

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, April 1, 1959

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Gerald B. Kinney of the Methodist Church, Orrington.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Report of Committee of Conference

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on

Bill "An Act relating to License Plates for Disabled or Paraplegic Veterans" (H. P. 229) (L. D. 319) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

LETOURNEAU of Sanford

CARON of Biddeford

BRAGDON of Perham

— Committee on part of House.

COLE of Waldo

DUNN of Kennebec

PARKER of Piscataquis

— Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Joint Standing Judiciary Committee be instructed to originate a bill empowering the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine to promulgate rules of civil procedure to take effect not less than 6 months after their promulgation, and to repeal, amend, modify or add to such rules after their promulgation (S. P. 440)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read.

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

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, would someone give us an explanation?

The SPEAKER: The Gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, requests

through the Chair an explanation of this order.

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Prior to entry here this morning, I inquired as to the advisability of giving an explanation of this particular order and it was thought that conceivably it might not be necessary. I am glad to make an effort to do so.

In the previous Legislature there was permission given to set up rules of civil procedure patented after the so-called federal rules of procedure, which rules would be entirely different from, in many respects, and a considerable departure from the rules under which the lawyers are governed and thus the rules under which so-called adversary proceedings, contests that come before the courts, are governed.

Now a committee was set up, an actual working advisory committee, to write in draft form a set of rules. They were subsequently given the professional treatment by a professor at Harvard College. Subsequent to that, the Maine State Bar Association, meeting here in the House of Representatives earlier this year, had an opportunity to discuss. Subsequent to that it was determined that there were other changes that were needed. That is by way of background to this.

Now specifically, if these rules are going to take effect they necessarily are going to have an impact upon a great many sections of the Statutes that now exist, in matters of procedure. It was thought initially that perhaps the necessary repealing and amending should be done under the so-called acts to clarify errors and inconsistencies, the so-called "Omnibus Bill" that the Director of Legislative Research has available and that goes to the Judiciary Committee for hearing near the close of the session, to see that those things that have been overlooked as far as errors and matters of procedure and details, those things that can be rectified.

It was the decision apparently of the Supreme Court, and the members of the Bar working on this entire body of rules of civil procedure,

that this vehicle I am speaking of, namely the Act of the Director of Legislative Research, was not perhaps the proper vehicle; but rather it should be a bill entirely in itself. And incidentally, this will necessitate a bill of some eighty pages. Now I could go on but I have a feeling that a great many would be perfectly satisfied if I just concluded my remarks and sat down. Unless it is necessary to expatiate further, shall we say, I will be glad to sit down. Thank you.

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for his explanation and the eighty page bill — will it cost any money?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor addresses another question through the Chair to the gentleman from South Portland, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker, I have so little money of my own that oftentimes I don't think of those things perhaps, but I understand — I would presume rather, that the cost would be predicated on the basis of any other bill that would be presented to a committee. I don't know what the cost per page or per line would be, I know that the inquirer or the presenter of the question which I am attempting to answer is a person of considerable acumen, and I know that he can determine the exact cost for himself or from others. Thank you.

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

Mr. STANLEY: I thank the gentleman for his praise this morning and I would move that the order have passage.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the passage of this Order in concurrence. Is it the pleasure of the House that this Order shall receive passage in concurrence?

The motion prevailed.

Senate Reports of Committees Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Highways reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Cost of Snow Removal on the Interstate

System" (S. P. 400) (L. D. 1168)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve relating to Ferry Terminals at Islesboro and Lincolnville (S. P. 367) (L. D. 1050)

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to County Appropriations to Promote Counties" (S. P. 299) (L. D. 823)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Use of Surplus Funds by Counties" (S. P. 300) (L. D. 824)

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

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice, Resolve read once and tomorrow assigned.

Orders

On motion of Mrs. Smith of Falmouth, it was

ORDERED, that Rev. Milton Grant of the Congregational Church, Falmouth, be invited to officiate as Chaplain of the House on Friday, April 3, 1959.

On motion of Mr. Edwards of Stockton Springs, it was

ORDERED, that Mary Marden of Belfast be appointed to serve as Honorary Page for the day.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort Miss Marden to the front of the House to serve as Honorary Page for the day. The Chair would also advise the House that Miss Marden is the granddaughter of Representative Monroe of the House.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted Miss Marden, Honorary Page, to her place at the front of the House, amid the applause of the Members.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Election Laws reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Changing the Date of the General Election (H. P. 4) (L. D. 13)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass Printed Bill

Mrs. Knapp from the Committee on Election Laws reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Time of Enrollment of Voters" (H. P. 858) (L. D. 1226)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill 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 Town of Warren for Loss of Tax Revenue" (H. P. 481) (L. D. 699)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. LESSARD of Androscoggin
ROSS of Sagadahoc
— of the Senate.

Messrs. WADE of Auburn
SANBORN of Gorham
BARNETT of Augusta
— 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 Union, Mr. Heald.

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker, in regard to Legislative Document 699 I find that I am taking the unpopular stand of asking for tax relief for a community that has state-owned property within its boundaries, but this particular situation is unique for various reasons, the first reason being that the property in question, the state prison farm, takes up some five hundred acres of a community that derives 47 per cent of its taxes from farm land. Secondly, it is located in such a position that all of the trade and so forth goes to another community, while the cost of its service such as schooling, fire

protection, roads, maintenance, snow plowing and so forth are borne by the taxpayers of the Town of Warren.

Now I have heard it said by some people, if you don't want the State-owned property in your town why send it up to our town, but no one with any common sense would ask for a bunch of convicts to be located in their community. I am not implying that the prison farm isn't run properly or that its buildings are unsightly or anything like that. What I am saying is that when such an outfit is in a community, it reduces the value of the remaining property in that area and it cuts down the desirability to build new real estate in that community. This being the case, something should be done.

Now I understand that the prison intends to purchase another farm in Warren as soon as this session is over. When they purchase this land, they don't consult the town fathers or the taxpayers or anyone. This could go on and on until it swallowed up the town or made the tax burden so high to the remaining people that they might be forced to abandon their farms.

There are those of you who might say this bill would set up a dangerous precedent. I say a dangerous precedent is now in progress and should be stopped. Some might argue that the town of Warren, the taxes — there are towns that have higher taxes than the Town of Warren, but it is one thing to have higher tax rates and it is another thing to have a high tax rate and need new schools, new roads, new fire equipment and so forth, and to have the only industry, a woolen mill, recently close its doors. Some may say you are asking for too much; they may be right. The town was recently evaluated and the same standards were used on the personal property as is used all over town.

Incidentally this bill does not take into consideration the personal property such as cattle, poultry, farm machinery and so forth. Some of you may argue that it wouldn't cost the Town of Warren one cent more if there were a six million dollar building on this property, and I think they are right. In fact I think we made a mistake when we asked for

tax relief on the prison barracks buildings that are located on the property, but I do think that the tax loss for the buildings that were torn down and the farms that were bought up should be taken into consideration.

It is no doubt apparent to you by now that I didn't have any professional help on this issue nor did I ask any single legislator for any special consideration. I do request that you ask yourselves, what would you do if you had this malignant growth in your own home town?

As a result of conversation with members of the Committee in regard to the aforementioned barracks building. I submit an amendment that is on your desks now, and I move that this amendment be adopted together with the Committee Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that the motion in order at this time would be a motion regarding either report. The Chair understands that the gentleman moves the acceptance of Report "A" "Ought to pass".

