

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

VOLUME II

1959
and
SPECIAL SESSION
1960

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Wednesday, May 20, 1959

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. George Perry of Augusta.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate Senate Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass Covered by Other Legislation

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Salary of the Judge of Waldo County Municipal Court" (S. P. 61) (L. D. 94), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Officers of Waldo County" (S. P. 62) (L. D. 95), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Judge of the Lincoln Municipal Court, Lincoln County" (S. P. 63) (L. D. 96), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Clerk Hire and Salaries of Certain Lincoln County Officers" (S. P. 64) (L. D. 97), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Officers of Knox County" (S. P. 198) (L. D. 493), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Judge of Rockland Municipal Court" (S. P. 199) (L. D. 494), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Clerk Hire in County Offices in Oxford County" (S. P. 220) (L. D. 559), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of Judge of Rumford Municipal Court and Providing

Clerk Hire" (S. P. 221) (L. D. 560), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Certain County Officers of Kennebec County" (S. P. 241) (L. D. 624), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Officers of Sagadahoc County" (S. P. 243) (L. D. 626), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Judge and Recorder of Bath Municipal Court" (S. P. 248) (L. D. 631), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of County Attorney of Somerset County" (S. P. 260) (L. D. 673), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salary of County Attorney of York County" (S. P. 282) (L. D. 744), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of Judge and Recorder of Saco Municipal Court" (S. P. 287) (L. D. 749), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Attorney and Assistant County Attorney of Penobscot County" (S. P. 341) (L. D. 917), as it is covered by other legislation.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Increasing Salaries of County Commissioners of Lincoln County" (S. P. 351) (L. D. 978), as it is covered by other legislation.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought to Pass in New Draft Amended in Senate

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act relating to Certain Per Diem Fees of Deputy Sheriffs" (S. P. 124) (L. D. 275) reporting same in

a new draft (S. P. 482) (L. D. 1353) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

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

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 482, L. D. 1353, Bill, "An Act Relating to Certain Per Diem Fees of Deputy Sheriffs."

Amend said Bill by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 3. R. S., c. 89, Sec. 150, subsection XV, amended. The last sentence of subsection XV of section 150 of chapter 89 of the Revised Statutes, as enacted by chapter 267 of the public laws of 1955, is amended to read as follows:

'The Superior Court messenger of Cumberland County shall also receive \$10 \$11 per day for court vacation time, service and attendance when said service and attendance are authorized by a Justice of the Superior Court.'

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House that Senate Amendment "A" shall be adopted?

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This Senate Amendment "A", if you realize, calls for Superior Court messenger to receive \$11 per day for court vacation time. Now this court, as I believe, is adjourned for almost three months in the summer. If I understand rightly, now we are going to pay \$11 a day for three months for vacation time. I think it is quite a good vacation. So not being in accord with this, I move indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, that means only to Cumberland County and they have ten terms in a year and the remainder of the time they have vacation.

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

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to enlighten the gentleman from Bridgton and the other members of the House, I think the gentleman from Bridgton is misinterpreting the term "vacation time". "Vacation time" in Superior Court is when a Justice is presiding for a specially assigned matter. There are usually two or three days, or maybe in Cumberland there would be a week or two, when a Justice is in session in the court house when he hears such matters as contested divorces and other petitions. It does not mean every day between terms.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, after that explanation and having full confidence in the ability of my colleague from South Portland, Mr. Jones, and the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Berman, I will now withdraw my motion.

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

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act relating to Number and Compensation of Special Deputy Sheriffs in Cumberland County" (S. P. 183) (L. D. 426) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 183, L. D. 426, Bill, "An Act Relating to Number and Compensation of Special Deputy Sheriffs in Cumberland County."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 7th line thereof the under-

lined figure "\$13" and inserting in place thereof the underline figure '\$11'

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Election of Council Members of City of Portland" (H. P. 211) (L. D. 302) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 5.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good, that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that I was merely going to move that we adhere, and the bill would have died automatically anyway. But if that is the way the gentleman from Sebago wishes it, I go along with him.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Time of Elections for City of Portland" (H. P. 398) (L. D. 581) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on April 21.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Although this is a good bill and got by the legal fraternity with a unanimous vote and went merrily through the House here, in view of the lateness of the season and everybody else wants to get home as well as I do, I shall be glad to recede and concur.

Thereupon, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State for Guaranteed Loans for Recreational and Industrial Park Purposes (S. P. 178) (L. D. 422) which was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence in the House on May 14.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and asking for a Committee of Conference, with the following Conferees appointed on its part:

Messrs. NOYES of Franklin
ROSS of Sagadahoc
HILLMAN of Penobscot

In the House: On motion of Mr. Dennett of Kittery, the House voted to insist on its former action and join in a Committee of Conference, to which Committee of Conference the Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House:

Mr. DENNETT of Kittery
Mrs. SMITH of Falmouth
Mr. PLANTE
of Old Orchard Beach

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to State Owned Automobiles for Liquor Inspectors" (S. P. 420) (L. D. 1204) which was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence in the House on May 18.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to adhere.

In the House:

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur, and I would address the House briefly in support of that motion.

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill was presented to the Committee on State Government and came out with a nine to one "Ought to pass" Report. This measure is an economy measure, and it merely places the state liquor inspectors in the same category with several other

departments, meaning that the State owns the automobiles that they operate. Presently the liquor inspectors are operating their own automobiles and being paid mileage, and what it actually boils down to is the State of Maine is buying the automobiles that are operated by the liquor inspectors.

The enactment of this measure makes it possible for the Liquor Commission to purchase automobiles and save money on official travel expense in the enforcement division. No additional appropriation is necessary. Savings will absorb the necessary acquisition and operating costs. During the 1958 calendar year liquor inspectors travelled 501,097 miles, and were paid \$32,298.79 for these miles or 6.45 cents per mile. This mileage is necessary for proper control, and incidentally as I promised you I would be brief, I will be, the inspectors were paid anywhere from \$1,800 to \$3,000 a year for the mileage of their cars, and they operated 19,000 to 41,000 miles a year. Truly it is my belief that if this bill is passed, if we recede and concur with the other body, it will be an economy measure and will save money for the State of Maine, and I think that is what we certainly want to do.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti.

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with my colleague from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, but yesterday I got some figures from the Bureau of Purchases and there are some questions that I would like to ask. It seems to me that the Liquor Department is talking about economy. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kittery if he could answer this question, — where the liquor inspectors are now located, their base operations, and where they are assigned at present, and having answered that question I would like to ask another.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I don't know where the

liquor inspectors are based. It is impossible for me to answer the question. I am in this particular instance dealing with mileage, and I regret I cannot answer the question of the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti. I simply do not know.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Cumberland care to answer the question?

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, as I assume the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, where are they assigned? Is that what he said?

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman restate his question.

Mr. ALIBERTI: The question as I asked it was that I wanted to know where the inspectors, their base operations are, where they live first of all and then where their assignments are.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Aliberti, I think at the present time there are eighteen liquor inspectors and they are assigned to different counties. Like in Aroostook County there is one, then in Penobscot County there are two, in Cumberland County there are three, Androscoggin there are two. They are assigned so many to each County.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti.

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, the reason I bring that up is that I understand that we have liquor inspectors who are assigned, who live, let us say that for instance they live in Lewiston and they are assigned probably two or three hundred miles away from Lewiston, and when you talk about economy and travel, economy begins at home, and if you are talking about the number of miles the gentleman from Kittery has mentioned, that is true only because the assignments have not been properly spaced so that the economy would be there. In other words if you have a man here in Lewiston, he should be patrolling the Lewiston area and don't send him up to Presque Isle. Now at the end of the year that could really come to a lot of miles.

I have here from the Bureau of Purchases some figures that I would like to read. The cost of a vehicle, a 1959 Ford Fairlane, six

cylinder, two or four passenger car, would cost the state some \$1,500. Traveling 20,000 miles a year would mean that each and every vehicle would have to have a change of a new set of tires and four tires at the state list price would come to some \$74.40. Because of the terrain and the weather in Maine, you would of necessity have to supply two snow or mud tires for each and every vehicle, and that would be an additional \$38. Assuming that a person, an inspector travels 20,000 miles a year, we would also assume that he would use 1,333 gallons of gasoline, and the going price at the state level for gasoline is 23.68 or in round figures 24 cents a gallon, and that figure would come to \$319.92. Oil is based at a list price to the state of 65 cents a gallon, and figuring twelve oil changes a year, that would come to approximately \$9.75. You certainly would have to replace a battery during the course of the operation of the car for a year, that is another \$26.89. Twelve grease jobs, which would be mandatory I believe, would be \$12 and three gallons of anti-freeze at the state price would be \$4.32. Twelve months' storage at a minimum price of \$7.00 per month would be \$84, and I haven't found a car yet that does not use up one muffler during the course of a year, and the price that I have put on this, I don't have the state price, was some \$13 at cost. That figure I believe is low.

Now I have not included in this the price of insurance. I tried to get that figure this morning, the Insurance Department, Mr. Ernst, was not available, he was going to give the figures to me. Therefore, there is still a lot more, many more questions that I would like to have answered as far as this is concerned, and therefore I would ask this group if they would give me until tomorrow so that I can get this information from the Insurance Department to bring these figures right up to date, and if I find that these figures are within line of what the Department says I would be the very first to get up and say that we should go along with the liquor inspectors for their state-owned vehicles, but until I do get that information, I would ask

now that this House grant the permission to table this until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Alberti, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to State Owned Automobiles for Liquor Inspectors," this matter be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that the House recede. The gentleman may not debate the tabling motion.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Coyne.

Mr. COYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my desire—

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may not debate the tabling motion.

Will all those who favor the motion to table and specially assign for tomorrow please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that the House recede.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Coyne, had his mike up and was up to speak before the tabling motion. I will yield to him and then I will speak.

The SPEAKER: It is not a question of yielding. The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Coyne, may be recognized in his own right if he so desires.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville.

Mr. COYNE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As a signer of the "Ought not to pass" Report, I will justify my signing it by stating first I am a great believer in free enterprise. I believe it is what has made our nation great and it is likewise good for our state. When we go into a business that belongs in free enterprise, we are violating that sacred cause. I have a mass of figures right here that

would be available for all the members of the House, and it came from one of the departments in the state, too long for me to go into and not effective for me to read it, but the only saving that I can see if you may call it a saving—call it what you like—would be we will not pay taxes as a state, but also we will lose those taxes by the person who would purchase his own car and operate it in the carrying out of his job. There are other features in connection with this which you may call a saving, but it is not. We are putting our hand in one pocket and putting the money in the other pocket. Therefore, I hope that the motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I knew that I was in error by saying that I would yield. I was trying to catch Mr. Coyne's eye to tell him to get up to speak before me. I am happy we are going along with the rules.

In further answer to the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, no liquor inspector would be placed in a certain location and have to travel two or three hundred miles. There are times, if my information is correct, when they have special investigations and they might send another inspector somewhere else. For instance, in Rumford, it has happened on one or two occasions that I know of very definitely. There are two inspectors from Lewiston. There are some from up north, but they are told that their home base will be around the center, as near the center of their work nearly as possible.

Speaking on the measure before us, the reason that I am opposed to this thing is in concurrence to a great degree with the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Coyne, and a further reason also is that what I think that ought to be done and it was tried a few years ago and quickly dropped because of certain people that had a private interest of their own. We had a gentleman come before the Appropriations Committee who was from one of the big automobile manufacturing

concerns, and he presented a plan whereby we would go into the leasing of automobiles and thereby really save a considerable sum of money. It is being done in many other states now. I therefore would suggest that if we succeed in not going along with the other branch on this thing, that it would be a good thought possibly to have an order presented to refer to the Research Committee so that they would study that program. I know the merit of the leasing has a lot of merit. It certainly is being brought into private industry to a great degree. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman from Lewiston that a motion to recede takes priority over a motion to insist.

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

Mr. CARON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It is my understanding that at the present time that several of our departments in the state who have their automobiles, one instance is your state troopers, I certainly feel that if the heads of the departments, of this specific department, are requesting automobiles for the inspectors that there is a very good logical reason behind it and that it will be a saving to the state.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The members that are here today who are members of the last session will know that this state-owned automobile question was very thoroughly discussed and investigated. The Honorable John Quinn of Bangor led the forces for state-owned automobiles, and I supported him at that time, but it was definitely shown to us that as far as economy is concerned that it would be a greater cost to the state, and that is what I am interested in today is economy and that is why I have changed my mind and intend to support the contentions of my good friend, Mr. Aliberti, because I think he is right. In fact, I know he is by the figures, and when you come to buy these cars that are going to run 41,000 miles

as has been stated by the gentleman from Kittery, it is just going to mean that you have got to have a new car the next year, so it was so thoroughly discussed and gone into that I am convinced, and I could get the figures that were presented before, that as far as economy is concerned, it costs more money for the state to own a car than it does to pay for having them run, and the last time after the last session why they did away with the state-owned garage here where the cars were taken care of, but when they had that state garage why that was a help for the cars that were being owned by the state. Now we do not have that garage now so it would cost more money now even than it would at the last session, so I hope the motion to adhere, to insist, does not prevail.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This question of the ownership of state cars, of the operation of privately-owned cars, is an old question in this legislative hall, one that has been discussed a good deal. We in the committee felt, on the basis of the presentation of this particular bill, that in the category of the amount of driving that is done in the course of liquor inspection that ownership of state cars and the resulting supervision of driving that would be possible through that ownership would result in an operating economy. For that reason as House Chairman of the Committee on State Government and a signer of the "Ought to pass" Report, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Exeter, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I was one of the nine signers of that "Ought to pass" Report and I think we had a very definite valid reason for making that report as we did. Long mileage is expensive mileage. As you get up to 28,000, 30,000 miles your cost per mile is reduced tremendously and any business organization in this state supplying cars would supply the cars for their

personnel if they were driving about 30,000 miles per year. I think the state would be very ill advised to pay eight or nine cents a mile to these liquor inspectors whose business requires a very heavy mileage because the state can own that mileage three or four cents per mile less than that, so it is just a matter of economy that I rise to support the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that we recede.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti.

