigned matters, An Act relating to Hydraulic Brake Fluid for Motor Vehicles, House Paper 73, Legislative Document 111, tabled on March 18 by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, pending passage to be enacted; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the rules be suspended in order that I may enter a motion to reconsider the action whereby the House passed to be engrossed on March 11 the Bill "An Act relating to Hydraulic Brake Fluid for Motor Vehicles", House Paper 73, L. D. 111.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, moves that the rules be suspended to reconsider the action on this bill whereby the House passed it to be engrossed on March 11. The Chair must advise the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, that suspension of the rules in this case will require the approval of two-thirds of the House. Is it the

pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House reconsider its action taken on March 11 whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, now moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, Mr. Mayo of Bath offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 73, L. D. 111, Bill, "An Act Relating to Hydraulic Brake Fluid for Motor Vehicles."

Amend said Bill, in the 4th line, by inserting after the underlined abbreviation and figure "**Sec. 41-A,**" the following underlined headnote: **'Hydraulic brake fluid.'**

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the last underlined paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following underlined paragraphs:

**'The Secretary of State shall, after public hearing following due notice, adopt and enforce regulations for the administration of this section and shall adopt and publish standards and specifications for hydraulic brake fluid which shall correlate with, and so far as practicable conform to the then current standards and specifications of the Society of Automotive Engineers applicable to such fluid.**

**No person shall distribute, have for sale, offer for sale, sell or service any vehicle with any hydraulic brake fluid unless it complies with the requirements of this section.'**

House Amendment "A" was adopted, the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter, An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets, House Paper 70, Legislative Document 108, tabled on

March 18 by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, pending passage to be enacted; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of that gentleman, the Bill was retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 1.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought to pass" in New Draft, House Paper 870, Legislative Document 1215, of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Splash Guards for Certain Trucks", House Paper 513, Legislative Document 726, tabled on March 12 by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, pending the motion of the gentleman from Farmingdale, Mr. Weston, to recommit the Bill to the Committee on Transportation.

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Farmingdale, Mr. Weston.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmingdale, Mr. Weston.

Mr. WESTON: Mr. Speaker, I now withdraw my motion to recommit and move the adoption of the "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Farmingdale, Mr. Weston, withdraws his motion to recommit and moves the adoption of the "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report of the Committee. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, the Report was accepted, and the New Draft read twice.

On motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, the Report and New Draft were tabled pending assignment for third reading and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 1.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Requiring Certain Trucks to Carry Flares", House Paper 705, Legislative Document 1005, tabled on March 19 by the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy, pending second

reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of that gentleman, the Bill was retabled pending second reading and specially assigned for Thursday, March 26.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought to pass" and Minority "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Operation of Farm Trucks", House Paper 459, Legislative Document 665, tabled on March 19 by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, pending the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to second the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report, and I would like to speak briefly.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ERVIN: In consideration of this bill, Legislative Document 665, I think it is a fair bill; I think it is a just bill and has a lot of merit, and that the mileage restrictions on farm trucks should be removed. A recent survey involving 78 reports shows that one-third of the farmers reporting could not use the farm plates because of the mileage restriction. Further study has revealed that farm trucks travel relatively a short distance from the farm, about eighty percent within sixty miles, yet one or perhaps a dozen trips during the year may be necessary beyond the sixty miles from the farm.

There are many reasons why I have supported this bill, but rather than prolong any debate, I am going to cite just one. Aroostook County is a big county, and a man having a farm truck license living in Van Buren who hears and knows about some good seed potatoes that he can buy in Houlton or Island Falls or Sherman, and would like to have that seed to plant in his section of the county this year, he cannot take his farm truck and go to Houlton

or go to Sherman or go to Island Falls and pick up his seed and take it back to Van Buren because of the restriction.

This is only one instance where a farmer might go beyond the sixty-five miles from his farm in order to do something of farm work. This is the only reason I am going to cite, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, to accept the Majority Report does prevail.