Mr. HEALD: That is correct.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, moves that the House accept Report "A", the "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is a situation similar to the Augusta situation we heard about last week. The Committee on State Government brought out this divided report both to give the Town of Warren a chance to present its case to the legislature, and also to accord it the same treatment that was given Augusta.

As I said last week, the Committee does not believe that the State is ready to adopt the policy that is embodied in these bills, and therefore, as I said last week, we would assume and expect that the motion of the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, will not prevail.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Again when I signed the planned divided report,

I reserved the right in Committee to speak against this particular Legislative Document. I don't want to take too much of your time this morning other than to point out that the Bureau of Public Improvements has informed me that there are in this State 173 communities with state facilities. This is simply to point out how if you do open the door for one particular community, there would be 172 other communities entitled to some relief in lieu of the taxes. I move that the motion of the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, moves the indefinite postponement of both reports.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a far different situation than we had last week as far as Augusta was concerned because the Town of Warren has no state employees that leave part of their payroll in the garages and the restaurants and so on, and I was quite impressed with the fact that last Friday night after all the legislators had gone home, I visited a certain small local hotel and it was very quiet there, and I imagine that during the week business is booming. As you have already been told, Warren gets very little benefit from this, the benefit is on the other side, the taxpayers maintain the schools and roads. I have always favored a situation like this, and this is a very small price tag to pay for the land that was taken out of the Town of Warren.

As you know, the prison kept buying up farms and buying up farms and some of those farms were even staked off and claimed as mineral rights by the men that work in this prison, and even then the Town of Warren got no benefit out of those mineral rights. The men that staked the claims were the ones that prospered, so I think even though there is a chance of opening the door, the door is pretty well guarded, it is an awful job to get your foot in that door, and I certainly hope that the motion made by the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Friendship, that the question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, that both reports be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Well, I'll change my plea then, I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I shall be very brief. It has been brought before you here that the amount asked for is only a small amount. I would remind you that it only takes a very small leak in the dyke before the dyke is entirely destroyed and the flood is upon us. I admonish you to be very careful how you vote, and I strongly support the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker, I too do not want to prolong this thing, but I want to emphasize again that we shouldn't force little towns out of business or force their backs to the wall, and there should be some consideration given to them. It is an awful situation. In a town where they don't ask you a thing, they just buy up the property and it just goes and goes and you can plainly see what could happen and something really should be done. I am not saying this bill is the answer to it, but they talk about opening the door; the door should be opened if such things happen to communities.

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, that both Reports on Bill "An Act to Reimburse Town of Warren for Loss of Tax Revenue", House Paper 481, Legislative Document 699, be indefinitely postponed. Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone both Reports please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the

motion prevailed, the two Reports and Bill were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

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

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of eighth grade pupils from the Maria Clark Grammar School at Hallowell, accompanied by their Principal, Mr. C. H. Arber and their teacher, Mr. Wyman, and parents Mrs. Hunt, Mrs. Ballard, Mrs. Snell and Mrs. Russell. On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to all you ladies and gentlemen a most hearty and cordial welcome and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit here today. (Applause)

(Off Record Remarks by the Speaker)

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Examination of Insurance Agents and Brokers" (H. P. 133) (L. D. 191)

Bill "An Act relating to Protection from Nuclear Loss in Standard Fire Insurance Policy" (H. P. 533) (L. D. 768)

Bill "An Act relating to Powers and Stock of Development Credit Corporation of Maine" (H. P. 804) (L. D. 1143)

Bill "An Act to Revise the Fraternal Beneficiary Association Law" (H. P. 856) (L. D. 1224)

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 Increasing Salary of Mayor of the City of Lewiston" (S. P. 336) (L. D. 912)

Resolve in favor of George Freyer, Jr. of Covington, Kentucky (S. P. 365) (L. D. 1048)

Resolve in favor of Lena Freyer of Covington, Kentucky (S. P. 366) (L. D. 1049)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bill read the third time, Resolves read

the second time, all passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Bill "An Act relating to Hunting Deer with Bow and Arrow in Islesboro, Waldo County" (H. P. 620) (L. D. 888)

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" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

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

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 133 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Gifts of Securities and Money to Minors (S. P. 169) (L. D. 413)

An Act Clarifying Laws Relating to the Maine Industrial Building Authority (S. P. 215) (L. D. 554)

An Act relating to Municipal Court Dockets (S. P. 331) (L. D. 907)

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

An Act Prohibiting the Sale of Near Beer to Minors (S. P. 368) (L. D. 1051)

An Act to Authorize Independent or Internal Bank Auditors in Lieu of Directors' Examinations (S. P. 373) (L. D. 1100)

An Act relating to Definition of Retail Sale under Liquor Laws (S. P. 382) (L. D. 1108)

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

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

An Act Permitting Certain Public Utility Corporations to Hold Stock-

holders Meetings Outside the State (H. P. 440) (L. D. 646)

An Act relating to Withdrawal of Town from School Supervisory Union (H. P. 541) (L. D. 776)

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

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

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

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

An Act relating to Dissolution of Corporations for Non-use of Corporate Powers (H. P. 645) (L. D. 936)

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

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

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

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

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)

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

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

An Act relating to Credit Between Malt Beverage Manufacturers and Wholesalers (H. P. 910) (L. D. 1282)

Finally Passed

Resolve Authorizing the State Tax Assessor to Convey by Sale the Interest of the State in Certain Lands in the Unorganized Territory (S. P. 137) (L. D. 332)

Resolve Appropriating Money for Completion of Court Rules (S. P. 323) (L. D. 899)

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

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of eighth grade pupils from the Riverside Grammar School of Vassalboro, accompanied by their Principal Beulah MacDonald. On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you ladies and gentlemen most hearty and cordial welcome and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit here today. (Applause)

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned item, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act relating to Exemption from Taxation of Certain Property Owned by Municipalities", House Paper 508, Legislative Document 721, tabled on March 25 by the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Desmarais, pending acceptance of either report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau.

Mr. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Since the tabling of this matter, information has come to me that it may be possible to settle this matter amicably between the three towns that are concerned. In order to give us a little more time to reach an agreement I would move that this matter be tabled and specially assigned for April 15.

Thereupon, the Bill and both Reports were retabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 15.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number two, Bill "An Act relating to Expending Aroostook County Funds for Ricker College", House Paper 777, Legislative Document 1095, tabled on March 25 by the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Edmunds, pending third reading.

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

Thereupon, on motion of that gentleman, the Bill was given its third reading, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number three, An Act relating to Distribution and Sale of Publications Depicting Crime and Torture, Senate Paper 249, Legislative Document 632, tabled on March 25 by the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Porell, pending passage to be enacted; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. PORELL: Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Bacon.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Bacon.

Thereupon, on motion of that gentleman, the Bill was retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 7.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number four, An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets, House Paper 70, Legislative Document 108, tabled on March 25 by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, pending passage to be enacted; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this retabled until Tuesday morning. There are some details that haven't been worked out concerning this bill yet.

The SPEAKER: With respect to Bill "An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets, the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, moves that the bill be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday next, pending passage to be enacted. Will all those who favor the tabling motion please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the passage for enactment.