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, if the definition of economy is to take from one pocket to put it into the other, that would be sort of robbing Peter to pay Paul, because it is exactly what you are doing. You may save a few cents if you do, but you are taking from the taxes in every little town where these inspectors license their cars, you also take from the people in the towns and places where they service their cars, where they buy their gasoline and they pay the top retail price, they do not get the state price. Now there are many, many factors to think about in making a change-over such as this, and I believe that you are taking from the little man in these individual towns and taking tax money from them, and then trying to save on this end. Now I don't have to tell you people, I think you are well enough aware of the fact, that anything owned by the state or the federal government whenever there is a repair or a maintenance or anything else, the price immediately goes up. The state or the government can afford to pay. It is the law. But when a person is paying out of his own pocket and every penny that he saves is a penny earned, it makes him an awful lot more responsible for the automobile which he is buying out of his own funds, and therefore I would hope that this body would not go along with the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, and we hope that this bill will probably hit the earth where it belongs.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Coyne.

Mr. COYNE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want a little clarification. It has been stated that nine cents a mile for employees driving their own cars, that applies to the first five thousand miles. After the first five thousand miles, it is seven.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take one brief moment to point out why I think that this is an economy measure and how we can prove it is an economy measure. We made comparisons with the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game which operate fifteen state-owned vehicles. They operated their vehicles for the last fiscal year, that is the fiscal year of 57-58, on the basis of .0342 cents per mile. The Liquor Commission with their privately-owned automobiles and with the state paying the expenses, their automobiles cost .0635 cents per mile to operate. On the basis of the mileage traveled by the liquor inspectors which was 307,157 miles, it would have been a saving to the State of Maine of \$9,023.41, and these, ladies and gentlemen, are official figures. When the vote is taken I ask that it be taken by division.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to make just one comment. Just a few years ago this legislature granted these people uniforms. Now when they come into my town, I am at an intersection, the minute they turn into town everybody in town knows they are there, and sometimes the next town which is how they know they are in town. Now the reason I am opposed to them having state cars is mainly I don't want to decorate them any further because if they are not very effective now with uniforms, they will be less effective if they have automobiles, and if this branch feels that they are getting too much money for mileage, we should do something about that maybe. Maybe they should run their cars cheaper, maybe we should see that they

should, but buying them automobiles I am sure is not the answer if we want them to be effective and catch anybody, because I know that these joints that they are supposed to be trying to catch, they call from one to the other the minute they see one of these cars, when they see one of these decorated cars. They used to be quite effective when they were in plain clothes, but believe me today in my area they are not very effective.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I didn't feel that I wanted to inject myself into this but several statements have been made here as to the cost and as to economy. Believe me, ladies and gentlemen of the House, you can be assured that this will be no economy move if we go along with the State buying State cars. Within a few years we will be paying thousands of dollars more to maintain these vehicles than we are paying now for the travel that is being put in by these inspectors. Having been somewhat acquainted with maintenance business, having been in charge of procurements and purchasing with the U. S. Navy for five years where we had a pool of vehicles, I can assure you that I question some of the figures of cost here today. I don't know where these figures came from, but I can assure you that it is going to be a lot more costly if the State starts buying the cars for the liquor division than what they are paying now, and I hope that we do not go along with the motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winslow, Mr. Dostie.

Mr. DOSTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have been a member of the Board of Selectmen for nine years in Winslow. We have eight buses in the Town of Winslow, seven are individually owned by the town. We own the body outright, the chassis are owned by seven individual persons and one is owned outright by the town. I am afraid we have found out that it costs us more to run the town bus than it does with the ones of

individual persons because as you know yourself that when you run a car of your own you are liable to take better care of your car than you would if it is somebody else's car, and I feel this will be the same with these inspectors' cars. I for one don't believe that the city and furthermore, if you grant this, who is going to stop you?

Many of these towns, some of you are selectmen or town officials, ADC will be coming in asking for these people who go out on ADC cases have a car of their own. You had better look and listen and think about it a little bit before you vote on this thing, and I move the motion of the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that the House recede from its former action whereby it indefinitely postponed Bill "An Act relating to State Owned Automobiles for Liquor Inspectors," Senate Paper 420, Legislative Document 1204. Is the House ready for the question? A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to recede please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti.

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman approach the rostrum.
(Conference at rostrum)

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti.

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the previous motion and now move that we adhere.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, moves that the House adhere. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: During the debate the Chair has been notified of the presence in the gallery of the

House of several groups of students and I am afraid that some of them may have left, but not knowing which ones have left I will have to read them all anyway.

We have a group of students from Coburn Classical Institute of Waterville, accompanied by Mrs. Paul Fullam; a group of twenty-three pupils from the Edgcomb Central School, accompanied by Mrs. Lucy Pels, teacher and five of the mothers; a group of Cony High School students, accompanied by Ann Webster, Charles Arbor, Mrs. Ruth Weaver and Miss Leola Clement; and a group of Grade Eight pupils from the North Yarmouth Memorial School, accompanied by Mrs. Laura S. Fountain, teacher and six of the mothers.

To those of you who are still in the gallery the Chair extends a most hearty and cordial welcome and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit here today. (Applause)

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

Orders

On motion of Mr. Wade of Auburn, it was

ORDERED, that the use of the hall of the House be granted this evening for the purpose of listening to Mr. Emmett O'Brien, State Director of Vocational Education in Connecticut, who has been invited to attend and address the Legislature and guests.

On motion of Mrs. Smith of Fal-mouth, it was

ORDERED, that the Sergeant-at-Arms, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, Pages and Doorkeeper be permitted to appear on the floor of the House with their coats removed.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would appoint the official delegation to represent the House at the funeral tomorrow of the late Representative Myron Shepard. As the official delegation to represent the House, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Verona, Mr. Walsh; the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr.

Brown, the gentleman from Mt. Desert, Mr. Graves; the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Young; the gentleman from St. Albans, Mr. Hughes; the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, and the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm, and the Speaker.

**House Reports of Committees
Ought to Pass in New Draft
New Draft Printed**

Mr. Dennison from the Committee on Highways on Bill "An Act to Construct a Bridge Between Lubec and Campobello Island" (H. P. 5) (L. D. 14) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 970) (L. D. 1379) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am very reluctant to oppose this bridge resolve. It is a project in my own county, and it apparently would be of some benefit to the Town of Lubec. My opposition here today to this resolve is motivated by the way in which it is proposed to finance the structure. The Highway Committee and Chairman Stevens of the Commission have both advised the Washington County delegation that the bridge cannot and it will not be financed on its own. As this Resolve is written and it is the new draft of the original bill, it places the financing in the hands of the Highway Commission. Chairman Stevens told me categorically several times, and he has told other members of the delegation likewise that if this resolve is passed, he will then take the amount of \$280,000 from road projects already programmed in Washington County to pay for the bridge.

Now these projects are as follows: the Meddybemps road project \$200,000, Washington Street in Eastport \$50,000, the so-called Corduroy Road on Route No. 1 in Danforth \$30,000, or a total of \$280,000 of Washington County projects. These are the same projects that were announced last December, and are listed in the sufficiency rating program. You all have a booklet which lists these projects in your various

counties. Now I would say this, I asked Chairman Stevens why the Campobello Bridge was not listed in that program last December, and why these three projects were listed. He answered that the Commission felt that these road jobs were of a higher priority type and were more badly needed than the bridge. You see the position that the Washington County delegation has been placed by this situation. Under it we gain nothing financially on one end that we are not required to give away on the other. In effect the Washington County delegation has been forced into a position of choosing between two alternatives; one, build the bridge and give up the road jobs; two, do the road jobs and not have the bridge. It is an unhappy situation all around.

However, I see my duty clearly. I wish they could have found a way to build this bridge without taking the money away from our other modest apportionments, and I think you all know that Washington County has had rather small apportionments in the past two years. Since this is not so, I must in all fairness to my constituents and to the County at large I believe ask that this bridge Resolve stand aside so that our road program may continue as already decided.

If you could drive over this Meddybemps road, I think you would agree that it is one of the worst, if not the very worst federal secondary aid road in the State of Maine, and probably that is saying quite a lot. If you have ever ridden over the road between China and South China, you know what that is like. The Meddybemps road is about ten times as bad as that. We have had a lot of accidents. It is very, very dangerous. Cars and trucks are damaged on their under sections by the humps that have boiled right up in the middle of the highway. It is narrow. It is winding, and there are hillocks and deep dips in it. It is quite an important highway for our area. It is a feeder line. It serves the farmers in Meddybemps, Cooper and Charlotte, Alexander who are coming into Calais and that area to sell their goods and do their shopping. We have had delegations from the Calais, Woodland, Meddybemps area

three times in the past year and a half to come before the Highway Commission to see if we could not get this reconstruction project under way. I took a ten minute colored movie of this highway from a moving vehicle and showed it to the Commission last October.

Now this is something that we have looked forward to for a long time down there, and I can tell you that everyone was so extremely pleased last December when we found that the Commission had decided to include it in the new program. Now it is proposed to dash the hopes of these people. The bridge project has been produced and this project would shoulder to one side the road jobs. In addition the Danforth and Eastport job would also be eliminated. The work at Danforth will rebuild a small section on Route No. 1 which is in a disgraceful condition. It is a swampy area and many years ago was the so-called Corduroy road, made by throwing in logs for the foundation. Some of these old logs are sticking right up out of the road now, and this is part of Route No. 1. We were glad that the Commission recognized the necessity of taking care of this very serious condition. Now that would be dropped. At Eastport, Washington Street is the road leading into the city. It is in very bad shape, and it has already been held up from one previous program. Is it fair to knock this one out also?

Now, under this resolve, and you can't find it in the resolve which is here on your desk this morning, but the facts are that this would call for \$600,000 expenditure to be matched by \$600,000 from the Canadian government, which means that the bridge is a \$1,200,000 job. Now they have already in the financing set aside about half of this sum in the Highway Commission, and under this bill they appropriate \$313,000 more.

Now the Press has from time to time given accounts of this bridge project, and they have always stated that it would be half federal funds and half state. Actually I find from Chairman Stevens that \$500,000 of this money will be state money and only \$100,000 federal money. In addition, the Lubec town

road money in the amount of \$12,000 will also have to be tossed in. Now that was one of the selling points on this bridge down in our country when it was first proposed, that the federal government would be sharing the cost equally with the state, but the only federal money in this project is the \$100,000 which is the matching fund for the Meddybemps road. So this is a very expensive type of project. Certainly Washington County is delighted to have money spent in our area, but we are not entirely satisfied that such an expenditure of money would be wise and would give us the best advantage of the dollar. All during this session as the bridge campaign has been waged here, I went along with it, but I went along on the idea that it would stand on its own merits. Actually it will serve mainly as a thoroughfare for the inhabitants of the Canadian island of Campobello. They presently must reach the mainland by a car ferry. Obviously a bridge will be of great benefit to these folks. However, it is a dead end proposition currently. There is nowhere else to go once you reach the island unless you take a boat to Grand Manan which is another Canadian island.

It is not my purpose here to engage in a debate as to the benefits which are claimed to accrue to the State of Maine by the building of this bridge. Such as they are, they are collateral benefits. In other parts of the state bridges have been built and financed by bond issues or in some other manner, but I have never heard and I find nobody that ever has heard of any situation where bridge legislation was enacted at the expense of the already announced road program. We feel that this is a very unfair situation. Now I say again, I don't like to oppose this bridge, but I do have a duty to the people in my district and that duty is plain. I don't want to stand idly by and allow work to be sidetracked in that area in place of another. To put it in simple terms, our jobs were there first. The bridge supporters have claimed that they must get their job done this year because Canadian funds will be withdrawn. In view of the benefits

to be gained by the islanders, I rather doubt this.

When the Calais bridge was rebuilt in 1955 Canadian funds had stood ready for several years until the State of Maine's share was made available, and the bridge at Calais and St. Stephen which is a through bridge was included in the regular scheduled road program. It was not brought in to substitute other projects already on the calendar. The fact is the State of Maine might well benefit by waiting until the next biennium for this bridge job. Then there might be more federal aid secondary funds available. After all, if there are enough federal aid funds to be done on a fifty-fifty basis, and as I explained before it is now costing \$5.00 of state money to only \$1.00 of federal assistance. This is not the best type of deal for the State of Maine.

We have all discussed this with Chairman Stevens many, many times and the delegates have met somewhat fruitlessly many times in order to try to work out some solution. It has been suggested that possibly if the bid for this bridge job were low enough under the estimate of the \$1,200,000, it might be possible to use some of this added money for the road jobs. I asked the Highway Chairman yesterday if that were possible. He said if the bids were lower that would be possible, but he did not anticipate that they would be. In fact if anything, it appears that it might cost more because of rising costs of steel and because there has been some objection in the Lubec area to the opening allowed by the bridge for the passage of boats. If the bridge had to be raised it would result in somewhat higher costs possibly.