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: In Maine we have two types of farmers, the farmer of the land and the farmer of the sea. Now I am opposed to this bill. However, if this bill does *ἀλλὰ πῶς ἢ ἄρα ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος* *ssed* an amendment prepared exempting those who earn their livelihood from the sea, who farm the sea as worm diggers, clam diggers, lobstermen, draggers, seiners and the weirmen, for I feel that what is fair for the farmers of the land should also be fair for the farmers of the sea.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to get into a ridiculous situation here, but I would like to ask a question through the Chair, how long clam diggers, lobstermen, baitmen and everything had their own trucks. Now I know something about the seacoast life myself, and I know it is all bought up by wholesalers with their own trucks and not the individual people who farm the sea.

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman actually asking a question?

Mr. CALL: I am asking a question if he can answer it.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I know of quite a few lobstermen who operate their own pickup trucks in order to obtain bait, to haul their lobster traps to shore and for many



other purposes. I hope that answers the question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy.

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, I think if the bill is examined, they will find that pickup trucks aren't involved in this thing. It is a little bit heavier situation than that.

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

Mr. STORM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe that this is a good bill and I believe it has received more publicity more favorable than unfavorable than it actually deserves. A few days ago just before this was tabled, my good friend the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, raised the question about who could qualify as a farmer. Under recent definition that I have heard of a farmer, I think a great many of us could qualify, this definition states that anyone who is losing money is a farmer.

Seriously, I don't think that the objection raised by the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, is worthy of too much consideration. He mentioned his logging trucks, that he could register them under this provision. If he can qualify as a farmer on account of his chickens as he suggested, perhaps he could, but he would have to bear in mind that he would confine himself to a two axle truck and keep his gross weight below 18,000 pounds. That's all I have to say. I hope the motion to adopt the Majority Report prevails.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to arise and support the motion of my good friend the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call. I think if we would all turn and read Legislative Document 665 we would understand that it does not give the farmers unlimited travel. It says: "Trucks which are used on a substantially daily delivery schedule on established routes are not included as 'farm trucks.'" Now this farm truck business is just simply to be used in farming only. If you have got a regular schedule you are going

to run on such as haul logs every day or deliver milk every day and all of those things, why it is not covered by this L. D. at all.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Operation of Farm Trucks," House Paper 459, Legislative Document 665, the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

The SPEAKER: Will those who favor the motion to accept the "Ought to pass" Report please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

Eighty-five having voted in the affirmative and forty-seven having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

The Bill was then given its two several readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter, Senate Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Regulating Open Season on Deer by Zones", Senate Paper 92, Legislative Document 210, tabled on March 20 by the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, pending acceptance of either Report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to take just a minute to briefly explain my stand in signing the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on this bill, L. D. 210.

First the proponents of this bill would have you believe that the deer in Maine are starving to death, and that we should harvest more of them. Since this same bill was heard two years ago by the 98th Legislature, I have done some research. I have talked with at least a hundred outdoorsmen, guides, land cruisers, game wardens, and so forth. They all say that they have never found a place in the State

where they thought the deer were starving. These are all men whose work compels them to be in the woods most of the time, and I believe that although they are not biologists that they could tell if the deer were starving.

Another reason why the proponents are asking for this bill is that they would like a more defined line between the north and the south season. As it is now the seasons are by counties. They claim that the county lines are hard to find and that the hunter may cross them without knowing it. This I agree with wholeheartedly. However, I do not believe the Appalachian Trail is the answer. The Appalachian Trail is a trail that is spotted through the woods and in cases of no trees, it is painted on the rocks. With two inches of snow it would be almost impossible to follow.

For these reasons and for other reasons which you will hear this morning, I now move that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

**The SPEAKER:** The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, that the Bill and both Reports be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Dodge.

**Mr. DODGE:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The biologists in the Department admitted that they have studied this for only five years. Now I have talked with men who have been in the woods for sixty or seventy years. They go back and tell me what the deer herds were many years ago when we had a law in the state that you could kill two deer legally; I don't know how many illegal ones were killed, and at that time also in this state there was no law against serving deer in the lumber camps. The lumber camps even hired hunters in the winter and paid them \$3.00 a deer to bring the deer in to be served in the camps. Of course that wasn't legal but they did it just the same, and we passed this law that makes it illegal to serve deer in the camps.