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

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a Quinella bill. Two years ago we had a full dress rehearsal

here in a debate. The Quinella was permitted up to then on all the races except the first two, and it seems as though, although many people talk about the Harness Horse Racing Commission giving full authority to regulate things, but what happened they betrayed the trust. They permitted Quinellas on every race and two years ago that was limited to one Quinella on the last race and the daily double on the first race. Well, I think things are going along all right — of course there was a little talk about some of these small fairs who are losing a little money and the Quinellas would help them. That is why I wanted to table this because possibly I would go along with a Quinella on the fifth race and the eighth race. There have been a lot of complaints about these Quinellas, they are more a sort of one-armed bandit proposition when you come right down to it. The man, the sucker, will put his last dollar on the last race. That is why I say that the Commission has to be curbed and it has been spelled out. The Commission is no better than the men that fill the offices.

I now make a motion that we indefinitely postpone this bill and its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, that the Bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I arise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, that this bill be indefinitely postponed. The Committee took this bill under long consideration. As the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, has pointed out, a few years ago there were unlimited Quinellas on betting. In 1957 they were limited to one Quinella. The bill as presented and before amended this year would have given unlimited betting on Quinellas, but the Committee didn't go along with that. We compromised on three Quinellas in any race meet.

Now the reason for our status is this, that this bill pertains only to harness racing at the fairs, and as near as we could determine the

fairs are working on a very close budget and if they get a couple of poor days during the week they have lost money for that year. And they, as we all know, have a great investment in these fairs. Now this does not give them a blanket right to hold three Quinellas during the race meet, but it is left at the discretion of the Commission. Now this is an interesting bet, but it is not as bad as the daily double. The odds on the daily double are sixty-four to one, so if you are going to cut out a bet that bleeds the better, you better cut out the daily double, whereas the Quinella is twenty-eight to one. Now a better can bet his last dollar on the last race, even if there isn't any Quinella or daily double, he still has a bet open to him there.

Now if you limit it to just one Quinella, you get a rush at the window and that holds up the race meet, where if you have one or more Quinellas during the day you don't get as much of a rush at one particular window for one meet. And if you limit it to one Quinella you have to hire the help to take care of just that one window for that particular one race whereas if the Commission has the discretion of permitting up to three Quinellas why then you can use your help to better advantage. Therefore I hope that this House will defeat the motion which is presently before it.

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

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a division.

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

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, the talk about the measure of two years ago, it is familiar to me, it was my own bill. I think conditions have changed, I think there were restrictions put on by the committee report, I think the measure has been well explained by Mr. Good, the House Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Karkos, does not prevail. Then I intend to put an amendment on and speak on the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald.

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker, I arise to support the Quinella bill and I speak as former president of the Maine State Association of Agricultural Fairs and as president of Union Fair. I feel I am qualified and do know the problems and know how small a budget we have to operate on. The Horsemen's Association has recently been formed and they want larger purses and they should have larger purses. In order to give them to them we have to make more money, or at least make as much as we have in the past. Now we had one year that we could have multiple Quinellas and we made a little money. Now we had another year that we had only one Quinella and at least four of the fairs lost money. It is hard enough to get trustees and people to work at these fairs, most of the time for no salaries at all, and it is even harder to get them to sign notes to keep the fairs going, to pay for the grounds and such things as that, and as was already pointed out, in order to handle the Quinella bet at the window, which is a very popular bet, we have to hire extra personnel and that extra personnel just sits around until that last race. You have to hire those men by the day and if we could have three races sandwiched in there, of the Quinella, it would help things considerably. And I hope the Bill prevails.

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

Mr. KARKOS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Union, I could say this, years ago they put on extra races. It was common sometimes after a rainy day to have as many as twelve races. I think we should consider the evil as well as the profit for a few.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was not going to speak on this bill although it is my bill, but I feel that I am forced to. Two years ago when the Quinella was limited to the eighth

race, many times that eighth race got rained out and the fair associations lost money. Secondly, I saw thirteen people being put out of work. As you all know I have been working at the fairs for the last twelve years, I have been working in pari-mutuels, and I saw thirteen people put out of work, one calculator, six sellers and six cashiers that worked just on Quinellas. Now I feel that this is not the time. The State is going through a hard period and many people are unemployed and this is the time when we can employ five or six or seven or eight more people to work during the summer months, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Karkos, that Bill "An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets", House Paper 70, Legislative Document 108, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

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

A division of the House was had.

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

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the privilege of tabling this for later in today's session pending an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets" moves that the bill and all accompanying papers be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session pending passage to be enacted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Splash

Guards for Certain Trucks, House Paper 870, Legislative Document 1215, tabled on March 25 by the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, pending assignment for third reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This splash guard bill, so-called, was passed by the 98th Legislature. At that time as I recall, we had considerable discussion on the matter. The only change as I read this bill, the only change that it makes is to cut out trucks under 14,000 pounds. As the bill was originally passed these trucks were exempted from the requirements of the law.

At that time the feeling, as I recall generally, was that the large vans traveling the length and breadth of the State were the major offenders, and splash guards were required on the larger trucks and the vans. I might point out that many of the trucks in that smaller group operate both on and off of the highways, they operate in woods roads and in the fields, and it is often times rather difficult to keep splash guards on them—it would be rather difficult if splash guards were required to be kept on them. I cannot believe that there has been any particular public clamor that this law be amended, and I would at this time move the indefinite postponement of this bill with all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that this bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This particular piece of legislation was started in the 97th Legislature for one purpose, as a safety measure. At that time it was brought out whereby we in that 97th Legislature passed into law, making only semi-trailer trucks required to carry splash guards, which to me seemed ridiculous, because the rear end of a semi-trailer truck is no different than any other truck. So in the 98th Legislature I reintroduced legislation which we after

quite a heavily discussed item here on this Floor to except certain trucks from being included in this statute for 14,000 pounds or over. We do know or at least at that time it was expressed before this House it was their desire to prevent any trucks from being imposed upon by being required to carry splash guards, so we gave them that bill exempting contractors within a radius of five miles of a construction job, they were not required to carry them. There were several other restrictions which were removed from the bill and it received passage from the 98th Legislature. Since then and at this particular session, I introduced legislation once again to improve upon what we already had because of several complaints, but the rear end of any truck, regardless of weight, was just as dangerous for throwing splashed mud and so forth onto the car that was in the rear of it or cars passing by it. We did not impose any further restrictions except to reduce the weight limit which would take in all registered cars and trucks. This was heard before the Transportation Committee and as you know there is an amendment to this which has been passed through eliminating stake body trucks and half ton trucks from this requirement. The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, I believe put that amendment on which was adopted by the House. This was a unanimous report from the Committee. It has been recommended once, a second unanimous report came out with this amendment being adopted by the Committee and by both branches. So since then those who tried to defeat this measure for the past two sessions will now try to defeat it again. It seems to me the safety of the public on the highways is essential. Your Committee report is vital for your consideration because they heard all the facts of the bill. There was no opposition to the bill at the hearing. Everything up to this point as I felt was going along smoothly on this particular piece of legislation. But it seems now that each individual has a certain gripe that they claim is hard against the truckers.