What we have felt — the delegation's feeling has been that we very much wanted to have our road jobs and have a Campobello bridge at one and the same time, and we felt that it was possible to do it, and I still feel that this could be done if the bridge were financed through a bond issue. The other bridges have all been bond issue jobs, some of them are tolls and some of them are not. This bridge is so set up under federal legislation that it would be a free bridge,

so I am going to move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee with the idea in mind the Committee will work up a new draft which would provide for financing this bridge by means of bonds so that Washington County would not lose any of its present road programs.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis. One thing we can agree on, we all felt that Washington County got pretty rough treatment from the Commission in that it required not the cancellation but the postponement of the three jobs which were mentioned: the Meddybemps road, the Danforth Corduroy Swamp and Eastport's Washington Street paving. There is no question that that makes up incidentally all of the road work in the next biennium outside of No. 1 which is allocated to Washington County. However, I cannot agree that the bridge should either be postponed or that a bond issue is the proper way to handle it. I had hoped it would not be necessary to bother you with a long dissertation on the merits of this bridge. I shall try to keep my remarks pretty close to fact and cut down to the bone. I do have here fifty or sixty copies of little series of maps showing the location and mentioning some of the elements that go to make this bridge such a desirable thing that it seems worthwhile to postpone even those eminently desirable jobs and get this bridge built.

The bridge started on its way with a petition from the New Brunswick Legislature in late February, 1956 to the Dominion for permission to talk with the people in the federal government in the state about the possibility of building an international bridge between Lubec and Campobello. Very shortly after that, our senior Senator, Mrs. Smith, put in an enabling bill which was passed by the Congress. Very shortly after that, that same summer our now junior Senator, then Governor Muskie, arranged with the Province of New Brunswick to have a survey made of the location

and a preliminary estimate of cost. There was a great deal of negotiation and preliminary work that had to be done very largely by our representative from the third district, Mr. McIntire, and our then junior Senator, Senator Payne. While this is a small bridge and a short bridge and not a very expensive bridge, it is international and it takes a lot of doing by the four sovereignties involved, the province, the dominion, the state and the nation. At that time the province was under a conservative government, the dominion was under a liberal government. They had a good deal of trouble coming together on how they should split the cost, their half of the cost of the bridge. Later by what may be a happy chance the dominion government changed its political color and very shortly after that they agreed as to the split of cost between the dominion and the province. Last summer our Federal Bureau of Public Roads accepted the extension of Route No. 189 which is the road that runs from No. 1 into Lubec from its former terminus to the international boundary which is the middle of the channel which runs between the two places that makes the boundary between the nations.

Now when we get to the accounting I have not ever been able to understand the sort of arcane methods which the Highway Commission uses in splitting federal and state costs. I am somewhat surprised at the statement made this morning that it is now set at \$100,000 federal and \$500,000 state. My latest understanding is, and I stand to be corrected, but I would want it direct from the Commission, that eventually half of the American half will be reimbursed to the State in that Route 189 is in somewhat the same position as Route 191 where the Meddybemps job is to be done, so that if the federal, the American half, costs \$600,000 the eventual net cost to the State will be \$300,000.

On the estimates the Highway Commission's original, and let us say it was more or less a flash estimate, was a total cost for the bridge of \$800,000 to be split fifty-fifty. This was done nearly three summers ago and they allowed at

the time that probably the cost would rise about \$50,000 a year due to rise in prices or inflation or both, so that if that estimate was any good today the cost would be about \$950,000, and our half would be about \$475,000. The \$600,000 figure was put in to allow for, the first place, the fact that the original estimate was a hasty one and for such modifications in design that might be required under federal regulation and by unexpected further increases in costs. To the best of my knowledge costs have not gone up where that estimate needs to be risen more than they had originally thought.

Now there is another way to look at this. It is troublesome to have to delay these three other projects. I would be the first one to admit it. Personally, I think I have done all that I could and I am not sure that I haven't done more than I should in trying to wrangle some other way of doing this piece of business. Eventually it seems to me that from the State's and the County's point of view, it would be best to take this bill as unanimously reported by committee and let it go through as is. As against the \$280,000, \$50,000 of which is to be delayed two years and \$230,000 of which is to be delayed one year and \$12,000 of Lubec's money which probably is gone forever, we have allotted from the Highway Commission \$313,000 additional for the county, so it may not be a bad deal to put off \$280,000 mostly for one year to get \$313,000 extra in right away.

Now as to timing, the federal bill, the federal enabling act, had a statement that it shall become void if work is not commenced during 1960 and not finished by 1961. It is possible that this enabling act could be renewed. There is no assurance of it. In the second place, as you know under the Canadian form of government, elections can be called most any time, I'm not sure that they are going to be called and I am not sure that if they were called a different party would come in either dominion or province. If they were called, and the party government was changed in either place, I am pretty sure that in good old Canadian custom,

there would be another rival there so that if the Canadian half of the money is available now, we ought to grab it while it is there.

Now there is a third item which was well aired before the committee, Campobello was the summer home of our late President Roosevelt. I realize there are many differences of opinion as to President Roosevelt's policies. I don't think there is any difference of opinion as to the size of his place in history and there seems to be no question that the legend of a myth about him is growing and that Campobello is one of the three or four places that were closely attached to his life, will be growing in importance as a tourist attraction. I think you probably know about this play "Sunrise at Campobello" which has been running about a year and a half. If it hadn't been running a year and a half, there would be a movie already in preparation covering the same subject. They want the same man to play as President in the movie as is playing in the play on Broadway. When it is played, when it is produced, it is planned to use outdoor locations and to emphasize Campobello in much the same way that Camden was emphasized in "Peyton Place", although I must say the moral lesson to be drawn from "Sunrise at Campobello" is somewhat different from that to be drawn from "Peyton Place."

Now, that would be done next year, all those three things, and you can weigh them as you like, all seem to mean that we should get on with the job here. On this further point, Campobello is not a large island. It is about ten miles long, a mile and a half or two miles wide. It has about 1,200 people on it in the winter and about 1,500 in the summer. Beyond, about six or seven miles beyond Campobello is the Canadian island of Grand Manan, thirteen or fourteen miles long, three or four or five miles wide in various places, about 2,500 people on it in the winter and about 3,000 in the summer, thoroughly isolated, really more than Monhegan in a way. Its service is by one boat which makes two round trips in the winter and three in the summer. It is a quite unique tourist

attraction, but you can't get your cars over there. This boat will take about eight cars at a time and they sling them on board and off like they do cattle in a Haitian outport. Once or twice a year one gets dumped, it slips out of the sling, and all in all it is a most unsatisfactory method of transportation. I can tell you that the Canadian government is spending over a million dollars for a pier in one of the Towns in Grand Manan including an automobile elevator to give a decent chance for the cars to get on and off the island. They claim, and they are holding out for this bridge, that they plan to have a ferry from Grand Manan to Campobello, both being on Canadian territory and no necessity for going through customs. They will have several round trips a day between Grand Manan and Campobello and add to — make Grand Manan an accessible spot, no need of my booming this community too much. Both of those islands are much closer to the States than they are to other parts of Canada. There is the usual story about somebody having to do with John Barleycorn while the treaty was being negotiated and the line being drawn in the wrong place, that I am not too sure is true, but they are physically very closely connected with our country, sentimentally and by marriage they were very, very closely connected, before the first war nobody paid any attention to such foolishness as customs and immigration. People used to come across. Our senior senator from our county is very proud to say that he came up over the end of the wharf from Campobello as a boy and never thought to see an immigration or customs man for years afterwards.

I might as well admit this, my dear grandfather spent three years on Campobello due to a very unfortunate misunderstanding between him and the Treasury Department. They thought he was shipping four hundred pounds of wool a year from the sheep he had, and the Treasury Department would not believe that the sheep were that good, so he lit out for Campobello and stayed there until, I believe, it was President Grant's administration

came in and you could do business with Grant's administration so he signed one of the first consent decrees which in effect said that he had not done anything wrong but he would not do it again.

Grand Manan also has a sentimental tie. I have got the floor, I might just as well use it. An old great grand-pappy of mine was in the revolution four times with a record of four enlistments and no discharges and there is some thought that he might have been in for the money as a bounty jumper because it was apparent that he was in the British army two or three times and then sent over to Grand Manan before they knew where the boundary was going to be, but came over directly to this country when we passed the first pension act which allowed revolutionary soldiers \$6.00 a month. He lost no time about it and on the town books right now it is put down as Joseph Bond, Occupation: pensioner. I hope he was prosperous on that income.

The necessity for the bridge and the necessity for doing it as expeditiously as possible seems quite clear. The Committee thought so. There was no opposition at the hearing. We have all tried our best to wiggle out as best we could of cancelling some of these road projects, not cancelling but postponing them for a year or two. It does not seem reasonably possible. Now as to a bond issue. You can finance by bond issues, but it seems to me that rather than, this \$600,000 would turn into \$800,000 or \$900,000 before you got it paid off over a period of years, it seems to me it would be more sensible to put off some even eminently desirable projects for a year or two and get this thing built and paid for and get it into operation than to go through all the mechanisms of a bond issue which means putting off the payment of the money and then paying the interest over those years during which it is being paid. Thank you very much.

THE SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis, to recommit this Bill to the Committee on Highways.

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

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Now what Mr. Davis said is entirely true just the same as what Mr. Pike has said, but I do want to add a little bit to this. Now you were speaking about what we have received in Washington County on the roads. Now for 1958 and '59 our allotment was as follows: \$220,000. They set up an allotment of \$400,000 for the road over in Jonesboro. The contract price is \$220,207. Now the rest of it we did not get. Now in the Cherryfield project, there was to be \$100,000. They started that. It was supposed to be finished last July first. It is not finished yet. We have one other project, \$200,000 for this same road, out in Meddybemps and that was spent. That is all the money Washington County had from 1957 to 1958. Now from 1958, July first, until July first of 1959, out of all the money that was allocated in the State of Maine, Washington County was allocated \$400,000, and that project has not been let yet. Five other counties out of the same amount of money were allocated an average of \$2,000,000, five times as much as Washington County, so that is the amount of money that we have been getting. Now, our committee, the Highway Committee, were all very sympathetic to this bridge project and it come out of our committee a unanimous Report "Ought to pass." They had all been down with the exception of one or two to see the location of this bridge. We have been on Campobello and recognized the importance of this bridge, and I am going to go back just a little farther.

Washington County was allocated \$8,280,000 out of the \$98,000,000 which was created by the \$27,000,000 bond issue. We received more than \$3,000,000 less than was allocated to us. Now this money was allocated and used in other counties because in the end of 1956 all the money was used up. Now those are the amounts of money that we have been receiving. Now I am fully sympathetic in trying many possible ways to delay these other road projects, and I do want to

correct one thing, just up to yesterday, well we will call it a notice from the Highway Department, the \$200,000 on No. 191 would be delayed and the \$50,000 in Eastport would be delayed. The \$30,000 at Danforth is not planned to have been used. Evidently, they have found some other way to get that money. Now, the building of this bridge, of course, it would be a personal thing perhaps with me in a way. There is no doubt but what it would be a great help to the Town of Machias, and there is no doubt but what it would be a great help to Bangor because those people would go there on account of these larger stores that they do not have there, and there is another thing, if this project is delayed, these two road projects, we will receive the \$313,000 which is mentioned in the bill so that when this is entirely completed in four years, we will have received \$313,000 more.

Now in a way, of course, naturally, we tried in every way possible to get this government money matched with state money, but it seems as though the only proposition that was put up to us has been to delay these two road projects. Now we haven't any real assurance that they will be restored, but when we have an advice from the Highway Committee we know that they will so I hope this project, I think Mr. Davis made a motion not to accept the majority report, but I hope this bridge project will be accepted as it is marked "Ought to pass."

The SPEAKER pro tem: The motion before the House is that of the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis, that this Bill be recommitted to the Committee on Highways.

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

Mr. DENNISON: I would hope to submit this would not be recommended. We had it in our committee here for a number of months and they have talked over it in every possible way and Mr. Davis and the different ones have been talking to Mr. Stevens and the proposition as put up to you today seems to be the only proposition that we were able to obtain.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This appears a very difficult and perplexing problem for all of us in Washington County and I have a tremendous amount of respect for my good friend from East Machias, Representative Dennison, he and I have worked very closely on this matter trying to figure out some way that everything could be taken care of, and I still feel that the Highway Committee with all the ability and astuteness that those gentlemen have could work out some sort of a bond issue situation that would take care of it, even as they have taken care of so many other projects. What bothers me most of all in either cancelling or postponing our road projects is that essentially there is a difference between these road projects and the bridge. The road projects are very definitely public ways and they are public ways for the transportation of our own people to and from the various communities in every possible direction.

Now I understand the argument that is made here that if this bridge is built it will attract a tremendous number of tourists because of the publicity given to the island by a play and a proposed movie. Well now there is no doubt that there is some truth in that, but I wonder if we are not getting into such a collateral matter, in such an indirect benefit, that we are leaving our own poor people here in the state in the lurch. We might as well advertise some of New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island's other attractions. They have many. Fundy Park in New Brunswick is a beautiful place, and so is the Oak Bay salt water pool which is located only five miles from Calais below St. Stephen, but it seems to me that we should be advertising our own attractions here in the State of Maine, have things in Washington County or in other counties and not just be a sort of a thoroughfare and picking up the pennies that they leave here and there as travelers.

