

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 27, 1959

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Douglas H. Robbins of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate Senate Reports of Committees Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Repealing Certain Disqualifications of Benefits under Employment Security Law" (H. P. 397) (L. D. 580) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on May 6.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Treworgy of Orono, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law" (H. P. 649) (L. D. 940) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 20.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. TREWORGY: Mr. Speaker, I move we insist and that a Committee of Conference be appointed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Orono, Mr. Treworgy, moves that the House insist and requests a Committee of Conference.

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would now move that we recede and concur with the action previously taken by the Senate. This as you know is the bill which would increase the weekly benefits under the Workmen's Compensation Act

in a modest degree. It was previously blocked, I recall, by approximately one or two or three votes — well, my gentleman advises me it was eleven and he is probably correct.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, that on Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law" the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I hope that we are all aware of the background of this L. D. 940. It came out of Committee nine to one "Ought to pass." It lost about a week ago in the House, sixty-eight to sixty-seven on a call vote, and the Act itself or the legislation is a very worthy piece of legislation. The cost is very minor, and it enables a worker to receive an increase in benefits based on the cost of living since the last legislative session, so when you vote — the motion now is to recede and concur, Mr. Speaker? I would hope that you would go along with the motion to recede and concur with the Senate.

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

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire the way that Bill came out of Committee. I have memories that it was the item one that came out nine to one, and it was item one that was lost sixty-seven to sixty-eight. I think that item two was quite a different report from Committee and some different vote here on the floor.

The SPEAKER: Was the gentleman definitely asking a question or stating his belief in the matter?

Mr. HARDY: I was asking if that was available.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will announce the report. Would the gentleman defer just a moment, please.

The CLERK: The Majority Report "Ought to pass" with Committee Amendment "A" was signed by eight members of the Committee. The Minority Report "A", that is "Ought to pass" with Committee Amendment "B", was signed by one

of the House members of the Committee, and the Minority Report "B" was signed by one of the House members of the Committee, and the House voted on May 19 to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" Report.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I still think there is a little misunderstanding here because if we are working on item two on page one, it says this was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 20. I don't think the Clerk said — he said it was passed in the House I thought.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will continue to read the action of the House.

The CLERK: The Majority Report "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" was accepted on May 19 and the Bill given its first two readings, Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted and the next legislative day assigned for third reading. The Bill on May 20 was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading as no further verbal amendments necessary and on May 20 was read the third time, and then indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

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

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, that with respect to item number two, Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Injuries under Workmen's Compensation Law," the House recede and concur. A division has been requested.

Will all those in favor of the motion to recede and concur please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-nine having voted in the affirmative and forty-two having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Swan's Island for Aid Extended to Leverett and Marie Carter (H. P. 437) (L. D. 643) on which the House accepted the Majority "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee on Claims and passed the Resolve to be engrossed on April 30.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Hughes of St. Albans, the House voted to adhere.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Joint Resolution Memorializing Congress to Equalize Wage Rates between Boston and Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyards (H. P. 913) (L. D. 1287) which was adopted in the House on April 22.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I move that we insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, moves that the House insist and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am very much amazed at the gentleman from Kittery moving to insist on this matter when he has voted against every labor bill in this House.

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

Mr. DESMARAIS: Mr. Speaker, does the motion to recede and concur—

The SPEAKER: A motion to recede and concur would take precedence over a motion to insist.

Mr. DESMARAIS: Well, I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Desmarais, that the House recede and concur.

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

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

Nineteen having voted in the affirmative and ninety-seven having voted in the negative, the motion to recede and concur did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is the motion of the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, that the House insist and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act relating to Open Season for Fishing on Brooks and Streams in Cumberland County (H. P. 240) (L. D. 351) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 25, and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" on April 24.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Brown of Cape Elizabeth, the House voted to insist and request a Committee of Conference.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Establishing Columbus Day as a Legal Holiday" (S. P. 416) (L. D. 1200) which was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence in the House on May 23.

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

Messrs. BOUCHER of Androscoggin
LESSARD of Androscoggin
HUNT of Kennebec

In the House:

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

Mr. LINNELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adhere to our former action.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Linnell, moves that the House adhere. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

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

Thereupon, a viva voce vote being doubted, on motion of Mr. Linnell of South Portland, a division of the House was had.

Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and sixty-one having voted in the negative, the motion to adhere prevailed.

Orders

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

Mr. Carville of Eustis presented the following Order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the House have learned that today is the birthday of Mr. Harris of Greenville,

BE IT ORDERED, that the members of the House extend to Mr. Harris their congratulations and their best wishes not only for today but for the entire year.

The Order received unanimous passage. (Applause)

In motion of Mr. Knight of Rockland, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Hancock of Nobleboro be excused from attendance for the duration of his illness.

House Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Vocational Educational Institute in Presque Isle (H. P. 232) (L. D. 343)

Report was read.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, I move we substitute the Bill for the Report and I would like to speak on that motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman may proceed.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A week ago we heard this gentleman from Connecticut telling about the importance of vocational schools. Last year we had a research committee who made a survey of the State of Maine and in the report on that survey it is stated: The Board of Education was asked to support a research project to determine the needs for vocational education in Maine. This they did by allocating approximately \$20,000 from the George Briggs fund for this purpose. Eight men were employed for a six week period during the summer of 1958 for the purpose of personally interviewing approximately 1,200 employers regarding their opinions and convictions as they related to vocational training needs. The names of employers for this purpose were selected from the files of the Maine Employment Security Commission. Organizations contacted represented approximately 70,000 employees, about one-fourth of the working force in Maine.

A panel of sixteen persons was given the responsibility of evaluating the results of the research and other available information and to make recommendations in respect to the means by which needed vocational training in Maine might be provided.

The following are some of the conclusions reached:

The vocational education study reveals the existence of extensive and varied needs for vocational and technical education in Maine which are not now being met.

Public secondary schools in Maine have never been able to provide adequately the needed vocational education.

In order to meet the needs, it is necessary to establish such programs on an area basis.

There is a fundamental need for more and better vocational guidance and counseling throughout the Maine School System.

Many employers emphasized the need for better education.

Many states have developed or are in process of developing area vocational programs.

Facilities for providing skilled training for Maine people would be a desirable asset in the further industrialization of Maine.

The Committee has gone into detail in summarizing the needs. They have specified several areas of need in this field. They recommend that steps be taken to establish a system of area vocational schools to serve Maine youth and adults.

Without going into more detail may I say that one of the locations recommended was Presque Isle. The report stated that 700 to 850 students would be interested in the area around this city. This is an estimate. Because Presque Isle has a possible location which could be available we feel that this is an ideal location for a pilot school of this type. There is available housing for such a school at the Northern Maine Sanatorium, consequently it would be less expensive to set up a school there than to start where facilities are completely lacking and would have to be constructed at great expense to the state.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the unanimous "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee, I move that this Bill be substituted for the Report, and then I would like to make another motion following that.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, that with respect to Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Vocational Educational Institute in Presque Isle, the Bill be substituted for the Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: The price tag on this bill was \$250,000. The Committee did not feel that we were ready to take on the whole vocational program at this time, so consequently we passed out this Bill and others like it "Ought not to pass." We felt that a study should be made and the whole problem should be referred to the next legislature under the general vocational bill of the gentleman from the other side

of the hall, I hope the motion to substitute the Bill for the Report does not prevail.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, my purpose was to move that this Bill be referred to the 100th Legislature.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? Will all those who favor the motion to substitute the Bill for the Report please say aye; those opposed no.

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

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Primary Voltage Distribution System at Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 477) (L. D. 695)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for a Parking Space Adjacent to the Industrial Arts Building at Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 478) (L. D. 696)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of a Gymnasium at Farmington State Teachers' College (H. P. 528) (L. D. 763)

Mr. Davis from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Construction of an Incinerator at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 259) (L. D. 391)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Campus Roads and Walks at Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 474) (L. D. 692)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Stand-by Emergency Power at Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 475) (L. D. 693)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for an Industrial Arts Building at Gorham State

Teachers' College (H. P. 476) (L. D. 694)

Mr. Edwards from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Remodeling of Aubert Hall, North End, at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 264) (L. D. 396)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for Completing the Wings of Boardman Hall at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 265) (L. D. 397)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Certain Projects at Gorham State Teachers' College" (H. P. 384) (L. D. 567)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Improvements to the Women's Dormitory at Washington State Teachers' College (H. P. 433) (L. D. 639)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of an Athletic Field at Washington State Teachers' College (H. P. 434) (L. D. 640)

Mrs. Smith from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Construction of a Women's Physical Education Building at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 231) (L. D. 342)

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of a Women's Dormitory at Farmington State Teachers' College (H. P. 467) (L. D. 685)

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for a Natatorium Addition to the Multi-Purpose Building at Aroostook State Teachers' College (H. P. 468) (L. D. 686)

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Vocational Educational Institute in Androscoggin County (H. P. 470) (L. D. 688)

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for the Renovation of Corthell Hall, First and Third Floors, at Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 472) (L. D. 690)

Same member from same Committee reported same on Resolve

Appropriating Moneys for a Parking Space Adjacent to the Physical Education Building at Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 473) (L. D. 691)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mrs. Smith from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill, "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Completion of Music Section of Multi-Purpose Building at Aroostook State Teachers' College" (H. P. 380) (L. D. 563)

Report was read.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Bill be substituted for the Report and I would like to speak to that motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman may proceed.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: This music center which is being requested is to be a part of the multi-purpose building which is in process of construction. To delay the completion of this center for two years or more would be expensive, since it would mean remodelling rather than simply including it in a building now under construction.

The music center would contribute to a unification of facilities. The stage of the multi-purpose building would then serve as a band room. Three offstage rooms would serve as practice rooms. Until an adjoining classroom, originally planned but omitted because of insufficient funds, is available, arrangements for classroom space will need to be continued in another building. Such arrangements will make necessary supervision difficult for both instructor and student.

The center would create better working conditions, thereby making it more easily possible to obtain and retain qualified personnel. Inadequate facilities scattered over the campus add to the work load of the instructor and decrease his efficiency. We have been most fortunate in the quality of instruction in this area. The college has had Professor Jan Kok who has been on leave of absence to direct the Educational TV program in music

education this year, and he will return to Aroostook State Teachers' College next fall. He has much to offer. He should not be handicapped.