Now I have checked with the trucking industry, their lobbyists and so forth, they are not op-

posed to this particular piece of legislation, they believe it will do no harm to them, but it does protect the travelling motorist, those who are either passing or coming in the back of an old truck, even if a pedestrian is walking along the sidewalk. It does not fully stop a splash but it protects them from the hazard of throwing rocks out of dual wheels. We have a lot of hot rods on the road today with no splash guards whatsoever, and I think the public safety should be considered, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, does not prevail, and when the vote is taken I request a division.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I only have one comment to make. I searched diligently for this amendment that the gentleman from Bridgton refers to. I doubt very much if it exists. I would like to be shown such an amendment if it is in existence.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I might say that the amendment was included in a redraft of the Committee when it was recommitted to the Committee, which is different than the original bill. I believe the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, was the gentleman who brought that out from Committee on a redraft with that included, those exemptions. May I ask through the Chair if the gentleman from Lewiston cares to reply?

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill was heard in our Committee. We made arrangements where if a fender was on a truck it would not need to have any splash guards. These trucks that are travelling the highways with the stake body or they have no fenders of any kind will splash as much on your windshield as a two ton truck will, and we had this bill back into the Committee twice. We came out with it in new draft. We checked with the truckers association and we checked with the farmers that came in there,

and we checked with the Secretary of State and the State Highway Police, and they all thought it was a very good move, that if you went to go by a small truck the splash would be the same as a large truck, especially if it had dual wheels. I believe this bill came out in a new draft, there was no opposition to it, and whatever opposition to it has been shown here I don't believe should outrule what the Committee had decided on it, so I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Splash Guards for Certain Trucks", the bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

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

A division of the House was had.

Twenty-one having voted in the affirmative and ninety-four having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would like to recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of Civics Class students from the Bath Junior High School, accompanied by Miss Patricia Ames. On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you ladies and gentlemen a most cordial and hearty welcome and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit here today. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought to pass" with Committee Amendment 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 25 by the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Choate, pending acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. CHOATE: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the unanimous "Ought to pass" Report of the Transportation Committee.

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

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

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion, and I ask consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This Bill, L. D. 477, as I understand it, was opposed at the hearing especially for two reasons. First that it would be too expensive to install these lights, these revolving lights on the buses, and second, that most garages where these buses are stored do not have openings high enough to accommodate buses with revolving lights on top.

Now in attempting to amend this bill so that it may become acceptable, we are creating more or less an omnibus bill, something that will create more confusion than anything else. I would like to say at this point that I for one, and I am quite sure the rest of us here, are all interested in safety, specially in the safety of our children, but in anything that we do, whether it is for safety or for anything else, there is a limit to what we can do without creating a cumbersome situation, and there is also a limit to what we can achieve, to what results we can achieve by doing so. If our present laws are satisfactory, there certainly cannot be much benefit in adding new requirements.

Now I have talked with the Superintendent of the Brunswick Schools and of School Union 46 and with the public transportation company which furnishes school buses also, and they are all opposed to this measure for the same reasons, and they are as follows: Number one, it is an unnecessary expense and it is felt that this money could be put to much better use by providing more and better education for our children.

Number two, in the winter time, especially in our rural areas, when the branches of trees are weighted down with ice and snow, they often brush along the top of these buses, and these lights would be continuously breaking off.

Three, if these lights were put on brackets in the front or in the back of the buses as the amendment would allow, there would be great danger of breakage when these buses were backed up in the garages. Buses are backed up usually end to end two or three in a line and they could very easily be backed up against a wall or in these transportation companies that furnish these buses where they have the square end buses, the buses without the long hoods on the front, they could back up against one of those and cause a great deal of damage, both to the light on the school bus and to the other buses.

Four, to make this bill more acceptable, the amendment also provides that these lights would be installed only on new buses bought after September 1, 1960. Now school buses are good for ten to twelve years and we would have for at least the next ten years some buses with revolving lights and some without. Some buses would have lights on the front and the back and some would have some on the top. I think this would certainly add to the confusion and could be the result of more accidents than we have ever seen before.

This amendment also provides that this law would come under the supervision of the Department of Education rather than the Secretary of State. A few days ago I was talking with the Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Education and he informs me that they would have to accept this responsibility if such a bill was passed, but that they are not interested in it, they did not ask for it, and they would just as soon not have it.

School buses now are generally well lighted, and I believe they are all yellow, or very nearly, and there is no reason why any motorist should not recognize a school bus when he sees one on the road. The laws relating to passing of school buses are specific and are well posted along the roads, so that all drivers should be aware of them.

So Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do not believe that this State is ready or in need of this type of legislation, and I would now move the indefinite postponement of the Bill and the accompanying reports.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, that the "Ought to pass" Report be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. CHOATE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe that we are all sent here to express our honest opinions and sometimes our honest differences, and I respect the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, and his constituents and their viewpoints, but I would like to take about two or three minutes of your time this morning to explain, since most of you were not able to attend the hearing, some of the background and details and the amendments which are encompassed in this bill, L. D. 477.

As to the background, I might say first-off that this bill was not presented through selfish reasons. I have four children of my own, but none of them ride a school bus, they would not be affected by this bill. It was presented in cooperation with the Augusta Safety Council. The study that they made was started when one of their students was killed due to the fact that a truck driver did not see the bus lights in time to stop. Following that accident for two years they tested and retested all types of lights under all types of conditions. This bill is the result of their findings. Following the drafting of this bill — or a little bit prior to that, there was a meeting held in the Secretary of State's office at which meeting there were members of the Highway Safety Committee, the State Police, the Principal's Association, the Superintendent's Association, Parent-Teachers and the Kennebec County Law Enforcement. I felt that it was a privilege to work on a bill such as this which could possibly save the lives of some of the children in our State.

As to the details, in compliance with the Uniform Vehicle Code Law, this bill calls for alternately flashing red lights on the front and on

the rear. It also calls for two red revolving prismatic type lights one on the front and one on the rear. These are the type that are used by the state police on the state police cars now, and I think you will all admit that they are very, very effective under all conditions. If a car goes by a bus with this type of light on it, there is absolutely no excuse.

I might say that the lights could be mounted on the top of the buses if the height of the garage permits, or they can be mounted on brackets below the roof level which would do away with the objection of the height. They are just as effective in either position, but the amendment was provided to take care of that.

The price of these lights runs between \$100 and \$150 per bus. The estimated life of these lights is approximately ten years. Divided into that, it would mean it would cost \$10.00 to \$15.00 per year. I do not think that the cost factor should even be considered. The effective date has been amended to read that it shall be effective only on new buses after September of 1960.

I ask that in the interest of the lives and welfare of the children of this State, who ride on the school buses, that we pass this bill here today. In the final analysis we should ask ourselves this question: How much is a child's life worth? I ask for a division when the vote is taken.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, just one point that hasn't been brought out here today that I think is worthy of mention. We have been told that these lights cost \$100 to \$150 which no doubt is so, but you haven't been told that these school buses already have much battery trouble from the fact that they have to have a big heating system, they already are overloaded with lights, and one problem that we get into when we add any more lights is the fact that they can't run them without more generation and more batteries and this runs into a terrible lot of expense, especially to the older type buses which don't have any place to put an extra generator and no place to put an extra

battery, and in our area we have the same problem of having to rebuild our building where we put buses quite often, it is a cement building which would be a considerable job to rebuild, and I am imagining that this same condition is all over the State, and I also think that if a person cannot see the lights that are now upon one of these buses along with the big yellow bus that possibly he shouldn't have a license to drive. Thank you.