I think that is the issue that is before us and there is one other

point that perhaps has not been made clear, and I must rely on the Bangor Daily News, but in a story special of the news on April the 30th and I quote: "Although there is a big if in the decision, the legislative highways committee today unanimously approved the proposed international bridge to join Lubec and Campobello Island, N. B. Member of the Washington County delegation, a committee spokesman explained, have been informed that the international project is approved if the delegation can come up with the money." Well I don't know any committee report that ever comes in here that either it is or it isn't. Well now it has come in here "Ought to pass" but according to this story in which the statements are made by a spokesman for the Highway Committee, now apparently the Highway Committee had in mind that they approved that subject to whether or not Washington County wanted to give up its projects. Now I for one don't want to give up the projects, and I think there were other members of the delegation who felt the same way. Now whether the committee has changed their minds since then I don't know, but I would say that I think it boils down to this, that we had a program and we went up and fought for it before the Highway Commission and we tried every conceivable way to get them to put that job in and they did, and we don't think it is fair or right that after that has been included and everybody knows about it, that you are going to come in here and put in some other piece of legislation and say well toss that to one side, we will get some kind of an unofficial — and Dave Stevens told me, he says I won't promise you you will get that in the next two years — get some unofficial say-so, of course Dave Stevens might not be there two years from now. I will not go into that any further, but be that as it may we don't know who, maybe the whole Highway Commission may be changed, you can't tell, but in any event they are not sticking their necks out and saying well we will put that in in the next term, and we felt it was in there

this time and we feel we are entitled to it.

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

Mr. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, in talking this over in the committee they might have had a report come out ought not to pass, but they wanted it to come out ought to pass. Now this Meddybemps road, which is the biggest sum of money that might be used. We would not get that anyway for a year. That is not in the schedule this year at all so that road if they use that money, I am going to put the "if" in there, it would only be delayed one year, and it would seem as though it would be a wise idea. Now this is No. 191, this is a state aid road. That is not number one highway where the most of the people go. That is on No. 191, and if we do accept this "Ought to pass" Report, we will also have during those four years \$313,000 more to use down there, so I hope this motion of Mr. Davis will not prevail.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: We were in kind of a hard spot on this one. We figured, the committee felt that there should be something done on the prestige end of this, but it is one of those cases where you didn't have any money, and we reported it out this way hoping that the delegation could somehow figure out some way where we might come up with it, but you have heard it aired pretty well by the gentleman from Lubec, my fellow committeeman Mr. Dennison, and I will go along with anything the county delegation would like to have.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis.

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis, that this Bill be recommitted to the Committee on Highways.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike.

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, there are two points that I forgot, very small ones. One is that the present scow ferry only operates in the daytime during the hours that the American Customs operate. The bridge of course would be a twenty-four hour thing and Customs would be on duty all the time. It would be of high direct benefit to Eastport and Lubec sardine people too, who otherwise have to get Customs people out and pay them double time for a full day to look at their sardines coming in. The main point is however that with a limited use of the ferry, its limited hours, the people from the other side are unable to go very far from home base. To some extent in Lubec you have a captive audience. With a twenty-four hour operation they will be able to fan out to Bangor and other larger places and I suspect we will lose some business. But that by the way it will be an overall benefit to the State of Maine, because anybody who comes down there without going through the whole length of the State of Maine has got to be a very, very clever person indeed and everybody on the way up to benefit.

The other point is we are, whether we care for it or not, now involved in international relations. This has been very close to the heart of our congressman from the second district, Mr. Frank Coffin, who I think as you may remember is a member of the sub-committee on international relations specializing on American-Canadian relations. Mr. Coffin, who has taken a great deal of interest in this thing, feels that it would be a wonderful gesture for good relations between the two countries perhaps, where there has been some recent friction and is very much for this bridge. As a matter of fact, the only one in our present delegation that isn't all for the bridge and that has not done a great deal of work for it is the one who was recently elected, James Oliver from Portland, who has not had a chance to get his bill in it.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Davis, that Bill "An Act to Construct a Bridge Between

Lubec and Campobello Island," House Paper 970, Legislative Document 1379, be recommitted to the Committee on Highways, and a division has been requested.

Will those who favor the recommitment of this Bill to the Committee on Highways please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Nineteen having voted in the affirmative and eighty-three having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Denison of East Machias, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER EDGAR: The Chair thanks the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, very much for his help as Speaker pro tem.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms conducted the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, to his seat on the Floor amid the applause of the House and Speaker Edgar resumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of eighth grade pupils from North Etna and South Etna accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Otis and Mrs. Clukey. A niece of Representative Carter of Etna is in the group. On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you young ladies and gentlemen a most cordial welcome and we hope you will enjoy your visit. (Applause)

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Construction of Housing for the University of Maine and the Issuance of not Exceeding \$24,000,000 Bonds of the State of Maine for the Financing Thereof" (H. P. 108) (L. D. 181) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "B" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MATHIESON of Montville
CLARK of Scarborough
FRAZIER of Lee
ERVIN of Houlton
ROWE of Madawaska
Mrs. HANSON of Lebanon
Miss CORMIER of Rumford
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DOW of Lincoln
COFFIN of Cumberland
BATES of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: To explain what Committee Amendment "B" is, and the position of the House members that signed this Report, I will tell you how we arrived at this figure. The filing number is 399 which I believe is on your desks in which we propose to amend this University of Maine bond issue from \$24,000,000 to \$8,195,000. This figure represents the total construction for the next two years on the University of Maine campus or dormitories as proposed by Dr. Elliott, this is the amount of money that if we follow through on his program that he would need for the next two years for construction. The House members of the Committee on Education felt that we would go along with his proposal for the next two years and that the University of Maine should come back to the next legislature to ask for additional money for further construction. And for that reason we came out with the Report and Committee Amendment "B" to this bill for \$8,195,000 for capital construction at the University, and at this time I move the House accept the Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report as amended by Committee Amendment "B".

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

Mr. COUSINS: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of us in the House who wish to debate this matter not as to the reducing of the amount of the bond issue, but as to the inclusion of one other item in it, and I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, and we are going to tackle it a little later in the session as the bill moves along so that there will be just one day of debate and we won't be scattering it all through the session, so at this time some of us are reserving opinions on the matter.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report as amended by Committee Amendment "B". Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 108, L. D. 181, Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Construction of Housing for the University of Maine and the Issuance of not Exceeding \$24,000,000 Bonds of the State of Maine for the Financing Thereof."

Amend said Bill, in the Title, by striking out the figures "\$24,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figures "\$8,195,000"

Further amend said Bill in the 5th line of section 1 by striking out the figures "\$24,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figures "\$8,195,000".

Further amend said Bill in the 5th line of section 3 by striking out the words and figures "twenty-four million dollars (\$24,000,000)" and inserting in place thereof the words and figures "eight million one hundred and ninety-five thousand dollars (\$8,195,000)"

Further amend said Bill in the 10th line of the Referendum by striking out the figures "\$24,000,000" and inserting in place thereof the figures "\$8,195,000"

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

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Welfare reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Repealing Relative Responsibility in Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Disabled" (H. P. 19) (L. D. 28), which was recommitted.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. ROSS of Sagadahoc
— of the Senate.
Mr. STORM of Sherman
Mrs. HARRINGTON of Patten
Messrs. HANSON of Bradford
HANCOCK of Nobleboro
— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in the same new draft (H. P. 963) (L. D. 1365) under title of "An Act Relieving Children and Certain Relatives of Financial Responsibility in Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Disabled" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. BOUCHER of
Androscoggin
— of the Senate.
Messrs. REED of Woolwich
HEALY of Portland
RUSSELL of Portland
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. STORM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have had this bill in committee for something like four months and we have discussed it on several occasions. It is in here today under a divided report. There is no division in the feeling of the Committee as to the—what we would like to do for the people who are recipients of old age within our borders, but there is some difference of opinion as to how far we can afford to go with the thing. The bill, if passed, would have a price tag of \$1,200,000 for the coming biennium. As the financial picture has been made more clear to us, those of us who signed the Majority Report fail to see where that sum of money is going to be available, and for that

reason I now move that we accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very pleased with the remarks just made by the Chairman of the Welfare Committee, the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm, and I am going to ask the House a very special favor if I may. I don't think there is any bill of equal importance affecting our aged before the 99th Legislature, that is reason number one for my motion to follow. Reason number two, I understand that both parties are trying now to make determinations which will be made within the next week as to how the money over and above that is available over and above the supplemental budget is going to be spent. There is a possible figure that we have in the amount of \$2,200,000. Reason number three, the Welfare Department is restudying their figures on what they call average grants. If they are able to chip the average grant down by one or two dollars, the total cost of this bill will be affected. Reason number four, I would like this bill because it is of utmost importance to over several hundreds of our people in this State that it be given full debate and full consideration.

I have never asked the House before this session here, this is my most important tabling motion that I have made thus far, and I would ask you to go along with me in tabling this bill for full debate for Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, moves that both Reports be tabled and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 27, pending the motion of the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report. The Chair will order a division on the tabling motion. Will those who favor the motion to table, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-six having voted in the affirmative and fifty-five having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Amending the Gasoline Tax Act with Respect to Aviation Fuel" (S. P. 448) (L. D. 1301)

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

Third Reader Indefinitely Postponed

Bill "An Act relating to Weekly Benefits for Total Unemployment under Employment Security Law" (H. P. 969) (L. D. 1378)

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

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, moves that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you no doubt have looked over this new draft of L. D. 942 which now comes out as L. D. 1378, with your indulgence I would humbly request permission to table this bill until Friday, May 22 for the purpose of adding an amendment due to the fact that there was a miscalculation of dates in that bill.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, that this bill be tabled and specially assigned for Friday pending the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that the bill be indefinitely postponed. The Chair will order a division on the tabling motion.

Will those who favor the motion to table and specially assign for Friday please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-one having voted in the affirmative and sixty-seven having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that this Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Regardless of the effective date of this bill which is as recited in the bill at this particular time, April 1, 1960, based on figures for 1958 being the last complete year available, this bill carries a price tag of \$1,748,712.00. These figures are based upon a report that I have here of the Maine Employment Security Commission dated May 8, 1959 and the name in the left hand corner appearing there is from the office of James J. George, Sr., Commissioner-Employer Representative.

During the year 1958 there were benefits paid for 799,356 weeks. This bill calls for an increase in the weekly benefits of \$2.00 down the line, starting with the first week of payment from \$7.00 to \$9.00 and the last week of payment, that is the total that could be paid in any particular week is increased from \$33.00 to \$35.00 a week. In other words, each week down the line is increased \$2.00. Now based on the figures of 1958, multiplying the total number of weeks for which compensation was paid by two, gives you \$1,598,712.00, that is for total unemployment, and Mr. George, and I talked with him this morning in his office, estimates that the amount for partial unemployment would be an additional \$150,000 based on figures for 1958.

During the year 1958 there was paid out in unemployment compensation in this State from the fund \$18,891,229.00. Those figures come from the Maine Employment Security Commission. Now there was contributed by industry in 1958 \$7,484,538.00 making a deficit of \$11,406,691.00. In other words, without increasing any additional payments under this particular fund on 1958 figures, you had roughly paid out of the fund \$11,000,000 more than was

taken in, not including interest, and on the present status something will have to be done without depleting the fund further which this bill would do.

Well, you could increase the tax on the employer, that is one alternative that you have. Of course the law could be amended to have the employee contribute as he does with social security — I am not recommending that, I am just saying what could be done. Or if the fund gets too low we could borrow from the federal government; or we could stop payments entirely if we ran out of money. Now let's take the most feasible one, increasing the tax on the employer to find this additional \$11,000,000 under present situations. Now there are paid out in the State of Maine roughly \$500,000,000 which are being taxed for the payment into this particular fund. Now if everyone was raised to 2.7, 2.7 times \$500,000,000 only gives \$13,500,000. This is \$5,391,229 less than was paid out in the year 1958. So under the rate of expenditures in 1958, even jumping all the employers to 2.7 would not have taken care of the depletion.