At that time, so these people tell me, and from my own experience, there were many more deer in the northern part of the State than there

are now. Before the road went through from Greenville to Rockwood, up to Rockwood they used to go up there on a boat and take their cars across and go up to what they call Canada Falls. No one ever got off the road to hunt, they just went along on the road and they all came back with their limit of deer. Part of that time the limit was two deer per person.

Now they tell us there is not enough feed up there for the deer. Well, we must realize that Maine winters are all different. Our last winter has legally gone by — it's a question, but we know it hasn't been like the winters before for some time. It is almost impossible in five years time to tell how our deer are doing in their different yards, and as far as deer feeding, they feed on a variety of things. I picked up a book this morning on the deer in North America, which is written by biologists, and some of them are very prominent, and the things that they tell about deer eating, I never knew, but apparently they do, and they do survive. I think it requires a lot more study before we go to work and change our zoning laws, and in my territory, all the people there with the exception of one man who wanted to extend it longer because he wanted to kill more deer, are perfectly satisfied, anybody I have talked to.

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

**Mr. DUDLEY:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not going to talk on things of the past and books for the future, but I say before you this morning on your desks you will find a map relating to this L. D. 210, and at the beginning I would like to say, in case I talk so much I confuse you, that I am opposed to this measure to indefinitely postpone this bill. I would also like to state that I might surprise you by saying that I am not in the hotel business nor in the sporting camp business.

Now this bill, if you will kindly look at these maps, instead of using an unenforceable county line, uses the Penobscot River up to a point where it divides; from that point going right on the map it uses the Canadian Pacific Railroad to the

border at Vanceboro, then if you will come back to the Y where it turns left, it uses the Piscataquis River over to a point near Franklin County line where from that point on it takes the Appalachian Trail which is very well painted brown and white, and it is painted on the trees as well as on the rocks. Now for this reason, the enforcement division is very much in favor of this law. In my area there are many poachers across the line at leisure because this line is on the map you understand and not on the ground, so they cross the line at leisure and kill deer where it is not open. For this reason the enforcement division is all wholeheartedly in favor of this bill.

Now for the biologists. We employ a lot of these people, and they have worked very diligently for a period of approximately five years; they wholeheartedly support this measure. Now I say this, this bill doesn't take effect until the year 1960, and it takes effect for one year only. We have paid a lot of money to these biologists. How are we going to prove that they are right or wrong if we don't let them try their proposal at least one year? Now, the Legislature I am sure will meet again and readjust it if it is not so.

Now this does shift the burden. I would be the last man to stand here before this able body and tell you that this can correct all the injustices in the State of Maine so far as zoning is concerned, that would be far from the truth. It merely shifts the burden from one area to another. Now let's take for instance lower Franklin County; lower Somerset County would have carried the burden for a period, it will be nine years. Much of their land is closed. The figure from the Department of Inland Fish and Game in that area and mostly in that area is over 200,000 acres closed if you will bear with me on the map, lower Franklin and Oxford Counties. Now what this bill tends to do, it tends to move the hunters north into the unorganized territory of which you can see there is plenty of and plenty of places for people to go hunting other than the farming area.

Now two years ago, before this House, this nearly received passage

and hotels opposed it. This year the hotels do not oppose this measure in general for this reason. They had their guests that had made their reservations for one year in advance, so therefore they didn't want to go along with the measure. This year it doesn't go into effect, it goes into effect two years from now.

Now one year this bill came up and there were a lot of telegrams flashed around before your eyes. I could flash a lot of telegrams both for and against. I think that has very little bearing on the case, and I say to you, the good people of this Legislature, that I believe that anyone that carries the burden for nine years, it is time that someone else is asked to carry the load for one year. These people deserve a chance. They have come before this body and before the Fish and Game Committee three times that I have been there myself and tried to get something done about it. I say to you this, I don't want to talk all the morning, I only say that I think as good legislators we should be good compromisers and these people deserve a chance and I hope that this motion does not prevail to indefinitely postpone this measure.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from East Machias, Mr. Dennison.