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

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, I rise only in question of the amendment. I feel that an awful lot of our rural communities in Maine use a second-hand bus which they buy downstate somewhere. Now if I am not mistaken, I think I have heard that quoted twice this morning, it is on new buses. Now would the installation of these blinking lights pertain to these used buses that are brought into the State in great numbers for this purpose?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Poland, Mr. Dunn.

Mr. DUNN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In the Committee this was gone over quite thoroughly. They had one of these lights demonstrated; they also showed us the bus equipped with them. The cost, they thought the tops would be \$150 per bus. Compared with the cost of a new bus that is not too large. Also from a safety factor, if we can save one life the cost compared would be very small.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Hendricks.

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, I understand that Augusta has some of these buses in operation now, and I understand they are very satisfactory, and as a member of the Governor's Highway Safety Council I think there is a great need for this bill, and I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone it does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Whitman.

Mr. WHITMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to support the bill and the unanimous

report of the Committee on Transportation. I think they have had ample opportunity to look over all the various aspects of the bill, and I would like to say also that in my opinion this bill is not only in the interest of safety for the school children but in the interest of the average motorist. I on various occasions myself have been very much in doubt as to the intentions of some of these school buses, and particularly in the winter season when the mud sometimes camouflages their lights and it is very difficult to see them, whereas these rotary lights would allow the motorist to observe the beacon at a wide angle which is sometimes impossible with the flat trajectory of the present lights.

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

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Speaker, obviously I am quite familiar with the two buses in Augusta that have these lights and I would like to heartily endorse this bill and also I own and operate a school bus and I would have no objection to installing such lights on my bus because I strongly feel that the type of revolving light attracts a driver's attention at a much greater distance than the type of lights that we have at this time. Although my bus is an old one, and this bill pertains to new buses, and that I believe answers the question of the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, in view of the fact that it would be the new buses that would have this problem of battery sizes and so forth, and in accordance with the way the bill is written we wouldn't have to install them on the old buses, but if they could be installed, I certainly would be in favor of it.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Choate, one question before we vote on this bill. Is there anything in his bill that specifies what size light he is talking about? I do know that those flashing type lights come in different sizes.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, has addressed a question through the Chair to the

gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Choate, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. CHOATE: Mr. Speaker, the bill states in there that the lights shall be of the size and type approved by the Department of Education, and the type that has been used and recommended is the same size as that on the state police cars. There are various types and various sizes, but the ones that they want, the ones that they would recommend would be the same as you see on the state police cars.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, that the "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Type of Lights on School Buses", House Paper 330, Legislative Document 477, be indefinitely postponed. A division has been requested.

Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone the "Ought to pass" Report please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Thirty-two having voted in the affirmative and ninety having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Mr. Call, I think it is about time that the House was made aware of Rule 22, and I ask the Clerk to read the rule.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman defer just a moment? Does the gentleman from Cumberland raise a point of order?

Mr. CALL: I do, sir.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. CALL: I notice in the House several members who don't vote on either side of the question.

The SPEAKER: Without objection and because the Speaker does not have his reading glasses on, the Clerk will have to read this rule.

House Rule 22 was read by the Clerk as follows:

"22. Every member who shall be in the House when a question is put where he is not excluded by interest shall give his vote, unless the House for special reasons shall excuse him, and when yeas and

nays are ordered, no member shall have his seat until the vote is declared; in all elections by the House, or on joint ballot of the two houses, no member shall leave his seat, after voting, before a return of the House is had."

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. CURTIS: I wish to speak on this rule.

The SPEAKER: Debate on the rule —

Mr. CURTIS: It is not debate. May I speak?

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman be willing to defer until we have finished with the item and then ask unanimous consent to address the House?

Mr. CURTIS: Okay.

The SPEAKER: Yes sir, thank you.

Is it now the pleasure of the House with regard to item six, Bill "An Act relating to Type of Lights on School Buses" to now accept the "Ought to pass" Report?

The motion prevailed, and the Bill was read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 330, L. D. 477, Bill, "An Act Relating to Type of Lights on School Buses."

Amend said Bill, in the 19th and 20th lines, by striking out the underlined words and figures "over a 360 degree horizontal plane".

Further amend said Bill, in the 23rd line, by striking out the underlined words "Secretary of State" and inserting in place thereof the underlined words "State Department of Education".

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

'such new buses purchased after September 1, 1960.'

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to Obstructing Windshields of Motor Vehicles", House Paper 575, Legislative Document 808, tabled on March 25 by

the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Treworgy, pending passage to be engrossed; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. TREWORGY: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, in his own right.

Mr. WALTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: After going over this bill very carefully, it appears that we have got this worded to the satisfaction of all concerned as far as I am able to determine, and at this time I would like to present House Amendment "A" to L. D. 808 as distributed by filing 143.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Walter, offers House Amendment "A" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read House Amendment "A".

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

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

Amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof, before the single quotation mark, the following underlined sentence: **'In lieu of a "No Rider" sticker, a sticker not to exceed 3-½ inches by 3-½ inches may be used.'**

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the eighth House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Retirements and Pensions on Bill "An Act relating to Veterans Under Maine State Retirement Law", House Paper 730, Legislative Document 1035, tabled on March 26 by the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Lemelin, pending acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" Report, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. LEMELIN: Mr. Speaker, I have had some information that has reached me, and I would like to

have this recommitted to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Thereupon, the Bill was recommitted to the Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House Item number nine under tabled and today assigned matters, House Report "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to the Inspection of Motor Vehicles", House Paper 780, Legislative Document 1098, tabled on March 26 by the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, pending acceptance of the "Ought to pass" Report, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the members of the House that yielding as has been mentioned several times is not in order, and the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, may rise in his own right. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I tabled this that I might get more information on it and I have spent several days down in my own county and in some other places, looking into this measure. Now I am just going to give you an idea of what I have found. I have found that on every occasion that I have asked the garage people how they felt about it, of course they would like to have the increase, and of course that is only human nature that they should.

I have also found that as far as I can see it would be no improvement to change it over from where it is in the Secretary of State to the police because the police department has full charge of it anyway. In other words, if I wanted to start a station today why a policeman would come down and measure it out and lay it out and tell me what I had to have, and if I put a sticker on somebody that I should not why the state police would pick it up and then I would lose my license probably, at least I should. And again if my friend, the gentleman

from Cumberland, came to me with a car that shouldn't have a sticker and I wouldn't put it on for him, and he drives off and goes somewhere else, I am supposed to report at the end of the week that he came to my place and asked for a sticker and he didn't get it, and so the state police has a chance to check him.

I can't see any particular reason just why there is a great deal of merit for safety or anything else in this thing except that it would cost the people of the State of Maine something over \$600,000 a year and the State would get some \$30,000 out of the loot.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will concur to a certain degree with the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, in regard to the increased costs, but the issue at stake seems to be why we are changing it over from the present Secretary of State's office to the State Police. I was concerned too, so I did go to the State Police and make inquiry there and also to the Secretary of State's office.

Now we find that the function is pretty nearly three-quarters performed at the present time by the State Police because they have to go out and make an examination and report back to the Secretary of State, then the State Police have to go back and enforce them, so therefore, it was felt by the Secretary of State's office he should have full and complete charge of it with additional staff and cost to the state for employees or to turn it entirely over to the State Police.