Yesterday I made a statement, and I will read it, and I quote: "If all these bills here before me had been enacted, it is estimated the cost would have been an additional \$23,000,000." These figures were produced by Mr. George. However, it should be pointed out at this time that some of these bills have duplicate coverage. Mr. George estimated that if all of these bills, and those are the thirteen that have been presented to this Legislature, were passed, that the additional tax on the employer would not have been \$23,000,000 but \$20,000,000. Therefore, rather than put any additional burden on this particular fund, I hope that this House will go along with the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that it be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You have heard a very fine summary of 1958 from the very talented gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good. Now I do not think that the year

1958 should be used as a comparison because we know, we recognize I believe and admit that we were recovering from some sort of a recession or depression or what have you. Now I am not a prophet, I do not believe that Mr. Good is a prophet, that we can tell what is going to happen in the coming years. We are hoping and it looks much better. Now as a member of organized labor and a leader, I would be remiss to let this bill go by without saying something in its behalf. This bill has been cut down, pared to the bone, we felt that \$2.00 a week increase of all people contained within this bill, in other words, it would affect the low paid man as well as the high paid man, with no difference whatever. Now you have heard a lot of figures given to you which can be obtained from the Commission from which Mr. Good no doubt got his, those are ones that have gone in the past year, it has happened, but that is no indication it is going to happen again. We hear about the depletion of the fund; about the 2.7; we hear very little about the one-half that is being contributed now. The only ones that are paying the 2.7 are new industry that comes into this State, they have to pay that under a state law for three years, that is automatic. They are all afraid that this one-half of one percent might be raised up. I don't see that it is very apt to, and I think we all ought to ask ourselves and answer possibly, if all these bills had of been passed we wouldn't have been here at this time. That's very sure. And we are going to ask ourselves again, what have we done for labor or what have we done to labor? I oppose the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken, I request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a roll

call has been ordered, I believe I had better state my position—

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that a roll call has not been ordered, it has been requested.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: I want to make my position clear because I studied this thing very carefully over the night and when the call—when I vote I shall vote for indefinite postponement this time, even though I signed the bill as ought to pass, because I found out it is a lot more expensive than we thought it was, and we have already passed other labor bills that all have quite a price tag on them. I just wanted to make my position clear.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, in reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee, if we passed all these bills we probably wouldn't be here now; we probably wouldn't be here next time either. Also with reference to bills we have passed for labor. Here are some bills that have already been enacted and signed by the Governor, which have price tags on them beneficial to labor. L. D. 1184, An Act Establishing Disability due to Radioactive Properties as an Occupational Disease, that bill has been signed by the Governor. L. D. 1348, An Act relating to Artificial Aids for Employees for Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law. That has been signed by the Governor. These are not all unemployment bills, but some of them under the Workmen's Compensation Law, but there are benefits to the employees and they have been passed by this legislature for the benefit of the working man. There is L. D. 555, An Act relating to Hearing Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law. L. D. 1230, An Act Increasing Burial Expenses under Workmen's Compensation Act. Signed by the Governor. L. D. 1326, An Act Designating Certain Dermatitis Diseases as Occupational Diseases. Signed by the Governor, passed by this Legislature. L. D. 1075, An Act relating to Penalties under Employment Security Law. L. D. 238, An

Act relating to Rest Periods for Female Employees, and L. D. 122, An Act relating to Weekly Benefits for Partial Unemployment. All passed by this Legislature for the benefit of the working man. I think that this Legislature has set a fine record as far as the working man is concerned.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have heard remarks made in the House here on previous bills that were defeated in this House, we are to do a lot for the working people as we go along in this session, and these are the words that came from my good friend Representative Mr. Winchenpaw. I have yet to see it. First in this House you had a bill under the unemployment on the dependency allowance. Certainly that was defeated. Not good for the State of Maine. Too costly. Bringing the fact that the fund came down in 1958, certainly I will agree with everybody that the fund went down in 1958 caused by unemployment, and therefore that is the reason that we have the unemployment insurance under the State of Maine here like similar that they have in any other state in the United States. That is the reason reason why this law has been passed by the Governor. All of the bills that were to benefit the employees under the unemployment have been defeated so far. As Mr. Good, the gentleman from Sebago, brought out, a bill L. D. 555. Previously in the law it was passed in there that nobody could appeal the decisions of any deputy in the office in the City Employment Office in the State of Maine for the reason that if they need their unemployment benefits in appealing there is a time that they would have to go some fifteen weeks without any unemployment benefit on any disqualification. This bill went through, start paying after the total weeks of disqualifications but the disqualified weeks remains in the funds until so decided in the appeal of this certain person. What is wrong with this bill? Previously it was in a way to starve the people out and force them not to appeal any de-

cision if they so knew that they were right, because they could not wait any fourteen to sixteen weeks before getting their unemployment benefit checks.

The remark was made here that we may not be here. I agree highly that a good many of us will not be here at the next session. I'll buy that, and I'll work for that, even if I am defeated myself. When the question came up on the floor here what have we done for the working people I will have to go along on saying nothing, we have done nothing, nothing to bring us anywhere near what the protection of the working people in the United States have anywhere else but the State of Maine. We are so far behind that it is pitiful, but this session again is trying to put us further back than we were before because in other states they gave them more, but we don't here. You had a piece of legislation here that was introduced in this House of Representatives that was defeated with a report of the committee ought not to pass, asking the State of Maine to enter the federal loan. It wasn't three weeks after this House defeated this with the report of the committee that you found out that Congress had passed a bill to reopen loans for any state, but in headlines that the State of Maine is not included in that law. Why? For the actions of this House of Representatives. We have taken that stand here in the past, there is no use to close our eyes on them. Out of the states we are the one that is not entitled under this federal loan when possibly the people in the State of Maine will have to pay through its taxes to the federal government to take care of the loans of every other state in the union. But it wasn't good enough for our own people, and I hope you remember that one too.

I cannot brace myself for the year 1959 and '60 with the total of unemployment that we have had in 1958, I hope not. It has been one of the worst depressions that we ever went through in the State of Maine here, one of the worst. All the facts were brought out here about the fund going down but I'm going to repeat again a law that was passed in the last session of

the legislature to allow the employer to go down on the taxes, so by going down on their taxes did they create a lower income under the unemployment? They certainly paid less so that would mean less fund going in. They claim part of the amount of money that was spent in 1958 themselves under a law passed in this House in the last session to allow them to pay lower taxes than they were before.

It hasn't been brought out here also that all the paid-outs of the employers to the unemployment compensation are fully deductible under their taxes. I haven't heard about that either. It is very natural for any person in this House of Representatives to get up and oppose all of these labor bills and take care of our people in case of unemployment, that they will make it all the hard way for the employers that they cannot afford it, but they will not come out and tell you what the employer benefits by it on this tax exempt on what he pays to the unemployment. They will not get up here and tell you what they saved in 1957 and '58 under that cut down bill that they had to pay less money than they were paying previously, but you are blaming the employees that have been unemployed in the year 1958 for it. Pay it out. Why don't we come out and say the amount that the employer has saved themselves? Why don't we come out with the amount of what the employer saved by taxes that is tax exempt? Why don't we add this together and find out how much the employer is doing for his employees before turning the employees and the working people of this State and forget down the line and even try to starve them while they are unemployed?

I certainly oppose the motion of the indefinite postponement of this bill. This is a compromising bill that was \$39.00 a week with thirty-nine weeks brought down to twenty-six weeks on a little raise of \$2.00 a week down the line, and if anybody in this House feels it is too much for labor, I certainly don't feel it is. Whether they are employed or unemployed, if they are under the unemployment compensation they are under the high cost of liv-

ing as you are working and have your increase in wages yearly as you go along. They are facing this cost of living like you do on your own job and you are entitled to increase on your wages as you go along every year for the past five years. All you look on the paper is an increase in wages caused by increased cost of living, face yourself on those unemployments on that insurance that they have to face also this cost of living. I have been trying to relieve the people with large families here under this unemployment; I wasn't able to do it against this session which I would have stayed and certainly taken it under consideration, but we can't. Poor State of Maine.

We are wondering why our young generation is leaving us so fast. Don't worry over it. Let them go a couple of more years and you will lose a lot more. After they come out of the service today after their drafting age, when they come back to the State of Maine they realize the operations and the laws and how they respect these people in the State of Maine and what they think about them, and they turn around and they certainly move somewhere where they are looked at. You know that as well as I do. Check your records of the people moving out of the State, especially in your young generation and specially in your skills. Go out and lose them all. Spend thousands and thousands of dollars for an industrial department to bring in industry over here with no skills. Lose them. Spend money that way. You are contradicting yourself. Overlook the laborer. I have been a member of this House for a few terms and in every session that I have served here when anything comes up for labor there had been one of the biggest debates in this House that I have seen on any other issue. Labor, let's keep them down, let's keep them thirsty, let's keep them hungry. We had another law to take care of these low employments here on the starvation wages, but try to take care of them so they could earn a little more money to be able to eat three meals a day. What happened with it? Where was the labor then? You have a bill there, no bill, the name of a bill, but noth-

ing in it, and that is how you have been taking care of your labor in the state. I hope that this motion for indefinite postponement doesn't prevail and the members of the House really realize what they are doing.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Coyne.

Mr. COYNE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not a member of a labor organization; I am not an employer of labor, I am only a small businessman retired. I am not a scholar, but I do remember with pity and pain the millions who seek honest work and seek in vain over land that is broad and calls for labor and though many unsatisfied walks of men these our fellow men and women are in some cases taught to love the sloth they once feared and hated. Now I only have a thought that there are many idle rich as well as idle poor and the possibility of once and for all establishing in the world and country and state a condition whereby none would be forced to idle in want, none would be permitted to idle in luxury, but we would all know the sweetness of well-earned rest. With this thought in mind, hope and heart, I hope this motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, I until four years ago was one of these working men we have been talking about. I am against this bill. I have drawn unemployment at different times. I was perfectly satisfied with the unemployment. The people in my territory they are very — most of them are laborers that work in the factories, but they don't want to have those factories paying so much out that they can't keep in existence. Some of the textile mills. Now we know what has happened to the textile mills in various places. Our textile mill is running full blast every day of the year because the workers are willing to work along with the management.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

Yesterday as members of this House we passed by a division vote this law, this increase in the weekly benefits. There have been many figures thrown out here on the Floor of the House today, but the figure that was given to us as members of the Labor Committee, the cost of this bill would be \$852,000. The original bill that was presented to the Labor Committee was a bill that probably entailed far more money, but after many weeks of deliberation within the Labor Committee we of the Committee, and this is my opinion, and I can be quoted on it, who were serious and wanted to help the citizens of the State of Maine, and again I want to state that I am not a labor representative, I am an insurance executive, I have been involved in business over the years, but I felt that as a member of this Committee when labor legislation came before us, that we were to study it and try to come up with the right kind of an answer to help the citizens of the State of Maine. The majority of the committee in regard to this bill came out feeling that they had provided the right answer and a cure and a help for these people.

Now as I said yesterday, we as members of this House by a division vote approved the first and second reading of this bill, and then all of a sudden over night a caucus is called and low and behold something happened. Today the gentleman from Sebago, my very good friend, Mr. Good, arises here and moves for indefinite postponement. Well I hope that each and every one of us who are members of this Legislature will vote with our own convictions and not the convictions of people who are trying to pressure us around in this House. Believe me, I hope that when the vote is taken that the indefinite postponement will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles.

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker, I realize from certain undercurrent here that perhaps we are becoming almost exhausters on this particular subject matter, but I would like to make a couple of observations.

I cannot qualify as an executive or an authority or a recipient of any of the benefits, although I think if we are here much longer I may be arrested as a person not having any visible means of support. But I would like to make two references, rather glowing and prideful reference has been made to the number of bills that have been passed that relate to labor. I don't think we should use the word 'labor' in the capital sense, but rather should use the word in the sense that it relates to people who labor, because these bills relate to people who belong to organized labor and also those who belong to unorganized labor.

I was very pleased to have an identification by L. D. number and by subject matter of the bills that have been passed and have become or will become such a boon to the working people. I think upon reflection and upon analysis you will come to the conclusion yourselves individually that these bills, these several bills that have been passed individually benefit in a very fragmentary sense, they are desirable additions to the law. For example, the one on radioactivity. Certainly in the immediate future it is not contemplated that there will be very many people that are going to be affected by it. As far as the bill relating to artificial aids, the occurrence of the use of that provision of the law is not going to be extensive or particularly repetitive, or the one on burial expense. Then there is one involving a disease and I tried to write it down, I can't recall my own spelling of it, but I think it has something to do with, I was going to say turkey plucking, but I mean chicken plucking, because I think it is a disease contracted by those who work in these plants that condition shall we say the fowl for the market, that added another medical category to those categories now for which people can receive benefits.

I think also if you reflect in your own particular neighborhoods that within the last year or two various municipal governments have granted cost of living increases to teachers, to fire and police and public works departments, and it seems to me that where this bill

calls for a \$2.00 a week increase up and down the categories, that this bill in effect is a cost of survival increase type of bill. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes from Orono, Mr. Treworgy.

Mr. TREWORGY: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Labor Committee I think I should point out that thirty-one states as of 1958 paid sums of money in the form of weekly benefits up to and including \$33.00, and twenty states paid a sum above \$33.00, so I think if these figures mean anything, Maine is certainly above the average.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that this bill be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, has requested a roll call. For the Chair to order a roll call, the Chair must have the expression of a desire for a roll call from at least one-fifth of the members of the House. Will those who desire a roll call please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Desmarais.

Thereupon, Mr. Desmarais of Sanford, who would have voted "no" was excused from voting as he paired his vote with Mrs. Knapp of Yarmouth, who was absent but would have voted "yes" were she present.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that Bill "An Act relating to Weekly Benefits for Total Unemployment under Employment Security Law," House Paper 969, Legislative Document 1378 be indefinitely postponed. If you favor the indefinite postponement of this bill, you will say 'yes' when your name is called; if you oppose the indefinite postponement, you will say 'no'. The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Bacon, Baker, Bragdon, Brockway, Brown, Bangor; Brown, Cape Elizabeth; Brown, Ellsworth; Call, Carter, Carville, Caswell, Chapman, Gardiner; Chapman, Norway; Choate, Clark, Cousins, Cox, Danes, Dean, Dennett, Dennison, Dodge, Dow, Dumaine, Dunn, Edgerly, Edmunds, Edwards, Stockton Springs; Ervin, Frazier, Good, Graves, Hancock, Hanson, Bradford; Hanson, Lebanon; Hardy, Harrington, Heald, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Hughes, Jewell, Jewett, Jones, Kennedy, Lindsay, Linnell, Maddox, Mathews, Mathieson, Monroe, Moore, Morse, Perry, Easton; Philbrick, Pike, Rollins, Sanborn, Smith, Exeter; Smith, Falmouth; Stanley, Storm, Treworgy, Trumbull, Turner, Wade, Walter, Weston, Wheaton, Whitman, Williams, Winchenpaw.