We mentioned the saving which would be effected by the completion of the music center this year, or with the construction of the building. The cost of this additional classroom, office, and two storage rooms compares most favorably with the cost of similar facilities because it can readily be added to the building presently nearing completion. A delay in this project will nullify the saving that would result from completing this center at this time.

The increasing size of entering classes requires additional classrooms that will accommodate classes of this size. An alternate solution will be smaller classes and an additional number of faculty members over and above the number requested. In other words, delay in supplying this music center will result in increased expense of operation and delay much needed coordination in this area.

This music center would cost approximately \$26,000, and it seems to me that it would be poor economy to delay the action in constructing this music center because of what it would mean to the school and what it would mean in the savings in construction if we had to do it later on, and, Mr. Speaker, I move the substitution of the Bill for the Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, moves that with respect to Bill "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Completion of Music Section of Multi-Purpose Building at Aroostook State Teachers' College," the Bill be substituted for the Report and the gentlewoman requests a division.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As with many of these Reports we are sending out this morning, these are over in sections C and D in your Capital Improvements and I would call your attention to the fact that in that grey book it is set up to the extent of \$12,000,000 and beyond that everything is in C and D as

being highly desirable but not necessary. I will also call to your attention that the different people concerned are allowed to set up their own priorities by the B.P.I. and therefore if Aroostook State Teachers' College has considered this a high priority it would have been over in its first few millions, so on that basis the Committee felt they must sign out an "Ought not to pass" Report, and I hope the motion of the gentlewoman does not prevail.

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

Will all those who favor substituting the Bill for the Report please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Eleven having voted in the affirmative and ninety-three having voted in the negative, the motion to substitute the Bill for the Report did not prevail.

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of thirty pupils from the Colburn School of Pittston, accompanied by their teacher Mrs. George Lamson, and a group of pupils from the East Pittston Village School, accompanied by Mrs. George D. Crocker, their teacher. On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to all of you ladies and gentlemen a most cordial and hearty welcome and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit here today. (Applause)

Mr. STANLEY from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for the Construction of a Building for the University Press at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 262) (L. D. 394)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for Remodeling Aubert Hall, South End, at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 263) (L. D. 395)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Construction of Men's Dormitory at Maine Vocational Technical Institute" (H. P. 709) (L. D. 1014)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Stanley from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Providing Funds for School Lunch Subsidy (H. P. 802) (L. D. 1141)

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Patten, Mrs. Harrington.

Mrs. HARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I know better than to make a motion on this but I just want you to know what this is all about. If you find that your school lunch is not functioning, you lack funds and you want matching funds from the State, it will be necessary for you to raise money here today.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House to accept the Committee Report?

The motion prevailed and the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Covered by Other Legislation Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

Mr. Bragdon from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for Enlarging and Extending the Sewer System at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 338) (L. D. 498), as it is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Brown from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Expansion of the Steam Plant at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 336) (L. D. 496), as it is covered by other legislation.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Bacon of Sidney, the Reports were tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session pending acceptance.

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Af-

fairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve to Complete the Classroom and Library Building at Gorham State Teachers' College (H. P. 53) (L. D. 75), as it is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Davis from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Remodeling of Wingate Hall at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 261) (L. D. 393), as it is covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Construction of Service Buildings at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 337) (L. D. 497), as it is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Stanley from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Construction of a Classrooms, Laboratories and Library Building at the University of Maine in Orono" (H. P. 80) (L. D. 127), as it is covered by other legislation.

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to appropriate Moneys for Capital Improvements and Construction of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961" (H. P. 103) (L. D. 159) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 973) (L. D. 1384) under title of "An Act to appropriate Moneys for Capital Improvements, Construction, Repairs, Equipment, Supplies and Furnishings for Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961 and Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of Six Million Dollars" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. ROGERSON of Aroostook
PIERCE of Hancock
DUQUETTE of York
— of the Senate.

Messrs. DAVIS of Calais
EDWARDS of Raymond
JACQUES of Lewiston
BRAGDON of Perham
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. SMITH of Falmouth
Messrs. BROWN of Ellsworth
STANLEY of Bangor
— of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I fail to see this L. D., this New Draft 1384, and I move that it lie on the table until that is produced. They are distributing it now. I move this be laid on the table until tomorrow until we have a chance to look at the New Draft.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from Belfast approach the rostrum?

(Conference at rostrum)

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion and move this be tabled until later in today's session, this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins withdraws his motion and now moves that both Reports be tabled until later in today's session pending acceptance of either Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey (S. P. 501) (L. D. 1383)

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

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask what the price tag is on this.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, has addressed a question through the Chair as to the price tag attached to this Bill. Anyone may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, the original request was for \$15,000.

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

Mr. DUMAINE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: This piece of legislation came out once before, not before this group but a group prior to this and a temporary survey was told to the public as being made. I understand that they did not make the survey, but with the fast growing industry of aeronautics especially for private concerns, I believe should be up to a federal situation and not a state. You take your high speed jets, transportation of persons, freight later on, will need bigger and better airports than we can put in the localities. I therefore move that we indefinitely postpone this L. D. 1383 and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Dumaine, that the House indefinitely postpone Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta-Waterville Airport Survey.

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

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I am not positive if I understand this correctly but we had a new draft on our desk yesterday L. D. 1383 and in that new draft it says that the Aeronautics Commission make such funds available for aeronautical fund which in the opinion of the Commission is necessary, etc., and in the original draft L. D. 29 it stated that the \$15,000 should come out of the general fund and unappropriated surplus. So I would like to ask through the Chair of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, if in the new interpretation of this thing if the funds perhaps would be coming from a different source and would not affect our budget, now I am not sure.

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

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. STANLEY: In the last session of the legislature we had this

same bill before us and the Appropriations Committee sent the bill out giving the Aeronautics Commission the right to make the survey, but we left off the \$15,000 which they requested to do the survey with, feeling that at that time there was enough money in the Aeronautics Commission fund to take care of the survey. The survey was not made, so in this session we have a bill before us to appropriate \$15,000 from the general fund for the survey of the Augusta-Waterville airport. The Committee felt the same as it did two years ago, that there are funds in the Aeronautics Commission but last time we gave them the right to expend funds for this. This time we have directed them to expend funds and the figure of \$15,000 was the top figure although it is not specified in here. We said the funds necessary to make the survey. I am sure that they would not go over the \$15,000 because I don't think they have that amount of money. That was the thinking of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

Mr. BARNETT: Not a hundred per cent. I am still a little confused. Is it coming out of their budget or the general fund budget?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, may answer.

Mr. STANLEY: I am sorry. It will not come out of the general fund. It will come out of the Aeronautics Commission budget which is already taken care of. It will not be another appropriation.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

Mr. BARNETT: Yes, and if I could, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make an additional statement.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BARNETT: Therefore under those conditions I hope the motion of the gentleman from Readfield does not prevail because there is a need for this study. For example in Augusta the airport is not even adequate, or Waterville, for the Convairs to fly in here and so they have to rely still on just the two-engine small planes for all of their

air travel and the Augusta airport is not in a position where it can be extended any more to provide for the Convairs, and if we are going to have service to keep up with the times something has got to be done. I was on the Board two years ago and was somewhat abreast of this situation and the Northeast Airlines people, for example, feel that one centrally located airport of adequate size would be more economical for everyone concerned and that is why they would like to see such a study made, and I feel that the thing is highly desirable at this time. Thank you.

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

Mr. COYNE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As representative from Waterville, I would like to concur with what the Augusta representative has just said.

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

Mr. LANE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is not an Augusta - Waterville Airport, this is a Central Maine part Airport. This involves the Somerset County and all the small counties located in this central part of Maine. We all know that we cannot land any large airplanes in Waterville. We cannot land them in Augusta and I think it is about time we do something about it, and I hope that the motion of my good friend, Mr. Dumaine, does not prevail.

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

Mr. BARNETT: When the vote is taken, I request a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested.

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

Mr. DUMAINE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: If you try to catch a railroad train by stopping in any of the small stops, you have time to just about make it. Now if you build an airport outside of the city limits, way over, how are outlying district people going to be able to get to those planes on time without speeding or having

a highway system to set up for getting them back and forth, also the cost of travel and time is a necessary element, and I say keep our airports where we have them and expend money on those airports rather than to go out somewhere else. I definitely hope my motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

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

Mr. DOSTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to be opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Dumaine. I feel this should have been done two years ago. We had two sites two years ago, one of them has been taken away on this freeway that goes through Sidney and through Waterville. There is another site between Winslow and Augusta, which site is situated in Vassalboro, and I want to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Readfield.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Dumaine, that the House indefinitely postpone Resolve Authorizing Aeronautics Commission to Conduct an Augusta - Waterville Airport Survey, Senate Paper 501, Legislative Document 1383. A division has been requested.

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

A division of the House was had.