Mr. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In 1926 I went hunting. I hadn't been hunting for a great many years because I was too busy. In 1926 I thought I was going to kill a deer, and I went up on Round Lake Hills and I saw a bear, and I killed a bear that weighed 400 pounds, and since that time I have been the greatest hunter in Washington County. Now I have told that story quite a number of times, and I want to put a verbal amendment on it, the bear weighed 500 pounds.

Now in 1939, they had this bill that we are working under right today, and the bill was put in for the month of November. I put the bill in myself, and this gentleman from Aroostook County, they came down here and there was so many of them that we had the hearing in the House here, and all those people up in Aroostook County, they explained it out in a good way that

their territory froze up much earlier than that in the southern part of the state and it was very reasonable, so the bill was made so that they had ten days ahead of us, so now they have the forty days.

Now in 1951 I was on the Inland Fish and Game Department, and this Department all the time since the new man came in has been trying to change it over, and year in and year out he has been hiring more biologists. Now in Washington County I have been hunting every year since 1926 and in the same area. Now all those years along there in the camp we have always had six men and one cook. Sometimes some of the fellows have changed over, died, and I am too tough to go along with them, but anyway, all that time we got quite a lot of deer, and the last year and the year before last the whole bunch of us in that camp we got not one deer each but for the whole camp we just got one deer. Then we had a group from Gardiner that moved in there quite a number of years ago and they have had the same fate that we have had. For two years the whole outfit has only got one deer.

Now we in Washington County, we know that there aren't anywhere near as many deer as there were. A short time ago two biologists came to the Washington County Chamber of Commerce and they told us the same story, kill more deer to have more deer. Now just after the session started at one of our Chamber of Commerce meetings, the biologist down in our section came there, and those that are here that were there at that meeting, he had just one statement to make, he said in Washington County, and I heard a man talking to Mr. Smith awhile ago telling him that the deer were dying of old age, he was mentioning the northern part of Penobscot County, and then by and by he said something about Washington County, and I turned around to Mr. Smith and tripped him up a little bit on it. Well anyway, those deer in Washington County, there is not anywhere near as many as there were, and this biologist came to us perhaps two months ago and this one thing that he stated, kill more deer in Washington County to have more deer.

Now this bill, this is a three-legged bill here, they want us to have five more days in Washington County in December, and anybody knows what a buck is the last part of November and the first of December, and I am greatly in favor of this "Ought not to pass", but the bill is now to be indefinitely postponed, and I am in favor of indefinitely postponing this bill.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Mr. Speaker and Fellow Legislators: Your Department of Inland Fisheries and Game has been timed for several sessions to get this Legislature to change our deer season law to a more workable, a more equitable and a much more scientific approach to our deer population program. Heavy and selfish reasons have been consistently advanced principally by individuals who fear an adverse result of the recommendations in their own local area, and without regard to the overall good of the game management plan our able State experts have worked out and, as is their duty, consistently request the Legislature to enact. I think it is about time that we pay more attention to our experts and less to the selfish interests of the minority and pass this Department recommended bill, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, does not prevail.

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

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill came from the Committee with a majority "Ought not to pass" report. This is the same bill that was defeated here quite substantially two years ago.

We have been told by the biologists that we need this zoning to protect our deer herds. The reason given at a public hearing was the lack of feed in the northern area where they want to extend our season, and if we didn't shoot more deer they would starve to death. In other words, we have got to shoot them to save their lives, there is no other way you can figure that out. How many of you that are hunters have seen too many deer in the last few years? How many of you have seen

or heard of deer being found starved to death? Not too many, I believe, is the answer.

We have had an average legal deer kill of 40,000 in the last ten years. I think that proves that our deer herd is in good shape. As far as stunted deer they tell us about in the northern area, I think the facts will prove that there are more large bucks shot up in that area that made the Buck Club than there have been in quite a number of years.