NAY—Aliberti, Barnett, Beane, Berman, Briggs, Cahill, Caron, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Coyne, Curtis, Cyr, Augusta; Cyr, Fort Kent; Davis, Calais; Davis, Westbrook; Dostie, Doyle, Dudley, Dufour, Dumais, Earles, Edwards, Raymond; Galant, Harris, Haughn, Healy, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hilton, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Karkos, Kilroy, Kinch, Knight, Lancaster, Lane, Lantagne, Lebel, Lemelin, Letourneau, Lowery, Maxwell, Mayo, Miller, Nadeau, Pert, Pitts, Plante, Porell, Prue, Rankin, Reed, Rowe, Madawaska; Saunders, Tardiff, Walls, Walsh, Warren, Whiting, Young.

ABSENT — Baxter, Boone, Christie, Crockett, Emmons, Hutchinson, Kellam, Knapp, Lacharite, Parsons, Perry, Hampden; Rowe, Limerick; Russell.

Yes 72, No 63, Absent 13.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-two having voted in the affirmative, sixty-three having voted in the negative, with thirteen absentees and one excused, the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

Amended Third Reader Indefinitely Postponed

Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law" (H. P. 649) (L. D. 940)

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

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, moves that this bill be indefinitely postponed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy.

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: As you have already heard this morning, we have done a lot for the Workmen's Compensation Act and this is just one more. I made a few notes this morning as we went along here and I will just state a few of them briefly. This increase is roughly four per cent as this bill is amended now to the employer. It changes the pattern from \$35.00 to \$39.00 and from \$14,000 to \$19,500. This increase formerly went along in a very orderly fashion until the last few years when it has been radically increased not every other session or periodically, but every session. To state briefly the pattern of the increases over the past few years, in the thirty-four years prior to 1949 this thing increased \$15.00 a week or \$14.00 a week roughly, and in the past ten years this thing has gone up on the radical lift of \$15.00. Now if this thing keeps on a little tax here and a little tax there to our employers and we are always talking about the healthy climate that we hope to have, we are fast ruining it from one means or another. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Auburn does prevail.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The report from the Committee which was accepted yesterday in the House raises for weekly benefits for total incapacity the sum from \$35.00 to \$39.00, and the maximum sum from \$14,000 to \$19,500, this maximum five hundred weeks total benefits may frighten some people. However, I would like to relate to you people here that individuals who have benefitted from

this five hundred weeks total incapacity have averaged three benefits per year during the past four years. Three individuals per year have benefitted from the total five hundred weeks total incapacity, so certainly the price that Maine industry would have to pay for those individuals in that condition would not be crippling to any Maine industry. There are few other minor increases regarding death benefits and partial disability benefits. Again we can only make a humble plea that you give some real consideration to those who will merit from this legislation, and when the vote is taken I move that it be taken by a roll call vote.

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

Mr. DESMARAIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Desmarais, has moved the previous question. For the Chair to entertain a motion for the previous question, the Chair must have the authority as expressed by one-third of the members of the House. Will those — for what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. MILLER: I rise to ask that the House vote against honoring the motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER: Will those who favor the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third having arisen, the Chair is authorized to entertain the motion for the previous question. The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This question is debatable with a time limit of five minutes for any member who wishes to speak and any member who does wish to speak may speak only to the question of shall the main question be put now.

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

Mr. MILLER: I understand—can I speak on the main subject?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may not speak on the main question. The only question before the

House at the moment is, shall the main question be put now?

Mr. MILLER: Well I hope that this House will vote against the movement to prevent further debate in regard to this important issue. I have some very important facts which I would like to bring out and I would like to have the honor of presenting them to this House.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is, shall the main question be put now? Will those who favor the Chair putting the main question now, please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

Seventy-five having voted in the affirmative and forty-eight having voted in the negative, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The main question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law," House Paper 649, Legislative Document 940, be indefinitely postponed.

A roll call has been requested. In order for the Chair to order a roll call the Chair must have the expression of a desire for a roll call from at least one-fifth of the members of the House. Will those who favor a roll call please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, the Chair orders a roll call. If you favor the indefinite postponement of this bill, you will say 'yes' when your name is called; if you oppose indefinite postponement you will say 'no'. The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Bacon, Baker, Bragdon, Brockway, Brown, Bangor; Brown, Cape Elizabeth; Brown, Ellsworth; Call, Carter, Carville, Caswell, Chapman, Gardiner; Chapman, Norway; Clark, Cousins, Cox, Danes, Dean, Dennett, Dennison, Dodge, Dow, Du-
maine, Dunn, Edgerly, Edmunds, Edwards, Stockton Springs; Ervin, Frazier, Good, Graves, Hancock,

Hanson, Bradford; Hanson, Lebanon; Hardy, Harrington, Heald, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Hughes, Jewett, Kennedy, Knapp, Lindsay, Linnell, Maddox, Mathews, Mathieson, Monroe, Moore, Morse, Perry, Easton; Philbrick, Pike, Rollins, Sanborn, Smith, Exeter; Smith, Falmouth; Stanley, Storm, Trumbull, Turner, Wade, Walter, Weston, Wheaton, Whitman, Williams.

NAY — Aliberti, Barnett, Beane, Berman, Briggs, Cahill, Caron, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Coyne, Curtis, Cyr, Augusta; Cyr, Fort Kent; Davis, Calais; Davis, Westbrook; Desmarais, Dostie, Doyle, Dudley, Dufour, Dumais, Earles, Edwards, Raymond; Gallant, Harris, Haughn, Healy, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hilton, Jacques, Jalbert, Jewell, Johnson, Karkos, Kilroy, Kinch, Knight, Lancaster, Lane, Lantagne, Lebel, Lemelin, Letourneau, Lowery, Maxwell, Mayo, Miller, Nadeau, Pert, Pitts, Plante, Porell, Prue, Rankin, Reed, Rowe, Madawaska; Saunders, Tardiff, Treworgy, Walls, Walsh, Warren, Whiting, Winchenpaw, Young.

ABSENT — Baxter, Boone, Choate, Christie, Crockett, Emmons, Hutchinson, Jones, Kellam, Lacharite, Parsons, Perry, Hampden; Rowe, Limerick; Russell.

Yes 68, No 67, Absent 14.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-eight having voted in the affirmative, sixty-seven having voted in the negative, with fourteen absentees, the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Completion of Josias River Project in Ogunquit (H. P. 964) (L. D. 1368)

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. 127 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.

Finally Passed Emergency Measure

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for a Sprinkler System in Andrews and Robie Halls at the Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 471) (L. D. 689)

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. 125 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recess and reconvene at two o'clock this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, moves that the House recess and reconvene at two o'clock this afternoon. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House recessed.

After Recess 2:00 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Bills on their passage to be enacted.

Finally Passed Emergency Measure

Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Construction of Enclosures for Stairwells in Corthell, Robie and Andrews Halls at Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 786) (L. D. 1118)

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. 117 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Construction of a Building for Maine Employment Security Commission (S. P. 496)

An Act relating to Tolls on Bridge Across Jonesport Reach (H. P. 190) (L. D. 282)

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

Orders of the Day

Mr. Hughes of St. Albans was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In compliance with your Order of yesterday on the judging of the two lobsters which were presented to me, one claimed to be from Lincoln County and the other from the Bar Harbor area, I present my report which is not within the assigned limit of twenty-four hours that was allowed me to do so and was due to circumstances beyond my control. I got a double barrel gauge from the Sea and Shore Fisheries by permission of Mr. Green, measured them according to Section 114 of Chapter 38 of the Revised Statutes, finding them to be over three and three-sixteenths inches long and to be less than five and three-sixteenths inches long, measured from the back of the eye socket to the end of the body shell. I thought them to be a little short at first but to my surprise they were legal. I took them home to judge as I figured I could remain unbiased and unpressured from anybody including my wife. She is on a diet and it does not include lobsters.

I first sampled the one from Lincoln County and found it to be the best lobster that I had ever eaten; that is, until I had tried the one claimed to be from Bar Harbor. Then I had to change my mind. I wish to thank all parties involved in giving me the lobsters and to make a long story short, this is my decision. If you want a lobster dinner, do not go to Massachusetts, go either to Lincoln County or Bar Harbor where you will find the very best of lobsters. Thank you. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to accept the report of the gentleman from St. Albans, Mr. Hughes?

The motion prevailed.

(Off the record, Mr. Walter of Waldoboro approached the rostrum.)

The SPEAKER: On the record, the Chair would like to thank the gentleman from St. Albans, Mr. Hughes, for his diligence in making this study but the Chair has news for the gentleman. Both of those lobsters came from Lincoln County. (Laughter) However, the Chair will continue to state that it is a known fact that at one time Hancock and Lincoln Counties were all one county, and for that reason it is not surprising that both lobsters were of excellent quality, they had the Hancock flavor but they had the Lincoln origin, so we can understand it.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from St. Albans.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one more remark. It was not news to me that they did both come from Lincoln County, you will notice in the report I said "claimed" to have come. So, the gentleman by the name of Kenneth Grey, I believe, packed the lobsters.

The SPEAKER: The Chair compliments the gentleman.

Mr. Mayo of Bath, presented the following Order "out of order" and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that all bills and resolves referred to Joint Standing Committees, that have not been reported by such Committees by 4 P.M. Friday, May 22, be and hereby are recalled to the branch of the Legislature in which they were introduced, and the Joint Committees to which such bills were referred shall be discharged from further consideration of such bills recalled above. (H. P. 972)

The Order received passage and was sent forthwith to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage," Senate Paper 472, Legislative Document 1337, tabled

on May 15 by the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, pending further consideration. In the House the Bill was engrossed as amended by Filing Nos. 319, 338, and 354, and in the Senate engrossed as amended by Filing Nos. 319, 338, 379, 380, 381 and 382.

The Chair awaits a motion.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I have House Amendment "F" I wish to present.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that to present a House Amendment the gentleman must move reconsideration whereby we passed this Bill to be engrossed. Does the gentleman so move?

Mr. TURNER: I do.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, moves that the House recede from its former action whereby it passed this Bill to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

The Chair will order a division. Will those who favor the motion to recede from our former action whereby we passed this Bill to be engrossed please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred thirteen having voted in the affirmative and one in the negative, the motion to recede prevailed.

Thereupon, Mr. Turner of Auburn presented House Amendment "F" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "F" to S. P. 472, L. D. 1337, Bill, "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage."

Amend said Bill by adding after paragraph C of subsection III of section 132-B the following underlined paragraph:

C-1. Any individual employed by any establishment engaged in laundering, cleaning or repairing clothing or fabrics;

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman wish to speak to his motion? The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This motion is an exact duplicate of a mo-

tion that is in the federal law under the Minimum Wage exemptions under the Minimum Wage, and I can't see why it is not fair if you are letting one concern put in an amendment why you shouldn't another one. Now a small business, it may mean whether they live or die on increase in wages. As you know now the small business concerns — we have been losing a lot of small business through folding up and bankruptcies, and I think unless we can go along with your federal exemptions that this bill we had better kill it altogether because you are going to have an awful mixed up mess.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have been looking my papers over here to try to find an amendment that would exclude everybody from this bill. It is fast coming. I think every member of the House is aware of the humor of my very dear friend from Auburn, Mr. Turner, and he certainly is with this amendment, in my opinion running true to good form. This amendment here would exempt in this bill what is in my opinion are the workers working in the worst sweat shops in this state or any state. This will exempt those people who turn out shirts with the rapidity of a machine gun, surrounded with a smoke screen, the temperature well beyond a hundred, and it would protect the laundry proprietors who charge us twenty-five cents a shirt to burn our shirts at the fourth or fifth time that it hits the laundry. I am bitterly opposed to this amendment as well as others in the measure, but certainly this one we should take not two months' time in filing. I move its indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that House Amendment "F" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues here just passed me a letter where the Waterville Steam Laundry, Waterville, are definitely against the Minimum Wage of one

dollar an hour. "We have about forty workers here who will be laid off about September first if this law goes through. It will be impossible for us to operate more than the allotted ninety days after the bill is passed.

"The public will not stand a 40 per cent rise in prices when they can buy washing machines. Please do not throw us all out of work."

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At the present time there are thirty-four jurisdictions within the United States and its territorial possessions that have some type of minimum wage law. I have had the opportunity the past week of reading the thirty-four documents and in very few instances are laundries and cleaning establishments exempted. I feel, and I might add, that as far as the interstate labor is concerned to which the gentleman referred to, the federal law, it would not affect them unless they are an outfit so large that they would be doing business with other states, and also if the establishment is so small that they employed three or less people, under the present bill coming from the other body, they are exempted anyway, so in all fairness to other types of businesses that will be included by Fair Minimum Wage Law, it is only in good conscience that we support the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, and have this item indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wish to re-echo the remarks made by our good friend from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, regarding the laundries being one of the finest sweat shops we have anywhere it stands, and further in connection with his reference to getting the burned shirts after the fourth time, you send a two-piece suit to some of these combination laundries and tailor shops and they charge you \$1.75 and your pants come back with a double crease, and I should

very definitely wish to be opposed to our good friend, the genial Legislator from Auburn, Mr. Turner, in his amendment to this bill.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, in speaking in behalf of the dry cleaners and also the laundries in the Penobscot County area, I wish to say that especially in the dry cleaning field that the employees in the cleaning establishments in Penobscot County are receiving well over a dollar per hour. In the laundry industry in our area, I am sure that the majority of the plants are receiving the same. However, there are some laundries in our city and in our county that are not to the dollar Minimum Wage. However, it would be most certain that those plants would go out of business because of that situation. In regards to the sweat shop operation, I am sure that any of the modern plants today are operating under an air-conditioned building and that we do not have, at least in the Penobscot or Bangor area, any such thing as a so-called sweat shop.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Brown, speaks of most laundries operating under air-conditioning. I am not an engineer; I would like to ask him a question through the Chair. How do you air-condition steam?