Now it is immaterial to that department whether or not he has it except he said whichever department may have it should have entire jurisdiction over this particular issue, so I am concerned with the tremendous increase of the amount to \$1.00, and with the permission of this House, I would like to table this and specially assign it for tomorrow for the purpose of offering an amendment to the additional costs.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would remind the gentleman from Bridg-

ton, Mr. Haughn, that if the "Ought to pass" Report is accepted the bill would automatically be here in the House for third reading tomorrow at which time his amendment would be in order rather than tabling it until tomorrow.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the information, I will withdraw my motion and at the proper time offer the amendment.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In reference to this bill, I have checked with quite a few garages in my neighborhood, and I haven't yet found one that is in opposition to this bill. Now they tell me to do a bona fide real good job, that it is almost impossible for a mechanic to crawl under a car and look it over for the sum of fifty cents at the present day rates, and they tell me each and every one of them are losing money on it, and the ones that I have contacted I am happy to say are ones that we consider men who are qualified and trustworthy.

Now it is possible, we understand and we have been led to believe, that certain garages are apt to put on stickers without any inspection, but an inspection of an automobile today is a thing that is very important to the people who are in the automobile as well as you and I who are on the highways.

Now the cars must be inspected, mufflers, tail pipes, king pins, bushings, front and rear wheels as well as the condition of your tires. We are not attempting to make any kind of rules here that would be difficult or too difficult for anybody to put a car on the road, but gentlemen I say to you that this is a step in the right direction, and the more we crack down on them the more these old jalopies are going to be taken off the road, where it will not be possible for them to get a sticker unless their car is absolutely on the up and up as every man's automobile should be if he has regard for his own life and safety and the safety of others who are on the highways. I am very happy to support this bill.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I looked at this bill, and this bill seems to be a natural and I think that it ought to pass. I talked with Paul MacDonald, the Deputy Secretary of State, and he states that there are approximately 1700 inspection stations in the State of Maine and he said and I quote: "All our department is doing is selling the stickers." There is no inspection being made by his department. I have also talked with Chief Marx of the State Police, and he is in favor of the bill and said that his department would be glad to handle it, but if he handles it he will put some men on to see that these inspection stations are inspected.

Now the State Police have charge of inspecting these vehicles after they get on the highways and I think it is just a natural for them to have them inspect the stations and have jurisdiction over the inspection before they get on the highways. Therefore, I would go along with the motion that the bill ought to pass.

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

Mr. COUSINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the bill boils down to whether or not we want an effective inspection system. I don't believe it is effective right now. I have figures for the months of October, November and December of last year of safety checks made by the State Police. They checked 28,613 cars in those three months, and bear in mind that includes the month that the inspections are made and the two months afterwards, and out of those 28,000 cars they found 11,694 defects. Now that certainly shows that our present inspection system isn't working too well. This bill with the increase in money to the garage man and the full responsibility on the State Police certainly can't hurt, and it is bound to make for a more effective safety procedure.

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was on

the Committee and I heard this bill. I have also heard this bill here in the last three sessions that I attended, this bill to enforce — to begin to enforce this bill will cost us \$60,000, that is getting your foot into the door as we mentioned a little while ago on this Floor. That is the beginning. We are deriving \$45,000 approximately now from the automobile stickers. If you gentleman think that the garage people will do a better job for one dollar than they are doing for fifty cents, I don't see how. If it is your belief that the automobiles on the road today are killing people, you are wrong, because before the Committee it was shown, and I asked the Chief of Police, how many accidents happened due to jalopies or to new cars concerning directly with the automobile. Well there is nobody that knows real well, but approximately four to five per cent of the accidents that happen. We, the people that drive automobiles, are the people that cause the accidents, and you know that if you lose your brakes on the hydraulic system or air brakes on trucks, most likely the man will be careful and fortunate enough to reach a garage.

Pertaining to this bill here, I don't believe that any garage can go out and issue a sticker for a dollar and you will have any more satisfaction than what you are paying fifty cents for now. I have repeatedly spoken with different garage people and they said that in order to give a good inspection to an automobile the cost would be approximately an hour's work which would be \$3.00 to \$4.00.

My belief, and I signed the "Ought to pass" Majority Report with the intentions of putting an amendment on this bill and raising the price, but if you raise the price you have to raise the price of the stickers that you pay to the Secretary of State or to the Chief of Police, which would be ten cents in the case of a dollar and fifteen cents in the case of a dollar and a half and twenty cents. It will cost \$60,000 to enforce this law the first biennium that we will have it in effect, and we can rest assured that once the dyke has been opened, not only six police officers and six automobiles will be required to en-

force this law, but most likely it will be twelve and maybe fifteen, then the costs will rise, and certainly the majority of the people were against the dollar increase in their driving license, and they certainly would be against taxing themselves another dollar in this instance. Therefore, I move that the bill and its papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that the "Ought to pass" Report be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am a little worried about this bill. It is almost impossible to have an automobile that has been on the road any length of time without being able to find something that would be wrong about it. In some states where they do do a very strict inspection, they aren't allowed to inspect the car on a rainy day on account of the fact the brakes take differently, and you can leave a garage with your car perfectly inspected and the first hole you strike will throw your front wheels out of line and by driving a few hundred miles after that you will have a tire that is smooth that wouldn't pass inspection in many states.

Now out of 174 fatal accidents in this State, I am not telling about the number of fatalities, there were only four cars which were mechanically defective. That is the report from the State Police, and I don't believe that we are going to do a thing about keeping the cars in a better condition on the road by passing this or making this a law.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, the figure of \$45,000 has been mentioned by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais. That was the fifty cent rate. It has been estimated by Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Marx that at the dollar rate the total take for his department would be \$80,000.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think there are a few things that I should point out before this able body today in relation to this sticker. Certainly I am sure that we are going in the wrong direction in raising the price of this sticker. In my opinion we should go down to twenty-five cents for this reason: In order for these garagemen to get a price for inspection they would have to charge for what they do. Now, I am sure that there are no garage people in this State that don't know how to charge. As an illustration, some of you people must have had your car to one of these garages in the not to distant gone by times, and I am certain that they know how to charge, maybe not how to fix your car but they know how to charge, at least.

Now, as this law stands now, they charge for everything they do. Now, to get customers into the place, let's say many of you people here have been in business or are now in business, now what would a good businessman do, wouldn't he appreciate a law being passed that would drive someone into his place of business twice every year, he would consider himself a very poor businessman if he couldn't sell him something. And I feel that the garagemen are the same way. A good garageman, when the car is in there, he will sell them tires, wheel alignments, brake linings and so forth. The intent of the bill, the original intent of the bill was to get this man into the garage. The garagemen, they certainly know their trade, they certainly will sell them something. That is one of the points that I think we should know about and, another one is this: Certainly before we leave here I am quite sure that we will have to put some kind of a tax on people which we do nearly every session that this group meets. Now I, for one, don't want to put something before their windshield that they see every time they sit in their automobile and condemn the Ninety-Ninth Legislature, and believe me, they have plenty of time to see it while they are sitting waiting for their wives to shop or waiting to pick up the riders they are going to take along with them. This is just a few of the reasons. I am not opposed to any other part of this bill except the price, where

it raises it to one dollar, because I know that in these inspection stations in the country that it will be a production line; that you just can't pass legislation in this House that is going to make any group of people honest. If they are not honest for fifty cents they certainly will be dishonest for a dollar, because you can line them up and lap the stickers pretty fast, and you can't keep a State Police sitting on everyone's doorstep because it is quite a state from one end to the other. And I am sure that we are going in the wrong direction, and I hope this motion does prevail. I won't take any more of your time but I certainly could say a lot more about it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. WESTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have been doing a lot of transportation this morning it seems like. I would like to say a few words where this is my bill. I want it understood from the start that this bill was not in any way intended to discredit the Secretary of State's office, but changing this bill would put the administration of this under the State Police where I think it belongs.