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

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

Amended Bill

Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Town of Robbinston for Development of Recreational Areas (S. P. 362) (L. D. 1045)

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

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question through the Chair of some member of the Appropriations Committee regarding this Resolve. It has always been my understanding that the Park Department was the department that handled recreation in the state and I just do not understand why state money should be given to some town or city to develop their recreational areas. I wish this question could be answered.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member of the Appropriations Committee who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: The Park Department does of course handle the State Parks in the State of Maine, but I think we all believe that when the local communities are willing to take the labor of fixing up facilities on their own that we should help them to do it. We provide subsidies for the schools and subsidies for various other situations. I think that providing \$5,000 for this particular town will pay dividends to the state, that they will provide recreational areas which we would not otherwise have, and they will provide them for less cost than we could do it through the state department.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

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

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to also ask a question. The question is: Does the State derive any benefits financially from this appropriation that is asked for in this particular bill? Talk about everything that the State could do. I know that Lewiston, for instance, has a recreational area down there. Now could they come in and ask for funds to promote the recreational park down in Lewiston? Or any other part of the state just because they are furnishing recreational services for the people of the State of Maine? So the question I would like answered is whether or not the

State is deriving any financial aid from this.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, has asked a question through the Chair to any member of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the State would derive considerable benefit because it is proposed to have picnic sites, tenting and camping areas available and they are putting in some type of public landing on the lake there that will open up this natural tourist area to many, many more tourists who will come into the area and leave their money not only there but in all parts of the state.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

Mr. ALIBERTI: Definitely not. I still want to know if the State derives any financial benefit from it. I am not talking about the benefits derived from the campers there. All campers that go to these camping areas derive benefits.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, the benefits which the State would derive from this particular project is something that you can't count perhaps on your hands but it is like the money which we advertise the State. We advertise and promote the State with money. We can't say that money comes back into our hands from that but we are all aware that the money does come. How much financial gain the State will get from this is something that you and I might differ on but certainly if these people are willing to do these things and to promote the recreation facilities in the State of Maine, it does bring money to the state.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am a little bit leary regarding this bill. I am not against the Town of Robbinston or any other town in the state that wants money for recreational purposes, but at the start of this session I worked with a group of pri-

vate citizens who are in the process of developing camping and recreational areas with private funds. We had quite a discussion with the head of the Park Division regarding camping areas, and state camping areas at the present moment are going to go up on their prices for overnight camping from \$1.00 to \$1.50 to come more in line with the private enterprise who charge \$2.00.

Now this Resolve right here I think is again state, local, city governments slowly infringing and getting into the private motel business. I am definitely against the State of Maine being in the motel business with any more increase in their camping areas. I believe that private enterprise should be encouraged and helped in any way to develop this type of recreation. I do know that in the past year that private enterprise has completely outstripped the State of Maine in developing camping areas and day recreational parks. I really think that it is a step that is going to continue in that direction. There are a lot of young, aggressive men in the State right at the moment who are getting into this field of enterprise, and I think it will be eventually another industry that the State will have, and even though I very reluctantly will do this, I am going to ask this House to rescind its vote for third reading and indefinitely postpone this measure.

THE SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, that the House indefinitely postpone Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Town of Robbinston for Development of Recreational Areas.

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

MR. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, this situation in Robbinston is unusual, maybe it is unique. If not, it is unusual in this that the folks in the town are willing to put in their own labor and work for not—it isn't state enterprise, it isn't exactly private enterprise, but it is community enterprise. Now there are back from the shore in this town of Robbinston several very attractive lakes. The old roads that used to lead to them have gradually been abandoned and are hardly passable. The selectmen of the town have got a group

together that is willing, starting now I believe, to swamp out those trails, getting open places by the shores of the lakes so that people can come in there. You ask about the benefit to the State of Maine. It is just a general benefit that you get from the tourist business. This area is not yet developed to the point where private enterprise can see any profit in putting motels or camps by the shores of these ponds. It may very well be that after the initial work has been done with this small amount of money, I thought if they had asked for \$100,000 they would probably have got it, asking for \$5,000 is such a small thing that it is easy to throw away, but it means a very great deal to this town to get a little money matched by much labor to open up some areas which have really been in effect closed to the tourists who go down on number one highway. I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

MR. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to add one other word to what my good friend from Lubec, Mr. Pike said, and that is that the local grangers in four or five of the neighboring towns are taking a very active part in this development and those granges have not only contributed labor but they are putting in some of their own money into this thing, and it has real substance behind it, and we don't have any state parks in Washington County, and we feel that if our folks are willing to get together and promote something like this that it isn't unreasonable to request the State to perhaps provide a few of the tools so that they can go ahead and do the rest of the work themselves.

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

MRS. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about this. You know I find myself in complete agreement with the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, and also with the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Pike. I do feel that we should encourage private enter-

prise, but this is an unusual situation down there, and the townspeople voted at their town meeting to appropriate, I have forgotten the sum, I don't have my notes over here, but I figured it up as I recall from memory something like \$50. per resident to go toward that. There are only six hundred people or something in the town. I think they have really made something of a sacrifice to start this thing, and there are eleven lakes down there, and with all the talk there is about no water fronts, I just felt from my position on the Committee that we ought to do something to encourage this effort and then see if it wouldn't spread. I would not be in favor of continuing it.

You also must remember that when the State Park Commission does things, you pay for the maintenance, the capital improvements always, and when they tell you they made a profit, they only made a profit on the fees they took in and the general maintenance and not on the capital improvements.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very much in sympathy with the people from down in Washington County. I know that they need this probably to help their economy and so forth, but all we have heard all winter long is that this is a step in the — always going in one direction. We have had several bills that we have killed here during the winter, especially these tax or appropriation things. I am afraid that if we pass this resolve, two years from now every little town that has got a little pet project, they want to fix up their parks or something, they are going to be in here asking for an appropriation. I feel that possibly the town of Robbinston definitely has a good project started, but I feel that they are using the wrong vehicle to arrive at their destination. I think if they would go through the Park Department, the Park Department, I have just gone through this new L. D. that has been brought out here, it looks to me as though the Park Department is going to be rolling in money the next two years, providing it is

passed. I think they should take this resolve and their problems through the Park Department and get their money in that way. When the vote is taken I request a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Edwards.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We all know the conditions in Washington County, and I think that if we can do something for these people to help them out we should do it. Now we have this little group of people down there belonging to this little subordinate grange who have started this project as part of their community service project for the year. They have done considerable work for themselves. They have gone to the municipalities and have received help from them and they have come to us as representatives from the different sections of this State to assist them in helping with this project, and all they are asking for is \$5,000. It seems to me that we should at least give them a little hand and help them out and perhaps do a little something more for Washington County, and I hope when the vote is taken that you will vote against the indefinite postponement of this bill.

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

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, to coin a phrase, a short time ago the terminology of open up the flood gates was used sparingly in this House. I am very much in sympathy with the people in Robbinston and that area, very much so. We talk about \$5,000 like it was just nothing at all when we come to the State Legislature, but look back to your own town government and when you mention \$5,000 in the town budget, it very easily could be sixty percent of the entire budget in most towns, but here in Augusta we figure \$5,000 is peanuts. Just who are we kidding? You will probably have requests in this House next year from a lot of little areas up in Rangeley that are just begging for an opportunity to come in and ask for some funds with which to promote their little

areas up there, and they really need them, they have some beautiful lakes up there. Now shall we open the flood gates and let them all in? If you want to set the precedent right here in this House I am very, very sure there are a lot of areas in my particular jurisdiction that would like to come in on it another session.

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

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am from Washington County and of course I am prejudiced about this little bill. I was very happy to see someone in the western and northern part of the State come to our defense. \$5,000 is only pocket change to what we are spending around here and no one is more economy-minded than I am in this House. I notice here in this L. D. that Washington State Teachers' College is only appropriated for 1960 and '61 the sum of \$9,900. Now I think we in Washington County have more friends than some people think, and I hope when this vote is taken we will see them standing.

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

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session I argued that we shouldn't worry about precedent when we were talking on bills or on legislation here. Now I am going to argue that the House did worry about precedent and I hope they continue to worry about precedent. I think this is an affair that should be handled by the Park Commission. There is a similar bill in for the Boone-Eastport outfit for a dam across a little river up there for a similar park. I would like to see an amendment on this bill if it goes through to help us with the one that we worked so hard to build over in Union. It is just as fair for one place as it is for another, and I think that it should go through the Park Department. This can go on and on and on.

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

Mayo, that the House indefinitely postpone Resolve Appropriating Moneys to Town of Robbinston for Development of Recreational Areas, Senate Paper 362, Legislative Document 1045, and a division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

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

Thereupon, the Resolve was given its second reading, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: At this time the Chair would recognize the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of students from the Bristol Consolidated School accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Ella Poole, by parents Mrs. Gail Poole, Mrs. Elizabeth Hanna and Mrs. Merle Norton. And also the presence in the gallery of the House of a group of sixty eighth grade students from Pittsfield accompanied by their Principal Luman Atwater, their teachers Eleanor Toothacher, Helen Chipman, Davin Morin, and Mrs. Malaika Russell. On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you ladies and gentlemen a most cordial and hearty welcome and we hope you will enjoy and profit by your visit here today.

(Applause)

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act Reactivating the State Committee on Aging (S. P. 492) (L. D. 1370)

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. 122 voted in favor of same and 2 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Revise the Inland Fish and Game Laws (S. P. 205) (L. D. 544)

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

**Enactor
Tabled**

An Act relating to the Amount of the Annual Excise Tax on Railroads (H. P. 254) (L. D. 365)

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

(On motion of Mr. Wade of Auburn, tabled unassigned pending passage to be enacted on a viva voce vote.)

Finally Passed

Resolve Opening Portland Lake in Aroostook County to Ice Fishing for Salmon and Trout (S. P. 114) (L. D. 264)

Resolve Opening Wilson Lake, Franklin County, to Ice Fishing (H. P. 66) (L. D. 104)

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

Resolve Providing that the Legislative Research Committee Study the State and Municipal Tax Structure of the State (H. P. 131) (L. D. 189)

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

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

Mr. PHILBRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would ask a question through the Chair of the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, with respect to this item six, does that not have an emergency clause?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Philbrick, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, who may answer if she chooses.

Miss CORMIER: Item six requests \$50,000, \$25,000 for each year of the biennium and it does have

an emergency clause I think, yes. Yes it does, Mr. Speaker, unless an amendment has been put on, and there are no amendments attached to it, so I would say that it did have an emergency clause.

The SPEAKER: For the information of the House, the Chair will instruct the Clerk to read Senate Amendment "A" which was adopted in the House on May 22nd. The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "A"

Senate Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk. (Filing 409)

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Bangor consider his question answered?

Mr. PHILBRICK: Before it is finally enacted does it not require still one hundred and one votes?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that Senate Amendment "A" read by the Clerk eliminated the emergency clause. That amendment was adopted in the House on May 22 and the Bill does no longer require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. PHILBRICK: Thank you.

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

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

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Yesterday at a meeting of the leadership of both parties, it was decided that if the House were willing, we might recess for a half hour so that the Democrats in the House might caucus before the tax bills were removed from the table. Therefore, I would now move that we recess for a half hour.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, moves that the House recess and reconvene at eleven o'clock. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House recessed.