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman actually addressing the question or is that a rhetorical question? The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Brown, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. BROWN: In answer to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, I wish to say that in air-conditioning as far as dry cleaning and laundry plants are concerned, we have a special unit that sucks in the steam from the pressers which would exhaust that out through a so-called smoke stack and that the steam is eliminated from the building under those conditions.

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

Mr. JALBERT: I am going in to the engineering field now. I would like to invite my good friend Mr. Brown from Bangor to come with me to Lewiston and Auburn, and I will take him into every laundry establishment. When that rig comes down it is about this long and about so wide. It covers the person that is doing the work with steam, air-conditioning or no air-conditioning. I would take him Monday.

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

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, I am very much against this amendment. I can't see why this is going to affect any laundry or cleaning establishment to put them out of business. They will all have to pay the same amount, and what is going—they may bring up the price a little mite, but it won't be enough to put them out of business I don't believe, and these workers certainly should be able to earn — they earn a dollar now anyway. They should be paid that. Some of these amendments are all right and I would go along with many of them but this one I won't.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, we have gone along and passed an exemption for the hotels, restaurants and the like. Are we going to pass laws to cut the folks of one industry and build up another one? Of course the hotels and your laundry outfits they have their high priced lobbyists to operate for them. These laundry people, they are on their own. They have nobody to look out for them. The only folks they depend to look out for them is the representatives they send down to the legislature.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to extend an invitation to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, to visit Penobscot County and the City of Bangor and see how that operates and I believe

that there is a cleaner here in Augusta that has the same system.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You all realize that if you cannot kill something with one fell swoop then you can slowly smother it to death, and one way would be as with this legislation with amendments. Now those who are genuinely interested in a minimum wage realize that they cannot achieve perfection at the first instance. Our duty, or at least the duty of those who genuinely feel that a minimum wage is necessary, and I for one so believe, realize that we must come out with a Minimum Wage bill that has as few exemptions as possible, but on the other hand certain exemptions are necessary. If you would amend this Bill to death then pass the amendments that are here. I feel that we should reach a happy medium, and I think the happy medium has been reached with the Senate Amendments that are now on the desks and no more, and for that reason I urge that you vote against this amendment that has been offered, and when the vote is taken, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that House Amendment "F" be indefinitely postponed and a division has been requested.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "F" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-six having voted in the affirmative and thirty-three having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "F" prevailed.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would take great pleasure and pride in recognizing the presence in the rear of the House a former Governor of the State of Maine, the Honorable Horace Hildreth. And the Chair would request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort the

Honorable Mr. Hildreth to the rostrum as the Speaker's guest.

Thereupon, the Sergeant-at-Arms escorted the Honorable Mr. Horace Hildreth to his seat on the rostrum amid the applause of the House, the members rising.

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of anybody in the House that understands this Bill thoroughly.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentlemen requests unanimous consent to briefly address the House. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CALL: If we pass all these amendments what industries left would take use of this Minimum Wage Law? If we pass all these amendments, what is left? What good is it?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, has addressed a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he or she chooses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, I have here a list of the amendments and what they exempt. For example, Amendment 338 exempts home workers, those who work at home hooking rugs and knitting, etc. Amendment 354, which we passed, would include candling workers, but it was defeated in the other body. Amendment 379 exempts employers who have three or less employees. Amendment 380 exempts private hospital employees. Amendment 381 exempts waitresses, waiters and any service employees working for gratuity, and Amendment 382 includes, it puts back, the people who work twenty-four hours or less.

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

Thereupon, Mr. Haughn of Bridgton presented House Amendment "I" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "I" to S. P. 472, L. D. 1337, Bill, "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of paragraph E of subsection III of section 132-B and inserting in place thereof the following underlined paragraph:

'E. Any individual employed as a counselor or junior counselor in summer camps for boys and girls and those individuals who are regularly enrolled as students in an educational institution, or who are on vacation therefrom;'

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that the House adopt House Amendment "I".

The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As you know you have filing 398 on your desks, which I did not offer. I am substituting therefor filing number 401 in its place which was adopted and passed by this House when it left here, and at the other end of the corridor somehow it got a semicolon in between there which changed the aspects and the meaning of what we had passed here. So therefore, this amendment now puts back into the Minimum Wage Bill what was originally in it when it left here, and when the vote is taken I request a division.

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, through the Chair, and my question, in the form of an example: If a woman, a mother, grandmother should apply for employment in a hotel as a chamber maid, would she receive the minimum wage and would a college student applying for a position in a hotel as a chambermaid be excluded from the minimum wage?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to my good friend, Mr. Ran-

kin from Southport, I would say as it specifies in the amendment filing 401 that it says that "any individuals who are regularly enrolled as students in an educational institution," that is what this amendment applies to. If those persons he refers to were students they would come under this amendment. If not, they would come under the Minimum Wage Law.

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

Mr. RANKIN: This would mean that in the district which sends me up here the women who have families, some of them grandmothers, would not be employed if college students could be employed without being under the Minimum Wage. I move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, that House Amendment "I" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify something. The question which was asked concerned two specific occupations and under service employees working for gratuities which would include chambermaids which was one of the questions, under the present Bill they would be exempted so I don't think it would affect any of those grandmothers desiring that type of a job.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, it seems so my good friend from Old Orchard is talking out of both sides of his mouth. He did not want to clutter up that Bill with any new amendments.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think this needs some explanation as to actually what it means. I think my good friend from Southport, Mr. Rankin, is a little confused and probably from the an-

swer I might have given. I hope the gentleman from Old Orchard, Mr. Plante, has clarified it as mine, but this is something that the students work only in summer months. They are able through their earnings to return to school and colleges in the fall.

We must remember that an amendment of this nature protects the year-round employees, and they should be particularly kept apart from each other, and I think the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Rankin, knows I have been an advocate of a dollar an hour, but I myself employ in another state, high school and college students in the summer months who without that employment could not go back to school because they would not have sufficient funds. I am not in business in Maine. This bill does not mean anything to me personally except in the interest of the Minimum Wage Law, but I have year-round employees who receive a higher fee and I am certain that you people in business in this state who have temporary employees, such as students, who are benefiting by summer employment that you certainly want to help them, not gyp them, and also to protect the year-round employees that there should be some differential in pay. Or if not, you would not keep the year-round employees. It is quite a long, lengthy picture probably to be explained and I think everybody fully understands the meaning of it as much as I do, and I will move that you reinstate what we have passed once before in this House, this same amendment without the semicolon in it, and as I say I request a division on the adoption of this filing number 401.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I am a little confused on this amendment. We have had so many of them come in here with colons, commas, semicolons added and taken out. I would like to ask a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, in regard to students. Does his amendment exclude students employed in any type of summer work from the Minimum

Dollar Wage? I am referring to students who work in many of the summer hotels as bus boys, bellhops, driving the station wagon to and from in running errands for the hotels, etc. Those are the students that I am interested in. We have many hotels who hire these students during the summer. The students need the work, want the work, but I am afraid that if they are going to have to get a dollar an hour minimum wage, they are not going to be hired.

Mr. SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo: I think that the issue is clearly written here: "enrolled students in an educational institution." In other words, if they were students, they would not come under the Minimum Wage Law. Then you have another amendment which takes care of those who receive tips, and what have you, for their pay, that would still mean their earnings. But this one, this particular amendment does apply to whatever type of work they may do, who are on vacation and enrolled as students in an educational institution. I hope that clarifies the question.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman consider the question answered?

Mr. MAYO: It does, but not being an English professor or anything of that sort, as I read the amendment, it refers to counselor or junior counselor in summer camps for boys and girls and then it just goes on to keep right on talking about "individuals who are regularly enrolled." It still referring back to summer camps only. I think that something should be in there to clarify that.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: I hope that I can clarify that once again because that is the reason for this amendment coming back to you because it was the unmentionable body and these are the same words that we used in our amendment before. They

in their wisdom saw fit to put after the word counselor I believe "in summer camps for boys and girls and," which any phrase thereafter resorted back to the original part of "Any individual employed as a counselor or junior counselor in summer camps for boys and girls." This deletes that and carries on to another statement. There it has made it all into one statement the part after "for boys and girls" reverted back to the original part, and we delete that so it now covers all phases of occupation for summer employment.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: First I want to say that I am opposed to this Amendment 401 in case I talk so much and confuse you so bad that you don't know where I do stand, and I would like to say I employ a lot of these students, quite a few during the summer and they are certainly worth a dollar. If they are not worth a dollar, there is no man ever worked for me worth a dollar, and I would like to do something to help these children get their education, I would like to see them earn more than a dollar. However, I don't think we should attempt to pay them less than a dollar if we want them to go through the schools, at the price of tuition, the price of books and all the things that they have to buy today. I think we should encourage these children, have at least a dollar minimum wage, and I for one am very pleased to pay them that.

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

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker: I would like to address a question to the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, in regard to his amendment, would it prevent a person, an adult, from enrolling in a correspondence course and getting a job anywhere and using the correspondence course as a guide?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bridg-

ton, Mr. Haughn, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker: The only way I can reply to the gentleman from Union, Mr. Heald, is if they classify that particular thing he is speaking of as an educational institution I would say yes, if it so qualifies as an educational institution.

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker: As I suspected, this amendment has nothing to do with the summer business. As I now see it, a man who wished to hire a male to drive one of his trucks in business could reject a citizen of Maine who was not in school, say "I will not pay you a dollar," in which case the man would not be working. He could hire a student for fifty cents an hour and on fifty cents an hour no student can pay his way through college today, even though he gets a great deal of scholarships. My son is a junior at Bowdoin and his way is paid by the family but I know many working students there, and they certainly couldn't stay in Bowdoin or Colby or Bates or the University of Maine by working during the summer for less than a dollar.

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

Mr. PERT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It seems to me as though this amendment will be quite inconsistent. You take, for example, an individual graduates from high school, goes out to work to earn enough money to go to college, maybe a year or two after he gets out of high school, then he decides to enter college and he forfeits his right to make a dollar an hour. I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must remind the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that he has already spoken at least twice to his motion.

Mr. HAUGHN: That is why I have concerned myself, in order just to reply to the questions asked me, that is why I want to ask the

Chair, if he rules I have spoken twice in reply to several—

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that the gentleman has spoken twice and must have the consent of the House to speak again. Does the gentleman wish that?

Mr. HAUGHN: I request that.

Mr. Haughn of Bridgton was granted permission to speak again by a viva voce vote.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the Members of the House for the courtesy. I think in fairness to the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, and to Mr. Pert, the gentleman from Bath, that I should defend some of the replies that were made here. As has been stated that one young man who may go through high school and graduate and then earn money enough to go to college, he is not an enrolled student during that time. Therefore he would come under the Minimum Wage Law. So I don't think that would hold water, that type of debate, on this particular issue, as stated in his amendment.

The gentleman, Mr. Rankin, has stated that they can hire them for fifty cents. If he reads the remainder of this amendment, they either have to be on vacation, which naturally wouldn't be in school then for then they would be working under this amendment. If they are in school, studying, they certainly couldn't be out working, so therefore I don't know where his theory in thinking applies to this because it says they have to be on vacation to come under this amendment if they are under the Wage Law.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker. I have one question I would like to ask the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, a lot of these summer camps have laundries and I was wondering how the boys were going to go into the laundry business for work?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker: There is not much reply to give, I think we have just disposed of the laundry issue and this concerns enrolled students of schools on vacation in the summer months.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, that House Amendment "I" be indefinitely postponed. The Chair will order a division.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "I" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-five having voted in the affirmative and forty-three having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "I" prevailed.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "G" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, offers House Amendment "G" and moves its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "G" to S. P. 472, L. D. 1337, Bill, "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage."

Amend said Bill, in that part designated "**Sec. 132-H**," by inserting in the first line of subsection I, after the underlined word "**representative**" the underlined words and figure '**upon written complaint setting forth the violation of section 132-C**'

Further amend said Bill, in that part designated "**Sec. 132-H**" by adding at the end of subsection II the following underlined sentence:

'Such rules and regulations affecting any particular class of employees and employers shall be made and promulgated only after a duly held public hearing with notice and opportunity to be heard to those employees and employers affected.'

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is as to the adoption of House Amendment "G".

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of any member of the House—what would this amendment mean?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member of the House who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In simple language this amendment means that, as the law stands now, the employer would have no protection or no recourse against the Department of Labor and Industry providing there was some violation in his plant or in his store concerning the Minimum Wage. And under this amendment the employee and the employer both would have a chance to state their side or their case before the Commissioner of Industry and Labor here at the State House at a public hearing, after the public hearing has been advertised in the daily newspapers.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the adoption of House Amendment "G". The Chair will order a division.

Will those who favor the adoption of House Amendment "G" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred six having voted in the affirmative and fourteen having voted in the negative, the motion to adopt House Amendment "G" prevailed.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, is this bill still debatable?

The SPEAKER: There is nothing before the House at the moment. Does the gentleman request unanimous consent to address the House?

Mr. CALL: I do.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You now have just heard your eighth or ninth amendment, you see what a farce it is. What is left for anybody to receive a Minimum Wage Law? We have watered this bill down until it doesn't amount to the paper that it is written on. I now propose that Bill "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage Law" be indefinitely postponed and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, that the House has before it three amendments from the other branch and a motion to amend, or a question of amendment, takes priority over a motion to indefinitely postpone. So the gentleman's motion is not in order at this time.