I thought that the main purpose we were elected was to represent the people. I have not heard any public clamor for this change. The change is coming wholly from the Fish and Game Department. Everyone I have talked to, except one person in my area, is opposed to any change in the deer law whatsoever. So, therefore, I heartily endorse the motion to indefinitely postpone the measure.

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

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: At the hearing before the Inland Fisheries and Game Committee I appeared in behalf of over 5,000 members of the Maine Fish and Game Association. We heartily endorse this proposed zone bill. We believe that the State of Maine hires and pays biologists to tell us these problems. If we are not going to listen and give them a chance to prove their worth, I would suggest that we fire them as of today and use this money in some other way. I hope this recommendation on three zones will be accepted. The two zone affair that we have today is very unenforceable, you cannot follow county lines, you cannot follow town lines. Therefore, I move that we accept this three zone bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monroe, Mr. Monroe.

Mr. MONROE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Legislature: I am not basing my ideas on my own little territory around where I live. Up until last year, up until last April, in fact, I traveled the territories of Penobscot County, Piscataquis County and Somerset County, and especially during the hunting season it was my business

to visit these camps, and all the way along the line the story was just the same, there were no deer. They said that we were inviting sportsmen from out of state to come here and shoot deer. They came here and there were no deer, and that was not in my own territory, but around through those counties that I have mentioned. There are a lot of the members who signed this Majority Report, and I will say that I hope that the idea of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, goes through.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Casco, Mr. Moore.

Mr. MOORE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I also signed this "Ought not to pass" report on this bill, and I didn't do it because of selfishness, I hope, I did it on conservation. They tell us that there is an overpopulation of deer in this State, there were 140,000 licensed hunters that didn't get a deer last fall. That doesn't prove that there are too many deer. In the last ten years there has been an increase of 60,000 hunting licenses sold in this State, ten years ago until 1958, that is the increase, and during this increase our deer kill has been the same. That proves to me that there isn't more deer in this State. The only reason that we are keeping our deer kill at 40,000 is because we are putting more hunters in the woods. I hope you will go along with this motion of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, that this bill "Ought not to pass."

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, just in case they don't have time to read the record, I am sure I didn't say there were too many deer in the State of Maine. I am sure that there is enough of them always so that I would welcome company, and any time that the boys would like to come hunting I am pretty sure they can see a deer. However, of course, there is not as many as there was when my grandfather was a boy.

When a former Legislator spoke in regard to ice in Aroostook County it reminded me of this that I thought was worthy of mention: The reason that this bill is extended five days

in Aroostook County is because by airplane and by boat you can't get into the remote areas, and by extending the time you let in a warmer season where you can get in areas that have never been hunted before. And the intent of this bill is to get them into these places that have never been hunted before. And I would like to say that in an informal meeting of the Maine Fish and Game that they endorsed this bill very highly and of which my club in my area very highly endorses. Thank you.

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

Mr. BROCKWAY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that I must arise. I received a letter from the Three Rivers Fish and Game Club with headquarters in Milo, and they voted unanimously to oppose this bill. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, is successful.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I realize that there is no soul saved after the first ten minutes and no Christians made, but we need a few in this House, we need a few conservationists, true conservationists. Now, I have been accused of having no use for biologists. That needs some qualification. We need biologists if we are going to keep abreast of the times. We need them to guide us down the proper channels, we need their efforts of coordination and we need progress, and I am for that, but this bill is not progress. It is prejudice. I have no argument whatever with the area north of this mystic line, but in Washington County and the edge of Penobscot, an area in which I am very, very familiar, I spend a lot of time there, there isn't one deer today where ten years ago there were ten, and they haven't starved to death.

This pamphlet with which we have been bombarded was put together in 1955 and it is based on facts and figures true at that time in Washington County. Those facts do not exist today, and we are confronted

with a problem today, not five or six years ago. I must at this point disagree with one of my very good friends, and that is the gentleman from Jay, Mr. Maxwell. I opposed in the Maine Fish and Game Association, I made the motion that we go on record as opposing this three zone bill and that was passed.