After Recess

11:00 A.M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action

of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act Exempting Hospital Thrift Shops from Sales Tax" (H. P. 700) (L. D. 1000) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

MAYO of Bath

DENNETT of Kittery

LACHARITE of Brunswick

— Committee on part of House.

WILLEY of Hancock

WYMAN of Washington

FOURNIER of York

— Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Jacques de Lewiston presented the following Order out of order and moved its passage:

WHEREAS, the members of the House have learned that today is the birthday of Mr. Pert of Bath,

BE IT ORDERED, that the members of the House extend to Mr. Pert their congratulations and their best wishes not only for today but for the entire year.

The Order received unanimous passage. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair now lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" in New Draft, House Paper 963, Legislative Document 1365, (new title) of the Committee on Welfare on Bill "An Act Repealing Relative Responsibility in Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Disabled," House Paper 19, Legislative Document 28, tabled on May 20 by the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, pending the motion of the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to thank you first of all for the courtesy of permitting me to table the bill last week and one of the reasons that I stated at the time

that there would probably be better figures available for us regarding the amount of money required to service this bill. You will notice on your desks there have been two sheets that have been placed there regarding L. D. 28. The first sheet was released on January 26, and this other sheet was made available to me yesterday.

The required amount of state money to service L. D. 28 on the earlier figures was \$1,277,000. On the newly released figures the total amount of state moneys required is \$878,000. The reason for the difference between the two figures, a difference of \$400,000, is this: The Welfare Department has restudied their average grant on the basis of their experience from February through to May. The average grant now will be \$66 per month instead of \$67 and this will make it possible for us to make a substantial reduction there because anything over \$65 is straight state money. There is only \$1.00 of straight state money that is not matched by the federal government at this time. I would like to speak later on the new figures that have been released.

For a few moments I would like to give you my thinking on L. D. 28. First of all it would seem to me that one of the great tasks of the twentieth century, one of the great tasks that confronts us in all nations of the world and all communities is the final elimination of poverty. We have the technical know-how at our disposal to finally get at this great problem. It seems to me that we finally must find out who the poor are, where they are, and why they are poor. I think that one of our great tasks then is to initiate a frontal attack upon poverty, and to resolve to finally remove it entirely. I would propose to you today that L. D. 28 corners or focalizes an area of poverty and below subsistent living that exists in the State of Maine. I would propose for your consideration that there are two thousand, eight hundred and twenty people of our aged who are ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed. L. D. 28, if adopted by this House, will go a long ways in solving that problem. You will notice that in the title of the Bill in its redraft form it stated

"An Act repealing Relative Responsibility in Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Disabled." I would like to be clear on this point first of all that I believe in relative responsibility, and I would like to explain to you exactly what this bill does.

The bill removes relative responsibility and public assistance only in this way here, that it removes the income and assets of the adult child which are presently used to determine the eligibility or non-eligibility of the aged applicant applying for assistance. It does not destroy the moral nor the legal responsibility which adult children have to support their aged parents. I am not going to read you the section of the law, but if you would check you could turn to Chapter 166, Section 22 as amended by Chapter 141 of the Public Laws of 1955, with the moral obligation of children to support parents in need clearly stated.

L. D. 28 then does not remove this moral and legal obligation. It merely removes a qualifying rule in our public assistance law. I believe this, that it is the duty of children to support their parents in need. It is also the duty and obligation of parents to educate their children, and I would like to throw this out for your consideration. That our rule, it is the morally bound duty before God for parents to educate their children, in order to implement that moral and legal obligation we in the twentieth century and in our democratic community have chosen another way to do it. We have chosen our public schools to do it, and regardless of whether a parent is a taxpayer, a non-taxpayer, regardless of what his income may be, whether his income may be at the upper level, the middle level or the low level, the child is granted and the parent is obligated even to send that child to school. I propose to you that there is a similar analogy between L. D. 28 and our public school system.

I would like to talk a little bit about the public hearing. There were people from as far north as Veazie, Maine, as far south as Saco who came and attended the public hearing on L. D. 28. There was not

one opponent who appeared in opposition to the bill. Our former Senator Norman Ferguson attended that public hearing and spoke in favor of the bill and on his motion before the State Committee on the Aging the bill was endorsed as a prime need in our state. Town managers and other people all over the state have supported L. D. 28, and I am not going to read you all the letters, I am just going to read you some of the quotes from some of them. Some of them are from your own home towns. There is one in particular here from Bar Harbor, Town Manager Ralph F. Eye and he says: "the present administrative procedure is to arbitrarily refuse help to these classes of people if relatives within certain degrees have the ability to support them. The net result of this action is to throw the case load from the State to the various Towns, who may or may not attempt to recover from the relatives."

These cases that the Town does pick up, we should all keep this in our mind here, that there is no federal matching funds available for any town public assistance support. He goes on further and points out a very interesting thing here, he says that this whole procedure of relative responsibility is based on the present Section 20 of Chapter 94, Revised Statutes of 1954. "As a historical note" he goes on "the original passage of this act was in the Elizabethan Poor Law of 1602, brought to this country through the Massachusetts Bay Colony and later Commonwealth, and to the State of Maine in 1820. Its terms are almost unchanged through the three hundred and fifty years, and it would almost seem as if something should be done to bring the provisions up to date." He further says "In no case should the Department be empowered to refuse a needy case merely on the basis of responsible relatives, thus passing the buck to the towns and the general pauperization of the individual applicant."

Here is another one here from Sumner, Maine that I shall not read. Another one goes on from Waterville "From a practical and moral standpoint I feel that children definitely have an obligation

to support aged parents. However, the temper of the times has changed, and the present law results in the harshest of injustice upon elderly people who cannot bring themselves, and quite naturally so, to suing their children for support. I doubt that any person having any experience with the practical application of this law could come to any other conclusion than that it should be unreservedly abolished."

Another one from Phippsburg, Maine here says: "I offer any assistance" this is from James E. Chambers, Board of Selectmen, "I offer any assistance that I may be able to give you in the future to aid in the success of this bill."

From Peter Garland of Saco: "Children's responsibility to support needy parent is fine in theory, it has proven to be impracticable in application in far too many cases. Thus the aged continue to suffer regardless of the intent of the original legislation. Passage of L. D. 28 will be a big step forward in correcting gross injustice now unwittingly being imposed on a large segment of our aged and needy people."

From Milford Blackstone, Manager of Washburn: "Urge repeal of present law. Strongly support legislative document number 28 as proposed."

From Joachim Parent, Hamlin Plantation, Maine: "In favor of this bill."

Have another one here from East Holden, Maine, a Mr. Phillips from Augusta, the Overseer of the Poor in Elliottsville, Rangeley. We move on and on. I will go down to the last one here if I may. Finally there is one from the Town of Kennebunkport, Maine. Selectman from the Town of Kennebunkport, Maine he even goes a little further, he says he feels that people at the age of sixty-five should have the guarantee of subsistence of living, period, no qualifying rule whatsoever.

I would like to close on this. I think that these people, there are twenty-eight, two thousand eight hundred and twenty of them in the state. We have problems in our national economy as well as in our state economy with what we call

food surpluses. All of us know that for a number of years that our construction industry has been operating not at a maximum level of production. They have been holding back. We have our textile industries that are unable to find markets for items that they can produce. These are the things that these people use, and in that sense L. D. 28 can be justified on economic grounds. We have these surpluses, we have these things, we must set up the institutions to channel them to the people who need them and can use them.

I think our duty is very clear, and my duty is clear in this, if I am not clear and I am not carrying out if I don't state three things before I close. I know that first of all that there will be abuses. There will be some children who will be in the high income brackets there and they will turn their parents down for support. The parents will have to seek public assistance. I know this will happen. I believe, however, that those types of people who live in Maine are a very, very minority and infinitesimal number of people. I would stack up the abuses to the great good that this bill can do.

Number two, the revised figure of \$878,000 does not provide for probably another \$300,000 which this body and the body at the rear of the hall should provide for probably increased hospital payments. The average hospital payments are \$13 per day for public assistance now. Probably something should be done there by merely giving you the cost figures on this and whether in your deliberations you want to do something better for them in the way of hospital care, well, that is up to your judgment.

Finally the number of sixteen hundred and the other number the present recipients of twelve hundred twenty that would be affected by the bill totals out to two thousand eight hundred and twenty people. This is still an unknown factor whether or not there would be more than the two thousand eight hundred and twenty people. It is unknown. It is the best guess that we have. If it did go over that number, there would be certain consequences that we would have

to face up to at that time, but this is the best figure that I have been thus far supplied with by the Welfare Department.

I have one closing note here to make. This Report as you know came out Majority Report five to four "Ought not to pass." The difficulty that the Committee, for the large part I understand, was the availability of funds. This I understand is possibly no longer a difficulty. There may be over and above a supplemental budget money available to the amount of \$2,200,000. I think if we had removed this difficulty earlier in the session the vote may have been different but the vote did come out majority "Ought not to pass" five to four. Senator Oscar Brown, as you know, has recently been very sick and was not able to vote on L. D. 28 and he has contacted me and he said that if he were here in the Senate and in the Committee he would vote "Ought to pass."

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

Mr. STORM: Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen: First of all I would like to compliment the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, on the splendid defense that he has made for his bill. This is a very idealistic piece of legislation. I believe Mr. Rowe is an idealist.

I have to take issue with him on certain things that he has said, however. He said that this would not remove all the legal nor any of the moral issues involved. It is true that the legislature has no control of the moral issues in regard to the Old Age Assistance program. I can't agree with him that he does not remove the legal responsibility.

The first section of this L. D. 28 says that Subsection VI of section 283 of the Public Laws is hereby repealed, and that section reads that that is under the requirements for Old Age Assistance and that Section VI is that the applicant has no child or children residing in this state and able to support him. That section is struck out. I can't see but what that repeals all of the legal responsibility for children in this state. It is perfectly true that the department would be very happy to have this repealed and it would

save them a lot of work and a lot of investigation. That investigation that they are doing now is the means by which they determine who is eligible and who is not, and letting the barriers down entirely why of course they would immediately put everyone on the rolls that applied, and there are sixteen hundred of those cases at the present time who have been turned down because of this restriction, and nobody knows how many more there might be in the state who have not applied because they have realized that their situation was hopeless under the law and therefore have not applied, so that for that reason neither the sixteen hundred figure nor the estimated cost figure are realistic. I believe that they are at best an educated guess.