The pending question now is the matter of the amendments from the other branch.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would move through the proper mechanics to accept the amendments so mentioned, and I would like to speak if I may.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, to move that the House concur in the adoption of Senate Amendments B, C, D and F, and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KNIGHT: As I stated before, one way to kill a bill is to slowly squeeze the life out of it, which apparently is what is being attempted to be done here. I do believe though that a fair compromise can be reached by adopting these amendments. Now there are those who would say that it would be a supreme insult to the working man if this bill with its amendments were to pass. I say it would be a greater insult to the intelligence of the voters of Maine if we were to kill this bill and give the reason for our killing it, that it had too many amendments. No matter how it comes out, if it passes it will be a hundred per cent better than what we have now, because now we have nothing. And as I stated, it is our duty to give the people of Maine a Minimum Wage bill with as few exceptions as possible. However, this bill can-

not become perfection in its first instance.

Two weeks ago the papers carried the headlines, "The House Passes the Dollar Minimum Wage." I need not tell you what the headline last week concerning this measure was. Now the people of Maine are not cognizant of the gymnastics that are possible in this Legislature, and if we were to reverse our previous decision whereby we passed this bill I for one could not go home and justify it with the voters. I now request that when the final vote is taken here it be taken by a roll call.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman desire a roll call on his motion to concur in the adoption of Senate Amendments B, C, D and F?

Mr. KNIGHT: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman withdraws his request for a roll call. The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, that the House concur in the adoption of Senate Amendments B, C, D and F. Is the House ready for the question?

Will all those who favor the adoption of these Senate amendments in concurrence, please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to accept the Senate amendments prevailed.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to recede from the adoption of House Amendment "E" and indefinitely postpone it in concurrence? Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if it would be in order I would like to move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all of its accompanying papers, and speak briefly to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentlewoman that the motion is now in order and the Chair understands the gentlewoman to move the indefinite postponement of this Bill and all accompanying papers; and the gentlewoman may speak to her motion.

Mrs. SMITH: I would like to read to you an editorial in the Kennebec Journal of Friday, May 15, which I think says better than I can what I would like to say to you. It says,

"Shouldn't Maine's two political parties compete for the responsibility rather than the credit for minimum wage legislation?"

"Of course everyone who stands to get a raise will love it.

"But many other serious questions have been raised by those who will pay the bills. One is a rather serious claim that many people of limited or handicapped capacities working for modest pay in retail and service establishments would be raised right out of their jobs.

"Another is that the legislation now shaping up would be so extremely 'liberal' that Maine would be placed at a great competitive disadvantage with other states.

"Quite disturbing are provisions that would allow the Department of Labor and Industry to examine all of an employer's books. Can it be that staid old Maine has moved this far off its bedrock of free enterprise?"

"On the other side of the coin are proponents' claims that Maine is far behind the times in wage legislation, and that its representatives are out of touch with the people in this respect.

"It would seem a great deal more debate is needed on these and other counter claims before taking the plunge. If it is to be taken, perhaps a great deal more work needs to be done, especially in behalf of those who might be hurt by legislation they think will help them.

"As for the bandwagon scramble, aren't the great majority of Maine voters serious minded people who place responsibility above expediency?"

And I am sure that there are enough members in the House this afternoon who may well take this to heart and I hope you will go along with my motion to indefinitely postpone, and I ask for a roll call when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti.

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question through the Chair, please, of the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. ALIBERTI: Would you be kind enough to tell me who wrote that article?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, who may answer if she chooses.

Mrs. SMITH: I would not be able to tell you the name of the person but I am sure it could be obtained from the Kennebec Journal editorial staff.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: A great many of the people in my area take the K.J., but none of them have ever told me that they thought that they sent me up here to do what the K.J. wanted done or what the editorial writers thought should be done. They sent me up here to do what I thought was best inasmuch as I have served them in several different ways in my home area, and I am quite surprised that we are going to try and have the newspapers continue to run the affairs of this Legislature. I am sure that you ladies and gentlemen who are sent here, your people expected you to decide this on its own merits, and I hope when the vote is taken that you do decide it on the merits as you feel and vote as you do feel. I hope this indefinite postponement does not prevail, because it surely will make us look real silly to our people back home if we indefinitely postpone it at this time.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I only wish to correct the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis. I did not ask him to vote as the newspaper printed, I only reminded him that they had said the way I felt much nicer than I would be able to say it.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, now that we are reading and quoting the editorial writers, I would like to put into the records of the House an editorial by James Keller of the New York Mirror on Monday, April 27, 1959: "The annual income of the nation's nearly 44 million families during 1957 may interest you. Here are the Census Bureau figures:

"Four million families received \$10,000 or more;

"Eighteen million had incomes from \$5,000 to \$10,000;

"Fifteen million were in the \$2,000 to \$5,000 range;

"Six and one half million received less than \$2,000 annually.

"Note that while 22 million families received \$5,000 or more in income, approximately the same number took in less than \$5,000 annually.

"If you are blessed with more than the average of worldly goods, help those less fortunate. If you do you will contribute to the economic stability of everyone. Standards of living that include more than the bare essentials of life benefit one and all alike.

"It is a Christlike service to show the same reasonable concern for the economic improvement of the poor that you would expect if you were in their place."

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milbridge, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House: I rise in support of the motion of the lady from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith. I am sure you all know how I feel about minimum wage. I expressed it on the floor of this House some time ago, and I am still not clear, and I do not believe that we can legislate prosperity in the State of Maine. We tried it in the nation and we did not become successful even then. I am more opposed to this Minimum Wage Bill now with its various amendments than I was in the beginning. I think the machinery of this and the many exemptions is going to be a tremendous tax burden to the people of the State of Maine. We will have

to set up a bureau in the State Department to take care of this thing that will cost I know from \$15,000 to \$20,000. I don't see how it can be helped.

I notice in here too in the declaration of policy it says this: "to provide adequate maintenance and to protect their health and to be fairly commensurate with the value of the services rendered." I think that is quite an important thing, commensurate with the value rendered to the employer. I said this before on the floor of this House that a dollar minimum is not needed in the State of Maine because those who are able to earn a dollar an hour are being paid one dollar an hour, and I think some many more. I think a dollar minimum is too little. That is why I oppose this Minimum Wage Law, and I speak about the women who are not able to earn one dollar an hour but they are able, under the present laws, to earn some money because they don't come under the federal bill.

I hope the ladies and gentlemen of this House will give serious consideration to the cost of administering this Bill if it becomes effective with its various amendments. This should deserve your serious consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Dumaine.

Mr. DUMAINE: Mr. Speaker, I have become just a little bit confused. I would like to have the Clerk read off by file number the amendments that have been attached to this Bill.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the filing numbers of all the amendments.

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am curious, does that mean just the amendments that have been actually adopted?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Readfield who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. DUMAINE: Actually adopted. The ones actually adopted, that have been adopted here today and

those of the members of the other body that are added to this. In other words, all of the filing numbers attached now for becoming law.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the filing numbers of the amendments actually adopted in addition to those which were adopted in the other branch.

The CLERK: House Amendment "A" with filing number 319 adopted in the House on May 7, adopted in the Senate in concurrence on May 14. House Amendment "C" filing number 338 adopted in the House on May 7 and in the Senate on May 14. House Amendment "G" adopted in the House today, May 20 and will be sent up for concurrence, filing number 383. Senate Amendment "B" filing number 379 was adopted in the Senate on May 14 and has been adopted in the House on May 20, and on the same date Senate Amendment "C" with filing number 380 was adopted by the branches, and on the same date Senate Amendment "D", filing number 381 adopted in both branches, and Senate Amendment "F" with filing number 382 also adopted by each branch on the dates given, May 14 in the Senate and May 20 in the House.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, on the amendments I would like to read the Senate ones and make a brief statement. Filing number 379 exempts any individual employed in a business or service establishment which has three or less employees in any one location. Filing number 380 or employed in a private hospital. Filing number 381 exempts any individual employed as a waiter, waitress or service employee who receives the major portion of his remuneration in the form of gratuities, and filing number 382 exempts those employees of summer camps for boys or girls under the age of 19 who are counselors or junior counselors or are regularly enrolled in an educational institution, or are on vacation therefrom.

Originally we had a Bill that quite a few felt that there were not enough exemptions. Others felt

there were too many exemptions, but this has been compromised down to a point where it is time to say stop, and I do not believe that anyone can justify voting against this if they sincerely believe in a minimum wage with the excuse that it has too many amendments, and I hope that when the vote is taken that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state the pending question. The pending question is the motion of the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, that the Bill and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, has a roll call been requested?

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a motion to reconsider, but I intend to vote for this Bill, but I would like to inform the membership in my opinion House Amendment "G" which was passed absolutely nullifies the intent of this Act. I do hope, however, that we have got recourse somewhere else to take care of this one.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, that Bill "An Act to Establish a Minimum Wage" and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been requested.

For the Chair to order a roll call, the Chair must have an expression of a desire for a roll call on the part of one-fifth of the Members of the House.

Will those who favor a roll call please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered.

Mr. Sanborn of Gorham, who would have voted "yes" had he voted, was excused from voting as he

paired his vote with the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Caron, who was absent but would have voted "no" were he present.

Mr. Dudley of Enfield, who would have voted "no" was excused from voting as he paired his vote with the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Danes, who was absent but would have voted "yes" were he present.

Mr. Bragdon of Perham, who would have voted "yes" was excused from voting as he paired his vote with the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, who was absent but would have voted "no" were he present.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, that Bill "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage" Senate Paper 472, Legislative Document 1337, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. If you favor the indefinite postponement of this Bill you will say "yes" when your name is called, and if you oppose the indefinite postponement, you will say "no." The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Bacon, Baker, Brockway, Brown, Bangor; Brown, Ellsworth; Call, Carter, Carville, Caswell, Chapman, Norway; Clark, Cousins, Dumaine, Dunn, Edmunds, Ervin, Good, Graves, Hancock, Hanson, Bradford; Hardy, Harrington, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Jewett, Kennedy, Knapp, Lindsay, Linnell, Mathieson, Monroe, Morse, Perry, Easton; Philbrick, Rollins, Smith, Exeter; Smith, Falmouth; Turner, Walter, Whitman, Williams, Winchenpaw.

NAY — Aliberti, Beane, Briggs, Brown, Cape Elizabeth; Cahill, Chapman, Gardiner; Cormier, Cote, Couture, Cox, Coyne, Crockett, Curtis, Cyr, Augusta; Cyr, Fort Kent; Davis, Calais; Davis, Westbrook; Dean, Dennett, Dennison, Desmarais, Dodge, Dostie, Dow, Dufour, Dumais, Earles, Edgerly, Edwards, Raymond; Edwards, Stockton Springs; Emmons, Frazier, Gallant, Hanson, Lebanon; Harris, Haughn, Heald, Healy, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hilton, Hughes, Jacques, Jalbert, Jewell, Johnson, Karkos, Kilroy, Kinch, Knight, Lancaster,

Lane, Lantagne, Lebel, Lemelin, Letourneau, Lowery, Maddox, Mathews, Maxwell, Mayo, Miller, Moore, Nadeau, Pert, Pike, Pitts, Plante, Porell, Prue, Rankin, Reed, Rowe, Madawaska; Saunders, Storm, Tardiff, Treworgy, Trumbull, Wade, Walls, Walsh, Weston, Aheaton, Whiting, Young.

ABSENT — Barnett, Baxter, Ber-
man, Boone, Caron, Choate, Christie,
Danes, Doyle, Hutchinson, Jones,
Kellam, Lacharite, Parsons, Perry,
Hampden; Rowe, Limerick; Rus-
sell, Stanley, Warren.

EXCUSED — Bragdon, Dudley,
Sanborn.

Yes 42, No 86, Absent 18, Ex-
cused 3.

The SPEAKER: Forty - two hav-
ing voted in the affirmative, eighty-
six having voted in the negative,
with eighteen absent and three ex-
cused, the motion to indefinitely
postpone does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed
to be engrossed as amended
by House Amendments "A", "C",
"D" and "F" in non-concurrence
and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now
lays before the House the second
tabled and today assigned matter,
House Report "Ought to pass" in
New Draft, House Paper 967, Legis-
lative Document 1373, New Title,
Bill "An Act to Revise the Maine
Housing Authorities Act," House
Paper 68, Legislative Document 106,
tabled on May 15 by the gentleman
from Portland, Mr. Miller, pending
acceptance; and the Chair recog-
nizes that gentleman.

Thereupon, on motion of that gen-
tleman, the "Ought to pass" Re-

port was accepted, the Bill read
twice and tomorrow assigned.

The gentlewoman from Portland,
Mrs. Hendricks, presented the fol-
lowing order out of order and
moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the
House have learned that yesterday
was the birthday of Henry "Hank"
Magnusen, TV Cameraman of
WCSH-TV,

BE IT ORDERED, that the mem-
bers of the House extend belated
birthday greetings to this fine, young
man and their best wishes for the
entire year.

The Order received passage. (Ap-
plause)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-
nizes the gentleman from Rockland,
Mr. Knight.

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, at
this time I would move to re-
consider item number one, Bill "An
Act Establishing a Minimum Wage"
and our action whereby we passed
it to be engrossed with the various
amendments, and I strongly urge
all here to vote against me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman
from Rockland, Mr. Knight, moves
that the House reconsider its action
whereby it passed to be engrossed
Bill "An Act Establishing a Mini-
mum Wage" as amended. Will
those who favor the motion to re-
consider please say aye; those op-
posed, no.

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

On motion of Mr. Perry of
Easton,

Adjourned until nine o'clock to-
morrow morning.