I am rather critical of the statements made here as to what the wardens have said. I don't think there is anyone in this room that knows wardens any better than I do, I have had a little experience with them and if any warden said he was in favor of this bill it is because somebody told him to say that. I defy you to find one who isn't under pressure who will tell you that he believes in this bill.

Of course, we exploit our deer crop, we take advantage of it. It has been going on for years, and yet we come up over the last few years to a kill of 40,000 approximately. If we can continue to add, continue to pursue the deer and take the deer in such quantities for that many years I don't think we have anything to fear but the biologists. Now, I know there is youth, like the rest of us they want to get ahead in their chosen field and I don't blame them for trying, we are all entitled to that fact. But for my money, here is one case where I can't go down the same beautiful street that they go, I have got to go out and be a bandit and be on the other side, and I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone will prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville, that Bill "An Act Regulating Open Season on Deer by Zones," Senate Paper 92, Legislative Document 210, and both reports be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eustis, Mr. Carville.

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I ask that when the vote is taken that it be taken by division.

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

A division of the House was had. Fifty-four having voted in the affirmative and seventy-seven having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now awaits a motion.

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

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker, out of order and under suspension of the rules, I now move that this bill have its final reading.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman must defer his intentions until one of the Committee reports has been accepted and until the bill has had its first and second reading.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we now accept the Minority Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, now moves that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill was given its first and second readings.

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

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Speaker, out of order and under suspension of the rules, I now move that this bill have its third reading and be sent to the other branch.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Jay that the Senate has now adjourned for the day and there is no point in sending it forthwith to the Senate today. Will the gentleman defer just a moment. The Chair is advised that the Senate has already passed this bill to be engrossed, so the Chair understands that the gentleman from Jay moves that under suspension of the rules this bill now be given its third reading without reference to the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

Does the gentleman from Lee wish to debate the motion of the gentleman from Jay?

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to ask a question first, and then possibly to debate it.

The SPEAKER: The motion to suspend the rules is not debatable.

Mr. FRAZIER: May I ask you a parliamentary question?

The SPEAKER? The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. FRAZIER: If this third reading is given will an amendment be possible tomorrow without reconsideration of the action?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that if this bill is given its third reading at this time the normal procedure would then be to pass it to be engrossed and the bill would then be out of the hands of the House. An amendment would be in order at any time prior to passage for engrossment.

Mr. FRAZIER: Then I would rise to oppose the motion to suspend the rules to give it its passage —

The SPEAKER: The motion to suspend the rules is not debatable.

Mr. FRAZIER: It was only to oppose it.

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to table the bill until Wednesday next for purposes of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER: A motion to suspend the rules cannot be tabled, and that is the question that is now before the House. After this motion has been acted upon a motion to table would then be in order.

Mr. CARVILLE: Then I hope the motion of the gentleman —

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may not debate the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House that under suspension of the rules this bill be given its third reading at this time? The House will order a division.

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

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative and sixty-eight having voted in the negative, the motion to suspend the rules did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CARVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I would still like to table this until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentleman that under the normal course of events this Bill will have its third reading tomorrow and a motion to table would then be in order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item eight, House Report "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Type of Lights on School Buses," House Paper 330, Legislative Document 477, tabled on March 20 by the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, pending acceptance of the Report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Choate.

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

Mr. CHOATE: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a slight misunderstanding on the part of a few of the members about the provisions of this bill, I would like to retablo it until next Wednesday.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Choate, that Bill "An Act relating to Type of Lights on School Buses" and the "Ought to pass" Report be tabled until Wednesday of next week pending acceptance of the Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Bill with accompanying papers was so tabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number nine, Bill "An Act relating to Obstructing Windshields, of Motor Vehicles," House Paper 575, Legislative Document 808, tabled on March 20 by the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, pending passage to be engrossed; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. WALTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I now move the passage of L. D. 808 with a Committee Amendment filing number 90 attached, and after that has been done I wish to submit a House amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, that the motion that would be in order at this time would be a motion to suspend the rules in order that the House may reconsider its action whereby it adopted Committee Amendment "A". The Chair understands that the

gentleman from Waldoboro does make that motion. Is it the pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now understands that the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it adopted Committee Amendment "A". Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now understands that the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, presents House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A".