We have also heard that a great many of the town managers have written in in favor of this, and that is readily understandable. I am a town official myself, and I know that anyone, anywhere where we can get anyone who is applying for assistance off from direct relief in the town and onto the old age assistance program, of course it is a decided advantage to the town, but there again there is a question of how far we can afford to go with this thing, and then if we get back to the moral responsibility, it is true as I said previously that that will still remain, but I think if we are realistic that we have to admit that when the moral responsibility on the one hand is stacked up against dollars and cents out of the pocket on the other, the moral responsibility is going to come out second best. I sincerely hope that you will go along with me in accepting the "Ought not to pass" Report on this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp.

Mrs. KNAPP: Mr. Speaker, we are raising money for parks, schools, roads and so forth for the enjoyment of the fortunate. We have a great many more aged who need help, some are getting it and some are not. Some are getting it from their children and some are not. They have spent their money in some cases to educate their chil-

dren and now they find they are in dire circumstances through no fault of their own. Now the children have taken on duties which take all their extra dollars and even though their salaries are high enough to shut out the old age assistance to their parents, they cannot and some will not provide for the medical aid and other bare necessities. If we took some of the money that we are paying the investigators to run around and investigate these cases I am sure some of these cases could be taken care of. Why not give these extra elderly folks a chance to have a few things they need so badly by passing L. D. 28?

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

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We live in a nation today whose wealth has never been equalled by any nation in the history of the world. We send billions of dollars abroad in money and in supplies to help those who are less fortunate than us. To name a few, we have sent the children of Europe, we have sent antibiotics to the Chinese, we have tried to buy a quart of milk a day for the children of India. And yet this winter and this spring while we debated here, indigent men and women in the State of Maine went to bed cold and hungry and ill because they lacked the money to buy the necessities of life and the medication to ease their pain. Probably many of them arose each morning from a troubled sleep thinking that no one cared. But we of this Legislature do care. If this letter I have received from the Department of Health and Welfare is true, and I will read only one paragraph, Mr. Douglass wrote the letter to me.

"During the current Legislative session, I have received inquiries from 42 different members of the Legislature concerning cases in which relative responsibility resulted in the action which caused the request. I would estimate that other people in the Department have talked with an additional 20 or 25 members of the Legislature."

That means that only one-third of us, and many of them are listening to me now, have gone to that

department trying to get additional help for aged men and women in the district they represent. But we never have enough money. Two years ago we came to the same road block, the money is all gone. But the problem remains with us, and if you kill this bill you will go home and the problem will stay with you.

I have received from the Department of Health and Welfare a letter which Mr. John Douglass received as recently as the 25th of May. This is written by a woman who we will call "Mrs. A." She writes, and I quote:

"Your letter at hand of the 20th.

"I am sorry to hear that you and Mr. Dean Fisher feel no way you can help me out.

"I am old, sick and lame and alone. Can't have anyone stay with me as my Old Age Assistance is too small for that. I am supposed to keep on a diet, but can't as everything in eats line are so high and getting worse. No, my sons are at too much expense to help. They buying trucks, horses and equipment. He has big overhead expenses. No chance from there that I can get help.

"I have had so much sickness and trouble in the last three years and a half. Why I am not worse off I do not know. Sickness and death. The son that could have been here with me to help was taken sick in the morning at five and at five P.M. was dead—heart trouble. One of the best guys to his mother—that was three years ago. Then Mr. A, my husband, was taken sick a year and a half, the last six months right in bed. I took care of him until the last three weeks. That is why I am sick and lame now. Then this last winter, my oldest son died in his sleep so I am here sick and alone, no one to help me, only a son who lives nearer come in, gets my water from way out to a spring and brings in wood."

This woman is with us today, she is sixty-eight years old, she has two living children, one who is deemed able to contribute \$25 a month to her support. She needs a total of \$76 based on the son's 1958 income. Her grant was recently reduced from \$65 to \$51 a month, which is a little over \$12.50 a week.

I hope, and I am in favor of this bill, that those of you who are approaching the age of sixty-five and those who have passed the age of sixty-five, will think before you vote and perhaps say to each of yourselves, "There but for the grace of God, stand I."

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: Perhaps it seems hardhearted for one to stand in face of all these emotional appeals and speak against this bill, but I have never been in favor of a trend toward the welfare state and this is one step in that direction. I feel that we should be careful of our independence and a welfare state does not mean independence. A welfare state means control by the state. I like to see people independent in their thinking and in their acting as far as it is possible to be, and this is not conducive to such independence.

I would like to read a little bit from a quotation which I found in a recent publication:

"Creeping over us like dark shadows from the past are old forms of tyranny such as can only achieve power by the failure of people to cherish their independence. And to look to government as the only means of relief from the discipline of life's vicissitudes and uncertainties is a surrender of independence, a weakening of freedom and a final submission to servile dependency for the means of living upon a centralized power.

"We know there are disciples of a planned society which would allow the state to care for the people from the cradle to the grave. In human history this is a utopia which somehow eludes all ideals and defies all high motives. There is a moral uncertainty within all people which the state cannot overcome or ignore. This will, in time, divide the family association of the people. Once give to great numbers of people the idea that government owes them a living and you move toward an anarchy that demands an authoritarian regime for its regulation."

I feel that this is just one more step in the direction of centralized

government in the direction of the state control of people and I am not in favor of this because of this reason. It is a different reason from perhaps what anyone else would give, but that is my feeling in regard to this bill and I hope that it does not pass.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I arise here not in favor of this bill and not in opposition to it. I would rather be considered as a friend of the House, and I feel that certain things should be brought to the attention of the members of this body. I think the place to start is with our situation today. If a person is in need of old age assistance, one of the requirements that he must meet before he can receive that assistance is the requirement that he have no child or children residing in this state and able to support him. That is one of the prerequisites. The applicant makes out various forms and various financial statements. The Health and Welfare Department read these statements; they investigate and they decide either that the person is eligible or is not eligible. Interwoven in this prerequisite is the old bugaboo of federal funds, and the Health and Welfare Department is governed a great deal by the federal requirements that they must meet.

L. D. 28 in its first paragraph repeals Section 6 which in effect takes away this requirement. That, I can find no fault with. But later on in this bill on page 2 you will notice that it states: The department may recover, the department being the Health and Welfare, may, and that is strictly permissive, it does not make it mandatory on the department, may recover from the children or child, here it says from any child, children, funds that they have expended. Later on it goes on in Section 5, the husband or wife, father, mother, grandparents, child or grandchild shall be liable. Then down in Section 9 it again gives the Department of Health and Welfare permission to recover funds expended.

I feel that first there is a price tag on this. If we can afford it by all means we should give it to them, and by that I mean aid to the aged, but let's do it right, let us not open the door to everyone, and I hate to use that expression, it has become so trite this session, but let us not make it a vehicle for fraud to be perpetrated upon the State. Let us leave in our present laws that allow the State if you will to recover back the fees, but let us speed the assistance to the applicant and then later on if there are people who can and are liable for the support of that aged parent, then by all means they should be made to support the parent and not the taxpayer.

I feel that first a parent looks to his child or children or relatives for assistance, and then and only then should it look to the State as its foster parent for assistance. I will vote for this bill, but with the intention of offering an amendment later should it pass, to leave the teeth in our present law so that the State does not completely relieve children of the liability to support their parents.

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: An old man's memory is bad sometimes, but I think it was in '53 that we had three hundred odd cases come before this House for increase in pensions for health. Having served on that Committee of Retirements and Pensions for two years, I don't know of any time in my life that was so heartbreaking than it was to sit there and hear people come in and appeal for an increase in their pension. I have had a lot of experience in it and I have studied this bill and I have talked to Dr. Fisher and talked to other people. How many in this House has got somebody over sixty-five? How many in this House are only earning \$2800 a year with six kids? How many in this House have got six kids and probably got two or three of them sick? I know when this vote is taken I am going to vote for it. You can't eat morals, they won't keep you warm, and as the good gentleman from South-

port has already told you, we are spending billions elsewhere. For God's sake let's have a little sympathy ourselves right here.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stockholm, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to go on record as supporting L. D. 28. The old people sure need it.

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

Mr. DOSTIE: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sherman, Mr. Storm, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act Repealing Relative Responsibility in Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Disabled." Will those who favor the motion to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Forty having voted in the affirmative and ninety-five having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Minority "Ought to pass" in New Draft Report, House Paper 963, Legislative Document 1365, was accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Outdoor Advertising Devices on the Interstate System", Senate Paper 401, Legislative Document 1169, tabled on May 26 by the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy, pending adoption of House Amendment "A"; and the Chair recognizes that gentlewoman.

Thereupon, Mrs. Kilroy of Portland withdrew House Amendment "A", presented House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 401, L. D. 1169, Bill, "An Act Relating to Outdoor Advertising Devices on the Interstate System."

Amend said Bill in section 2 by striking out the first 3 lines and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 2. R. S., c. 23, Secs. 147-A — 147-G, additional. Chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes is amended by adding 7 new sections, to be numbered 147-A to 147-G to read as follows.'

Further amend said Bill in section 2 by adding at the end, before the single quotation mark, the following underlined section:

'Sec. 147-G. Effective date; limitation. Sections 147-A to 147-F shall become effective April 1, 1961, but only if the federal funds referred to in section 147-C have then been appropriated by the Federal Government and if said Federal law and regulations have not then been amended providing for lesser restrictions than they presently provide. Prior to said April 1, 1961, no person shall erect or maintain in the rural areas within 660 feet of the nearest right-of-way boundary line of any portion of the interstate system, the right-of-way of which was acquired after July 1, 1956, any advertising sign, structure or device, except official signs and on-premise signs.'