Now, some gentleman here has said that this fee of a dollar would make a bunch of racketeers out of the garagemen. I didn't realize they were that bad. I have been a mechanic for twenty years and that is the first time that I was ever referred to as that type.

Now, you all know that you can't inspect a car for fifty cents, it would be impossible. In order to inspect a car properly today you would have to jack up the front end, inspect the steering box, you should check the master cylinder for brake fluid. The cars have two sets of headlights today where they used to have one; they have signal lights, these should be checked. There are twenty-five or thirty different things that should be done to do a good inspection. Are we going to ask these inspection stations to do a good job when we know they can't do it for fifty cents but that is all we are going to give them; we are saying to them that this thing isn't an inspec-

tion, it is just a racket, and that is what it has been, they have been wholesaling stickers for fifty cents. Now, I think if this law is put under the State Police they would certainly see that this was stopped to some extent; of course they won't do away with all of it, but they would help some. I think that a fee of a dollar sounds like a lot of money to some people but I wonder if they realize that only buys three gallons and a half of gasoline, and compared with the other costs of a motor vehicle I would think that was very small. I hope the motion doesn't prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Dumais, that the "Ought to pass" Report on Bill, "An Act relating to Inspection of Motor Vehicles," House Paper 780, Legislative Document 1098, be indefinitely postponed.

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

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

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

A division of the House was had. Sixty-six having voted in the affirmative and sixty-five in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Report was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PHILBRICK of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I would request a recount.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is out of order.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number ten, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Exempting Hospital Thrift Shops from Sales Tax," House Paper 700, Legislative Document 1000, tabled on March 27 by the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, pending acceptance of the Report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we substitute the Bill for the Report, and I very reluctantly again ask consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The hour is getting late and I am going to be very brief. To begin with, this Bill, L. D. 1000, had a very quick hearing, in fact, I believe it was less than five minutes. There was no opposition at the hearing but the Director of the Sales Tax Division had registered his opposition earlier in the day. In talking with him that same afternoon, and also upon two previous occasions, he informed me that he was opposing this bill because he is to oppose any bill that requested an exemption on the basis only that it might open the door to other requests. He also said that these thrift shops should have been excluded from the sales tax to begin with, and that the total amount of tax from this source all totaled from all over the State was less than \$1,000, all put together.

Now, these shops are operated by hospital auxiliaries, they are charitable organizations and there are only three or four of them in the State. They are not to be confused with the hospital gift shops. The gift shops are stores operated within the hospitals where they sell new goods and are operated by paid help. There is one of these shops in Brunswick; there is one in Bath, and there is one in Norway. Now, I don't know of any others, there may be one or two others but I don't know of them. There are also a few of these shops operated by church groups. I believe there is one of them in Kittery; one in Damariscotta, one in Castine, one in Bar Harbor and in Portland. Now, I don't know of any others of those either. All of these shops put together bring in about \$1,000. These shops are operated entirely by volunteer help.

In Brunswick the hospital auxiliary is made up of sixty to seventy women, mostly busy housewives who are willing to give part of their time and effort once in a while to help along with the thrift shop. The merchandise that they sell is second-

hand merchandise which has been donated and most of the sales run from fifty cents to one dollar. A large part of the merchandise that is sold is bought by families who are on welfare or bought by the local welfare department itself to be donated to needy families. This operation is nothing more than just a glorified rummage sale. Now, rummage sales are exempt from the sales tax at the present time, and there is no reason why these shops should receive any different treatment.

There are no other operations of this kind that I know of, so there is no danger of further requests for exemptions in this field. The proceeds from the sale of the merchandise is used to buy needy equipment in the hospitals, equipment that the hospital would not have or would have to go without for a long time except for the generosity of these women in giving their time and effort in operating these shops. The amount that they take in means a great deal to them and to the hospitals, while on the other hand the loss to the State is very negligible. It probably costs more to the Tax Department to collect and to enforce the collection of these amounts than we get out of them. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we substitute the Bill, L. D. 1000, for the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, moves that the Bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: We have one of those thrift shops in our little community hospital and it does a great amount of good for the amount of money involved. I would like to endorse the remarks made by the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, and I would like to proceed along the line of his recommendation. Thank you.

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to support the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, to

substitute the Bill for the Report. I really have nothing to add, with the exception of one point, and I would state that possibly without exception, all the merchandise that is offered for sale in these thrift shops is merchandise upon which the sales tax has once been paid. It is merely collecting it a second time. I certainly hope that his motion will receive your approval.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to support the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite. We have in our town, as he mentioned, a thrift shop, and if it wasn't for this thrift shop and the money that these folks take in and give to the hospital, they do not give the actual money to the hospital, but the money is put into the treasury of the Ladies' Auxiliary, Women's Auxiliary, and they in turn buy such pieces of equipment for the hospital. Now, I know in my town that if it wasn't for the money that they turn into our small hospital the hospital would definitely at times find themselves in financial distress in trying to purchase certain articles.

I attended the hearing. As a matter of fact the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite and myself were the only ones at the hearing in support of the bill. There was no opposition. The hearing only lasted, it was the last hearing of the day, we were all tired, it lasted a very short time, and I sincerely hope that the House will go along with the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, that the Bill be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act Exempting Hospital Thrift Shops from Sales Tax."

Will those who favor the motion to substitute the Bill for the Report please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the Bill was substituted for the Report.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its first and second readings and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item eleven, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Claims on Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for Support of Joseph A. and Madelon E. Glidden. House Paper 788, Legislative Document 1120, tabled on March 31 by the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair now recognizes that gentlewoman.

Mrs. KILROY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I now move that we accept the Minority Report of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy, moves that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a signer of the "Ought not to pass" Report on this Resolve, and as the House Chairman of the Claims Committee, I should probably explain my reason for signing the way I did.

The gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy, did a very fine job in presenting this Resolve before the Committee and I wish to compliment her on it. However, through the Welfare Department it was learned that through error the City of Portland had acknowledged the party mentioned in the Resolve as their responsibility in 1955. Had they submitted an application to the Department at that time an investigation would have followed and the facts been disclosed.

We have had several of these resolves before our Committee, and in cases where negligence on the part of the town or city officials was evident we have reported them out "Ought not to pass." I feel that where the State was not responsible for this error that we should not pay the past bill. The State has accepted the case now as a non-settled case and will pay in the future. We have handled this Resolve in the same manner as all others and it

has had the same fair treatment as the others, and I certainly hope the mention does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy.