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 575, L. D. 808, Bill, "An Act Relating to Obstructing Windshields of Motor Vehicles."

Amend said Amendment by inserting before the period at the end of the following underlined punctuation and words, or "No Riders" sticklers'

House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Treworgy of Orono, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 1.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number ten, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought to pass" and Minority "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act Permitting Sale of Liquor on Election Days After Polls Close," House Paper 765, Legislative Document 1083, tabled on March 24 by the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good, pending acceptance of either report.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Due to my absense yesterday, I had to attend a funeral, my good friend,



the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good, tabled this bill. I now move on item ten that we accept the Majority Committee Report "Ought to pass."

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Liquor Control Committee I would oppose the passage of this legislation. It seems to me that this is a small matter and yet it is a move to liberalize control because it opens the door for a little more sale. I feel that this is a bill which, while small, is still significant because it indicates a trend to liberalize the law. So I oppose the motion to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report. I move for the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The hour is late, I will be very brief. This law, as it now stands on the books of the State of Maine is for a definite purpose. It is to prevent political candidates, political machines from inveigling a voter and elector from voting for a certain candidate or a certain party or one thing or another by perhaps plying him with liquor or getting him in a position where he doesn't know how to vote. After the polls close there is definitely no need for anyone to ply anyone with liquor. It deprives a number of people who are engaged in business of what might be the lawful pursuit of their trade. This bill, as it stands, would allow, after the polls close, the sale of liquor in duly licensed premises in this State. I sincerely hope the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Chapman.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to support the recommendation of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I also served on this Committee and I signed the "Ought to pass" Report. We discussed this very thoroughly in Committee, and I feel assured that if the sponsor of this bill had been in the House yesterday it would probably have gone through without any trouble. I see no reason why a person, after the polls are closed, should not be allowed to continue his business of selling beer or wine or whatever type of licensee he is. It is a general trend all over the country to do this. The bars open in other places after the polls close. I do not think that this is any way liberalizes the law. It is only a matter of four or five hours that we are talking about. I sincerely hope the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, that Bill "An Act Permitting Sale of Liquor on Election Days After Polls Close," House Paper 765, Legislative Document 1083, and both reports be indefinitely postponed.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Crockett, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number eleven, Bill "An Act relating to Withdrawal of Town from School Supervisory Union," House Paper 541, Legislative Document 776, tabled on March 24 by the gentleman

from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, pending passage to be engrossed.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House Bill "An Act relating to Licensing of Horse and Ox Pulling Contests," Senate Paper 433, Legislative Document 1280, which was tabled earlier in the day by the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, pending acceptance of either report, and especially assigned for later in today's session; and the Chair recognizes that gentlewoman.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to offer House Amendment A and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The motion that would be in order at this time would be a motion to accept the Majority "Ought to pass in New Draft" Report.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, I make that motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, to move that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass in New Draft" Report.

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

Mr. HILTON: Mr. Speaker, I now move that this bill, L. D. 1280, and all the papers that go with it be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Anson, Mr. Hilton, now moves that the bill and both reports be

indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House? Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone please say "Aye"; those opposed, "No."

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Bill with accompanying papers was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the matter tabled earlier in today's session by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, Resolve for Laying of the County Taxes for the Years Nineteen Hundred Fifty-nine and Nineteen Hundred Sixty, House Paper 906, Legislative Document 1275, pending final passage.

This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 137 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Orders of the Day. The Chair would like to compliment the House most sincerely for the wonderful way in which the members stayed in the hall of the House in spite of the lateness of the hour. The Chair thanks you.

On motion of Mr. Jewell of Monticello,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.