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

Mrs. KILROY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Because of a technicality in parliamentary procedure I presented this amendment. I mentioned yesterday that the federal bonus funds pertaining to outdoor advertising restrictions are not available and will not be appropriated until 1961. Also twenty-two of the twenty-five states having already postponed similar legislation or adjourned passing none. Amending this bill does not prohibit the State of Maine to enter into any agreement with the federal code. There should be no real opposition to the passage of this amendment because if it is adopted then this bill will be enacted and will only delay its action until April 1, 1961, pending the appropriation of federal funds in the treasury bud-

et and pending legislation now in Congress. I hope this amendment will be adopted. Thank you.

(Off Record Remarks)

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy, that House Amendment "B" shall be adopted.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Highway Committee I must oppose this amendment. This amendment is not in the interests of keeping our interstate highway clean of advertising signs. This is pretty much wide open and confusing. It mentions rural areas. Now what are rural areas? I understand there is no definition in our statutes as to the explanation of rural areas. Where is the borderline?

The likes of this amendment has been kicking around the last two months whose author is no less than a lobbying interest of an outdoor advertising company of Chicago. They are experts in their field of lobbying, also experts in the field of confusing the issue. The only way the advertising interests will be satisfied is no control at all which is their aim. The lobbyists interests miss no tricks in their trade. This, giving a lovely lady to present this amendment is smart on their part. At the hearing as I remember, there was no opposition against this bill by the Maine Automobile Association, the Maine Good Roads Association, Maine Trucking interests, Small Car and Truck Owners Association and the Garden Clubs of Maine, and after we amended it in the Committee there was no opposition from the petroleum industry.

This is your highway, ladies and gentlemen. Do you want it cluttered with signs with no control? The way I look at it, the big question is, I ask you ladies and gentlemen of the House if you want to take the controls of advertising signs on the interstate system out of the hands of the Highway Commission and put in the hands of the advertising interests of Chicago. I move indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that House Amendment "B" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, this subject as we know is very much tied up with the actions of the federal government which I understand at this time are still very indeterminate as to their outcome. I believe there are several bills in the federal legislature having to do with this regulation of billboards. Now it seems to me that under this amendment as I read it, that we are actually passing this bill, and it will become effective on April 1, 1961. The question then arises of course what will occur in the meantime. It seems to me there are two obvious restrictions in that respect, one being that it says that there shall be no billboards of any kind in the rural areas within 660 feet of the nearest right-of-way boundary line which corresponds I believe to the bill, and furthermore, it would seem to me that since the bill is being passed more or less by substitution and that it does become effective on April 1, 1961 that it would be very unwise for the billboard companies to erect billboards in the two years which would not be in general conformance to the legislative acts which they will probably have to live under after the two years are up. So it seems to me that in connection with this interstate system that effectively during this two year period while the matter clears up in Washington, we would have pretty much control and that we would not have a proliferation of billboards and flasher signs all over our interstate system. For this reason, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, does not prevail.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to concur wholeheartedly with my good friend Representative Baxter from Pittsfield. I feel that this is a worthy amendment and that a bill of this type does deserve con-

siderable study. I am particularly interested in certain sections of the bill which is going to place the Highway Commission in the advertising business. Now I believe in free enterprise, and I think that we should leave the advertising business to free enterprise. Under Section 147E I am pretty well disturbed about this section which will give the Highway Commission the power over municipalities in their zoning laws pertaining to advertising already established under municipal law. I also am quite disturbed about the constitutionality of this bill, taking away the right of land-owners, taking his property, because this does involve a depth of 660 feet. I think this amendment pretty well sizes up our situation. We all know that twenty - five states have had this legislation before them this past year and of the twenty-five, twenty-two have put this over until 1961. Now I think the reasonable thing for us to do is not to kill the bill, I am not against the bill, it is a lengthy document, it entails a lot of power and study and I definitely like to concur with the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter, and hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise this morning to support the gentleman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy, in regard to her amendment. I have studied this bill as thoroughly as I could. I have been approached by garden club members of both my area and state-wide. I have talked with my garden club members and asked them if they understood the bill, they said "no, not particularly, but we are against billboards." I informed my garden club members that I also am against billboards, they should be restricted in some way, but this vehicle that you have now before you under debate is not the proper vehicle at this present time. The amendment which Mrs. Kilroy has presented will postpone any action at this time, it will postpone until this legislature has had a chance to meet once again and decide in the meantime whether

this is a good piece of legislation or not.

I would like to explain to you two or three parts of the bill which I am very much against. Number one it gives too much power to the Highway Commission. The rules and regulations will supersede all local ordinances regarding advertising. Number two, the so-called drive-off parking and advertising areas will not adequately serve the traveling public or the businessmen of the State. Whoever heard of a person traveling at seventy miles an hour on the turnpike taking the time to drive off into a secluded so-called rest and advertising area to read a bunch of signs? All I can visualize in these signed areas according to this bill is the times when I go into Howard Johnson's Restaurant and look up over the counter and see the ice cream signs, twenty-eight flavors. That's just about the impression I have of these so-called advertising areas. Number three, no one outside of a twelve air mile limit of the interstate highway will be able to advertise. Gentlemen, visualize what this means to you people who live down in Washington County, who live up in Franklin County, who live over in Lincoln County, who live over in Knox County, in other words, any place in the eastern part of the State and also up in the western part when you go up into Oxford County, twelve air miles you will be able to advertise, if you live within twelve miles you will be able to advertise in these so-called signed areas.

Again as has already been said today there are at the present moment three Senate bills before Congress which could and possibly will entirely change this whole 95 situation and setup in regards to advertising. Also if you have read the papers at the present moment there is no money in the interstate system and there is no money appropriated in Congress for the interstate system in the next two years. Why, I say gentlemen at this time, should we buy this piece of legislation when nothing can be done about it until 1961 anyway?

In closing gentlemen, remember what I have said, that this twelve

air mile limit, within twelve air miles of the interstate highway, anyone outside that area will not be able to advertise. I sincerely hope you will not support the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, and will at a later date support the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy.

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to ask a question through the Chair to anyone that can answer it if I may.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FRAZIER: The question is this, I note the prohibition of the erection of any signs until 1961 in rural areas. Does this imply that it will be permissible to erect advertising in urban areas before the date of 1961?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, has addressed a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. MAYO: I would try to answer that Mr. Speaker. I do not know as I am exactly right on it, but as I understand it, this entire piece of legislation has to do with interstate 95 in itself, it will not pertain to any other highway. The rural areas are those areas considered outside of city limits, and I would assume that possibly if local ordinances allowed signs to be built they could be built. Now as I say, that is not to be construed as being true, I am just assuming.

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

Mr. FRAZIER: I would thank the gentleman from Bath, and because of that answer, I would have to be opposed to this amendment and support the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

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

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker, if these roads go through cities and a man wants to put a sign on his

roof advertising his business, I think that that is his business, and this is supposed to be a free country. We are not living in Red China or in Russia, we are living in the United States. If I wish to place a small sign on a house or somebody else does I don't see why we should be restricted if we are within 660 feet of this overpass. Therefore, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, does not prevail.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I too do not know the answer, but I would like to call something to the attention of the Representative from Lee, Mr. Frazier, that to begin with, in regard to the urban in regard to interstate, most of interstate construction does not go through the cities, it is a rotary that feeds in, I think we have heard quite a lot about that, and most signs are quite well controlled within these urban areas but I think you would get into great difficulty in excluding all signs from that area in the respect that as you circled you might have many signs that precluded to businesses right in that area that would be visible, and therefore you just couldn't get into that I don't think.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, from the beginning I have felt that I am very much against indiscriminate advertising along the interstate highway system. I would say further that I would like very much to go along with the unanimous report of the Highway Committee in this thing. However, I do not feel that as for me we have had the explanation of the necessity of this bill at this time that I would like to see. I think that the thing is still pretty much up in the air and we hardly know what we wish to do with regard to advertising on this interstate system, and for that reason I would like a better explanation of why we should not defer it two years than we have already had. Unless that explanation is forthcoming, I feel that I shall

have to vote with the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Kilroy, for her amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, that House Amendment "B" to Bill "An Act relating to Outdoor Advertising Devices on the Interstate System", Senate Paper 401, Legislative Document 1169, be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark.

Thereupon, Mr. Clark of Scarborough, who would have voted "no", had he voted, 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER: I would ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "B" 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 seventy-eight having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number 24 on page 4 of the calendar, Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing for Enlarging and Extending the Sewer System at the University of Maine in Orono," House Paper 338, Legislative Document 498, reporting "Ought not to pass" as covered by other legislation, which was tabled earlier in today's session by the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Bacon, pending acceptance of the Report. Is it the pleasure of the House that the House now accept the "Ought not to pass" Report?

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number 25, Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing for the Expansion of the Steam Plant at the University of Maine in Orono," House Paper 336, Legislative Document 496, reporting "Ought not to pass" as covered by other legislation, tabled earlier today by the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Bacon, pending acceptance of the Report.

Is it now the pleasure of the House that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" Report?

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Wade of Auburn,

Recessed until two-thirty this afternoon.

After Recess
2:30 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair now lays before the House item number 30 on page 5 of the calendar, Divided Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for Capital Improvements and Construction of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961," House Paper 103, Legislative Document 159, reporting same in new draft, House Paper 973, Legislative Document 1384, under title of "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for Capital Improvements, Construction, Repairs, Equipment, Supplies and Furnishings for Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961 and Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of Six Million Dollars," Majority reporting "Ought to pass" and Minority reporting "Ought not to pass", which was tabled earlier in the day and assigned for later in the day's session by the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, pending acceptance of either report.

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

Thereupon, on motion of that gentleman, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the New Draft read twice and tomorrow assigned.

On motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, the House voted to take from the table the second tabled and unassigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought to pass" and Minority "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act relating to Sales Tax on Motor Vehicles Traded In," House Paper 179, Legislative Document 250, tabled on May 8 by that gentleman pending acceptance of either report.

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House:

This bill is a key item in the taxation and appropriation package which is the most important job of this 99th Legislature.

This taxation and appropriation package will be a compromise because, although we Republicans are the majority party, let's face it, we are not the two-thirds majority party.