Mrs. KILROY: Mr. Speaker, information given to the City of Portland in 1955 pertaining to the parents of Joseph A. Glidden and the custody of said Joseph Glidden, the City of Portland furnished relief to said Glidden and his family for 1955, '56 and '57. It was not until 1955 did the City of Portland learn for the first time that Joseph Glidden was not given into the custody of his mother in 1943. Joseph Glidden became of age in 1953 with an unsettled status derived from his father. The State Department of Health and Welfare has now accepted Joseph Glidden as an unsettled status. The State Department of Health and Welfare does not have the funds in its budget at this time to pay the City of Portland. The payment at that time was \$1,388.61, and I understand since then that the Health and Welfare Department has paid a sum of something around \$144 to the City of Portland.

The City of Portland has a large population, and this bill is, it seems to me, a very small bill for three years taking care of a family who needed relief at that time, and I simply ask that we receive a proportionate share of the claims before this Committee. Therefore, I humbly ask that this Minority Report be accepted.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If this was only one bill to come before the Committee perhaps the Committee could have looked favorably upon it. But we just have dozens of those things where the error is made in the municipalities, and of course, as has been stated over and over again, that once you do it for one municipality, why how can you deny the others. Now, had the City of Portland been looking after their business in a proper way, and that is what you have to say, in fact, my own town has been in the same kettle of fish before now, and in fact, we have dozens of bills down there, the same thing. We have

the same things coming in because they didn't file their gas reports in time, but they bring the bills in and ask that the Claims Committee approve them.

Well, where it is a negligence on the part of a municipality or on the part of a person with a gas tax or anything where it is their own negligence, I don't see how possibly that the Committee could in real sincerity bring them out "Ought to pass." We have a lot of those bills and it is just impossible, and I move that the Bill and accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

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

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

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me that there was no negligence on the part of the City of Portland. It seems to me that there were erroneous statements made, so I hope that the Minority Report is accepted.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it was—Maybe we could use an easier term than negligence, in other words, they just didn't find out what was going on, and I move when the vote is taken it be taken by division.

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

Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone both Reports on Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for Support of Joseph A. and Madelon E. Glidden please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-eight having voted in the affirmative and fifty-two in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Resolve with accompanying papers

was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number twelve, Bill "An Act relating to Area Directional Signs," Senate Paper 436, Legislative Document 1284, tabled on March 31 by the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Edwards, pending passage to be engrossed.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I offer House Amendment "B" to Bill, "An Act relating to Area Directional Signs" and move its adoption.

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

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 436, L. D. 1284, Bill, "An Act Relating to Area Directional Signs."

Amend said Bill in the 5th line by striking out the underlined figure "14" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '16'

Further amend said Bill in the 15th line by striking out the underlined figure "14" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '16'

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "Sec. 149-A" by inserting after subsection V a new underlined subsection V-A, to read as follows:

'V-A. Acadia Trail (Route 3—Belfast to Bar Harbor: Such sign shall be constructed and maintained on the Maine Turnpike no more than 7 miles southerly from Augusta exit.'

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the Bill, "An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets," House Paper 70, Legislative Document 108, which was tabled earlier in today's session by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr.

Jalbert, pending passage to be enacted; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion of that gentleman, the House voted to suspend the rules and to reconsider its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The amendment is self-explanatory, it brings forth an emergency on this bill. The only reason I am putting it in is in view of the vote this morning taken, this would allow some of the fairs who would be penalized because this bill has passage but does not take effect until ninety days after we adjourn, I don't think it is quite fair to them, consequently I have been asked to present this amendment, and I hope it has passage.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, offers House Amendment "A" to Bill, "An Act relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets," and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read House Amendment "A".

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 70, L. D. 108, Bill, "An Act Relating to Quinellas at Harness Race Meets."

Amend said Bill by inserting before the enacting clause the following emergency preamble:

'Emergency preamble. Whereas, acts of the Legislature do not become effective until 90 days after adjournment of the Legislature unless enacted as emergencies; and Whereas, the following Legislation is necessary for the harness horse race meets which may be conducted in the State of Maine during the spring and summer of 1959; and

Whereas, the following Legislation will produce additional revenue to the State of Maine to carry on the functions of government; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the Legislature, these facts create an emergency within the meaning of the Constitution of Maine and require the following legislation as immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety; now, therefore,'

Further amend said Bill by inserting at the end the following:

'Emergency clause. In view of the emergency cited in the preamble, this act shall take effect when approved.'

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

Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, my good friend and seatmate here tells me that I did not vote on this bus bill, and I am very proud that he is interested in seeing the people do what they should, but I have an interest in there and that is why I did not vote because I own and operate a bus.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the House that with reference to Rule 22, everybody present is expected and is supposed to vote on a division vote.

Mr. Dennett of Kittery was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe that most of you are aware that there exists in the southern part of the State of Maine what is Maine's largest industry. I refer to the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard employs approximately eight thousand people. Presently there has been a controversy existing relative to the wage pay scale of the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyards. They have repeatedly sought equality in wages with that paid at the Boston Naval Shipyard. There was a bill in the last session of Congress that was introduced by the Senator from our State, Margaret Chase Smith, and it barely failed of passage. Presently there is in Congress two bills, one introduced by Senator Smith, the other introduced by the Congressman from the First District, Representative Oliver, asking for the same thing.

Now, the New Hampshire Legislature has introduced in their body and accepted a joint resolution as a memorial to Congress requesting that they act favorably upon these bills. The people in the southern part of our State feel that they have at least been slightly let down by

the Legislature of Maine because Maine has done nothing to support the cause. Therefore, Ladies and Gentleman: This morning I have a joint resolution, a memorial to Congress, which I ask that you accept and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, presents a memorial to Congress and moves that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and be printed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

On motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, the House voted to take from the table the sixth tabled and unassigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Claims on Resolve in Favor of Cleveland Sleeper, Jr. of Rockland, House Paper 805, Legislative Document 1144, tabled on March 26 by that gentleman pending acceptance of either report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a short statement of facts would be in order at this time. This bill deals with a claim presented by Mr. Sleeper. Mr. Sleeper is a fuel dealer of Rockland. He sold fuel to an elderly lady in his area. This lady died owing Mr. Sleeper a bill of \$371.22. Being a recipient of old age assistance, her home was sold to satisfy the State claims, and no funds were available for Mr. Sleeper's claim. I urge and caution you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to judge this claim on its facts and facts alone. Do not be swayed to vote against this man's claim simply to avoid the possibility of later criticism due to the fact that this claimant is making his appeal before a body of which he once was a member. I now move that the Minority "Ought to pass" Report be accepted.

The SPEAKER: With respect to Resolve in Favor of Cleveland Sleeper, Jr. of Rockland, the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, moves that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House: This bill was presented in due form before the Claims Committee, and the facts as stated by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, are correct we presume. This bill was rendered over a period of ten years time from our information, and the Committee more or less considered it a hazard of doing business on a credit basis, and taking that into consideration that is why it was reported out "Ought not to pass," and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, does not prevail.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move the indefinite postponement of this bill. I think this is a very bad piece of legislation, I don't think it ever should have been brought in. If we let a piece of legislation like this go through the House, I am quite well aware of what goes on in these old age assistance cases in regard to this bill and I am very much afraid that we will have a deluge of them two years from now. I hope my motion prevails.

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

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would move a division.

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

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.

Eighty-nine having voted in the affirmative and sixteen having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Bill with accompanying papers was indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Orders of the Day.

On motion of Mr. Cox of Dexter,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.