This bill, or this tax, is a fundamental part of the program formulated by the Democratic administration, and we must not think for a moment that its presence in that program is any accident. Months before we came here last January the executive branch in the persons of the then Governor-elect and his assistants had carefully canvassed the available major sources of new revenue and they had decided, and I believe correctly, that this tax was the least objectionable of the available sources of revenue.

A number of reasons led them to this conclusion and those reasons will be developed by others who will speak on this measure. A few of the basic reasons are:

1. It is non-discriminatory. In these days of universal use of motor vehicles, practically everyone who can pay a tax, including a great many corporations, buys motor vehicles.

2. It is easily collected, like other sales taxes.

3. This measure is the elimination of an exemption in an existing tax, and

4. It provides a substantial amount of revenue estimated at \$3,-500,000 for the biennium.

It is obvious that if we are going to do the things in the supplemental budget and there seems to be general agreement that these things are necessary, and if we are going to have the money to enact a reasonable number of other worthwhile L. D. 's, and if we are going to provide the money to service a capital construction bond issue during the next biennium, we must have a substantial amount of new revenue.

It is also obvious that if we are going to provide that revenue with one new tax measure, the trade-in tax is the only measure that will do it.

The Republican leadership in this House believes that this measure should be enacted to provide that revenue — so, for the reasons given, and although we Republicans don't like taxes, and although the Democratic members of this House don't like taxes, and although I am sure that the executive branch of this government doesn't like to recommend new taxes, I move the acceptance of the Majority "Ought to pass" Report of the Taxation Committee on this bill, and I hope that it will go on to enactment on a bi-partisan basis which is the only basis upon which any bill that needs an emergency clause can be enacted in this legislature.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that the House accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Sales Tax on Motor Vehicles Traded In."

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to our worthy Floor Leader, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, in regards to the acceptance of this report. He has stated reasons why he believes it should pass and the report should be accepted. To me this is not a party issue. This is a taxation prob-

lem. There should be no compromise on a taxation problem which is unjust, unsound and unfounded. He made the comment that it was decided by the Executive Branch upon their election that they should come out and tell us what tax we should impose upon the people of the State of Maine. I, as one Legislator, do not have words put in my mouth or told how or what tax shall be decided. I represent the people who elected and sent me up here, and I shall try to endeavor to do that now by saying that I am strictly and utterly opposed to the three per cent tax for the following reasons: They claim that this exemption as it is now is discriminatory. I say if you put the tax on it will be discriminatory because automobiles now carry the burden of the cost of highways, your returns from the gasoline tax and your towns from excise tax imposed on automobiles, your federal tax that you pay when you purchase an automobile, your sales tax when you first purchase an automobile. You then trade that car in which I have known several cars to be traded four or five times within the course of a year. That tax has been collected so many times it is pitiful. Why spoil a good thing when you have a good thing, and that is what you are doing when you are trying to pass the three per cent tax. There are other means and methods to obtain the necessities of the funds which are needed, if they should be needed, for additional revenue for the State of Maine without putting the burden upon the family man and those who have helped to create an industry in this state through recreation and other means, through the returns that we get on the gas tax, the garage man, the tax that is brought into the state through repairs subject to tax. There are so many ways that automobile is taxed now, it is ridiculous to even think that we should even consider a three per cent tax. I know the proponents for this measure will say that it is discriminatory because your appliances etc. do pay the full trade-in value on their merchandise. Well let me point out to this House, ladies and gentlemen how many times a refrigerator

is resold after the first initial payment of taxes has been paid on the purchase or any other type of appliance, maybe once in a lifetime that particular piece of equipment. They pay no excise tax beyond that point. They have no gasoline tax or any other tax to pay upon that particular purchase. They pay it once or at least twice at the very most. An automobile, the average life runs around ten years, that car may be sold a half a dozen times. You collected that tax over and over and over again, plus when you originally purchased the car you paid the full value of taxation, you are asking the public to repay over what they have already paid on. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would move indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers. I request a roll call vote when the vote is so taken.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that the House indefinitely postpone both reports.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the proposal we are considering today to eliminate the sales tax exemption on motor vehicle trade-in allowances is one of several revenue measures which this House will have to decide before we can go home. The legislature is asked, through this bill, to reverse the action it took in 1953 when the sales tax law was amended to impose the tax on motor vehicle sales to the sales price less the value of any vehicles traded in.

In order to understand this exemption and the reasons for it fully, it is helpful to review some of its legislative history, as determined by the legislative record of 1951 and 1953, and by the recollections of present and former members. Everyone remembers, I am sure, the original passage of the sales tax in 1951. As is to be expected with any major proposal, and particularly a tax proposal, the debate was heavy, opinions were divided, and the votes were close. The automobile, and its taxable status under the law, was a prime concern to many members of the House and Senate, and to the public.

It was, and still is, a commodity pretty much in a class by itself. It was and is the highest-priced item of personal property that the average person buys and sells. For this reason, many people inquired whether the sales tax, if passed, would apply to the full sales price or to the difference between the full price and the value of the trade-in. One present Senator said that he received assurances from the State Tax Assessor just outside the Senate Chamber that the tax would be imposed on the difference only. A reading of the legislative records indicates clearly that many others were under the same impression, and that this was a determining factor in their vote. The law, of course, was passed.

As soon as the sales tax became effective, contrary to expectation, it was imposed on the full price of motor vehicle sales. At the very next session, a bill to put the present exemption into the law was introduced, fully debated, and passed. Again, the legislative record indicates that the public was so concerned that many, many members came to Augusta and pleaded to their constituents to do something about a situation generally considered to be inequitable and unfair.

This, then, is the background of this bit of legislation. The exemption has been with us since 1953, and has worked well, and has been approved. Now it is proposed that the exemption be removed to produce an estimated \$3 million for the biennium. Like so many before you, you are plagued with revenue problems. Some source of additional money must be found if the state services are to be maintained and improved. While this may be an easy source, I submit that it is not the fairest source. This exemption has been labelled inconsistent and discriminatory. We do not think so, and would like to tell you why.

First of all, the automobile is one of the most heavily taxed articles there is. Before it ever gets to a dealer, the federal government has already added twenty-five per cent to its sales price through manufacturers' excise taxes. Thus, if the sales tax on a \$3,000

automobile is \$90, approximately \$22.50 of the sales tax is being paid on the federal taxes included in the price. This makes double taxation there you see.

You have all owned automobiles, and after you have bought your car, having paid the federal taxes just described, amounting to six or seven hundred dollars on the average medium-priced car, you pay the sales tax, averaging about \$50.

Then before you can drive it, you go to your local tax collector and pay a substantial excise tax. In my home town of Bowdoinham of 1031 citizens the excise tax was a little over \$10,000 last year, and hundreds of thousands of dollars were paid to other municipalities throughout the state.

Having paid your excise tax, the motor vehicle owner then pays registration fees, (which in the State of Maine are among the highest in the country) to the state in order to license his car and drive it. And of course the system is such, and properly so, that no plates will be issued until the previous taxes are paid. Registration fees last year accounted for over nine million dollars in state revenue.

This isn't the end of the story. For every gallon of gasoline you burn, the motorist pays a gasoline tax, again one of the highest in the nation. Gasoline taxes produced about \$21 million of state revenue and \$9 million of Federal Revenue.

According to the state tax assessor's office, total sales tax revenues last year were \$23,506,584. Out of this total, \$3,320,000 came from motor vehicle sales, again based on State figures. Thus the car owner paid over 14% of the total sales taxes, and this present proposal, this L. D. 250, would reportedly increase sales tax income by \$3 million in the biennium, an increase of \$1.5 million a year, or roughly a 50% increase.

If this bill is passed, the motor vehicle would thus account for over one-fifth of all sales tax revenue.

I believe the \$21 million in gasoline taxes, the \$9 million in registration fees, and the \$3 million plus in sales taxes, not to mention the local and federal excise taxes, dem-

onstrates pretty clearly that the motor vehicle is paying its fair share of taxes. The nearly \$34 million paid the state last year through these taxes represents almost one-third of all state taxes. What about the automobile business itself? It has been said that this is favored treatment; that other trade-ins are not exempted; that this is discriminatory. I do not believe this is so. Let us briefly examine these contentions.

I said at the outset that the automobile was a commodity in a class by itself. First of all, I think you will agree that in today's world, the automobile is a necessity, not a luxury. There is no need to recite the many reasons why; they are self-evident.

It is true that other trade-ins are not exempt. However, nothing else is traded like automobiles. A car will be traded and sold four, five, six and sometimes more before it is relegated to the scrap pile. Under the present law, a sales tax is collected on the difference each time, so that no sales taxes are lost in the long run. For example, if you buy a \$3,000 car, and get \$1500 trade in for your old one, you pay \$45 in sales taxes, having already paid a sales tax on the car you trade in when you bought it. When your old car is sold, the process is repeated, and so on down the line. The trade-in is truly an essential part of the automobile business, sometimes this is not so to the extent in other businesses. You have all seen ads for appliances which read, "\$299.95; with your old model, \$249.95". Is this not in effect paying a sales tax on the difference only? Most trade-ins on stoves, refrigerators and the like are pegged at one price regardless of age or condition. They are not truly trade-ins, but represent a discount on the sales price so that no sales tax is paid on them. The old appliance is usually discarded, salvaged for parts, or sold perhaps once. Motor vehicles are frequently traded a great many times.

This L. D. 250 would mean doubling the sales tax paid on the average new car sale. It would mean the buyer of a \$3,000 car would pay \$90 sales tax. When he buys another such car two or three years later,

he would pay another \$90, without the credit he is in effect getting as the law is now. His trade-in would be sold for perhaps \$1500, and that buyer would pay \$45 sales tax. Before the original car was finally scrapped, it would have been traded four or five times, paying sales taxes of 6 or 7 times on the original price.

You may inquire after all this, why should the dealers in these automobiles be interested in this? They won't pay the tax, the customers will and they should not have a selfish interest, but I maintain that they do have a selfish interest. The experience has shown that this tax, representing the substantial item on the individual sale that it does, has adversely affected sales in the past. The dealer will indirectly wind up assuming at least some of it. The automobile business, representing an extremely important segment of the American economy, has been in difficulty for several years. Last year, 400 dealers a month went out of business, 50 of them in Maine. Anything which adversely affects us further, such as this, is quite properly of serious concern to us all.

To summarize, I feel that the motor vehicle, accounting for nearly one-third of state tax revenues, is bearing its fair share now. I believe the automobile business, with its unique position and its economic condition, should not be re-burdened with this extra tax. I believe that L. D. 250 would return us to a taxing situation which 350,000 automobile owners found grossly unfair and unpopular, and which the 95th Legislature very properly corrected.

I might add that after weeks of research and investigation of the taxes the Maine automobile owner is paying now for the privilege of owning and using automobiles, they are paying around \$60,000,000 in taxes. This includes also the federal taxes, state and municipal, and I urge you not to revert your judgment and your actions and accept this L. D.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that the House indefinitely postpone both reports.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This item has been very well covered. There are just a few suggestions that I would like to bring out. First of all, we know that the sales tax became law in 1951 and that this exemption was placed on the books in 1953. Since the sales tax is our major source of revenue, what we are doing here is to narrow the base of the one source where we are seeking to get the most of our revenue.

Also it has been brought out on the floor this afternoon that the automobile exemption trade-in is a double tax. I would not agree with this because the sales tax is a tax on a transaction. The sales tax is not a tax on objects. It is a tax on sales. Consequently each time that a sale is made, a tax is collected. If it were a tax on an object then I would say that this is double taxation but it is a tax on a transaction, and this is the only object or the only item which is exempt on that basis. Also it is one of the most equally distributed taxes. For example, I think it would be very difficult to find in a town ten per cent of its population not possessing some sort of an automobile. When we tax cigarettes we are taxing the people who smoke cigarettes. When we are taxing transients, we are taxing a certain industry, but there are so many people today who own automobiles that it is a very well distributed tax. The person who owns an expensive automobile pays more than the person who owns an inexpensive automobile.

Also it has been brought out this afternoon that the automobiles are already heavily taxed from one source or another. That is true, but we should remember that every bit of the money that comes in from taxes from automobiles or one source or another goes to one place only and that is to the highway. We must maintain highways. We must make sure that they are up to scratch in every respect for these automobiles, and these automobiles are merely paying the freight that they should pay for the roads that

are built for them. None of this money goes to pay schools or old age, or welfare, or anything like that. The tax that the automobile bears today is paid on the roads which we have to have because of the automobiles.

I also wish to think that we should remember that if this exemption is not removed that we will need two taxes to replace this one because there is no one tax that has been suggested to this legislature to date that will bring in the sufficient amount of money to take care of this three million fund, so it means two additional taxes if we do not remove this exemption. And I think it is only fair to say that this is not a new tax, that it is an exemption to an existing tax. The mechanics to set up that tax are already existing. Consequently, we would have very little money to spend to collect the tax. I think it is fair, I think it is good business, and I certainly hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone will not prevail.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As a member of the Taxation Committee, who reported this bill in the majority "Ought to pass", I've got to defend my position. This tax, as the others have enumerated, was put on in 1951 as a base tax. A base of taxation. True it was put on against my vote but nevertheless it was on, and at this moment it was put on for the simple reason that we were avoiding an income tax in this State of Maine, and we are still avoiding it, and at this moment there is ten billion of intangibles in the State of Maine that is exempt from taxation. It is not touched, and you know there was a bill before you this year to try to eliminate the possibility even of taxing them. Well, the day is coming when you are going to, but that is neither here nor there. This tax was put on as a broad base. Well now, what we are doing now is trying to broaden that base some more by taking off the exemption that was put on in 1953, and I hope that the House will go along and vote against the mo-

tion before the House, indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. MAYO: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The one part of this bill that has not been brought in in any of the debate so far is the so-called farm tractor. We have listened in this legislature and I understand in all past legislatures, there has always been a big drive to help the farmer. Now in the past few years the business of selling farm equipment, tractors and all other pieces of farm equipment has become a very large and profitable type of business to certain individuals in the State of Maine. The trend to farming is to mechanize, do away with the old fashioned horse and buggy and the horse and plow. I feel that this piece of legislation here is definitely discriminatory. Discriminatory against the person who must have that type of equipment, discriminatory to the farmer who must have farm equipment, to the industries in the State of Maine who have fleets of cars and trucks, to any individual who for any reason at all in his business must trade automobiles on a regulated basis. I certainly see no reason for this particular type of tax. I have been approached by many of my constituents at home to oppose this from both sides of the political fence, and I am awfully glad that the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, has asked for a roll call because I certainly will vote against this tax, and when I go home I will wave my great big ballot in front of my constituents.

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, has just pointed out one thing that I do think we ought to keep in mind. If we don't pass this tax there certainly will be a great many demands for other exemptions in the next session, and we will find as we go on that the sales tax which as the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, has pointed out is a tax on a transaction is going to be cut out, all out. Some

of the people have said this is not discriminatory. I would like just to bring out one small point where it certainly is. The man who goes in and pays cash for his car pays the full tax. Now if he pays part cash and part in property, part in other value, he only pays part of the tax and if that is not discriminatory, I don't know what is. I certainly hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone will not prevail.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: I appeared at the hearing for this measure and I speak for it today. In reference to the remarks of my good friend from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, wherein he indicated that we were being told by the Governor, I would like to read the part of his budget message wherein it concerns this item. "The review of our selective taxes and the present exemptions under our sales and use tax reveals one glaring inconsistency. That is the exemption of the automobile trade-in allowance on the sales tax. It is obviously discriminatory. Trade-in allowances on all other manufactured items are not exempted. I recommend that this discriminatory exemption be eliminated thereby increasing the general fund income."

I would like to state that no governor be he of the Democratic or Republican faith ever tells the legislature. It is mandatory for him in his inaugural address to recommend; it is mandatory for him as the chief executive of the state in his budget message to recommend. I happen to be one of the members who heard before committee this bill when it was first passed by this legislature. The strongest of the proponents claimed then that it was a preferential tax. The chief lobbyist claimed then and they do now, as a matter of fact two of them refuse to lobby because they felt as one told me they have had it long enough.

In reference to the remarks of my good friend from Bath, Mr. Mayo, where it concerns discrimination against the farmers I might state that farm machinery in my

opinion is not touched by this measure. Also, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Mayo, states that he is happy that the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, made the motion for a roll call so that he could wave the sheet in Bath to show the people he did not vote for this measure. I certainly will concur with him. I shall also bring my ballots on all other measures wherein it involves more for old age assistance, more for health and welfare, more for education, and more for institutions and tell them this. I voted for this tax so that you could get these benefits. Money does not come out of the clouds. It is very obvious that possibly by his remarks he would enjoy the pleasantries of voting for all spending bills and no tax bills. I want no part of it. I certainly hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

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

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I suspect that we are most all aware that this was the only tax measure from the Taxation Committee that was reported out with a nine to one report. I think that you are also aware that some of our ablest legislators sat on this committee. Now, I am reluctant also to vote for any kind of a tax until first the need is proven that we need the money, and after carefully weighing all these questions that have been put before us I am quite sure that we need new revenue. I see no other place to get it. Therefore, I feel it is my duty to vote for this tax, and what I rose mainly for I hope that someone would stand up and explain to some of the legislators here what they lose in school subsidy, where the loss is going to be if we don't pass this tax. Now it has been very well explained how bad the tax is, that's been very well covered before this House, but I hope that before the debate ends that someone will get up and explain to these legislators that don't understand what we do lose in school subsidies and welfare and where the loss is going to be provided this tax does not pass. Thank you.

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

Mr. HILTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I did not intend to get into this argument but the farm machinery has been brought out and I would like to present a little example of how it works on tractors. We don't trade tractors every day. The last one I had, the one I've got now is two years old and I used the other one ten years. I did get a trade-in allowance of \$1,000, probably the tractor was worth \$500. That was \$30, if I had not been allowed the exemption I would have paid \$30 more which would amount to \$3.00 per year during the period of ten years. There are other farm machines that are — they don't last any longer than the tractor does. You take hay balers for instance. Their cheapest power take-off is around \$1,800, and I am going to say that those are not going to be as of long life as a tractor is. There is no exemption on the trade-in value of balers, field choppers from \$2,000 to \$2,500, and corn pickers which I don't intend to swap very often, \$3,400. There are milking machines. We trade once in a while and bulk tanks are something new and I have known cases where those have been traded and they cost from \$2,000 to \$4,000 each. I hope the motion before the House to indefinitely postpone does not prevail. I think that if we don't plug this loophole that we are going to have, — in fact I understand I think there is a bill, there was a bill introduced to exempt the trade-in on farm machinery. I hope the motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am very glad to hear the discussion on this particular bill. I think all the points have been pretty well covered except one or two, but I as one legislator cannot truthfully announce the vote for this tax while luxuries are not exactly tax exempt but, you might say, to a certain degree tax free. I will not criticize the legislature in any form or any

way intentionally for their actions in passing certain bills, but I introduced a bill here to try to get revenue on what I call a luxury, namely the race tracks on track breakage. It was rejected. That in its wisdom the legislature found that was not what they believed a way of obtaining revenue. There was another measure introduced before this body by another gentleman for number plates with letters on automobiles which would have brought approximately \$300,000 in to the state coffers without any burden of tax or force taxation upon the people. That was rejected.

Now an automobile today is certainly a necessity. It is no longer considered as a luxury because without that the State of Maine would fold up. You take the rural areas where there are no trains or no busses or other means of transportation, those people would be confined to a small rural area and be back in the horse and buggy days, but thank goodness to automobiles, it has opened up an avenue, between that and televisions and radios and what have you there are no longer any hicks in the State of Maine. We are all city people even though we may live in rural areas. They know what the world is doing and what is going on. I will say that I will not wave my ballot in the air regardless of the outcome of this bill, but I will do this much, be happy to see the press record each and every vote so the people of the State of Maine will know if this should pass you are placing I recall still a discriminatory tax on the people on the necessities of life and not luxury.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell.

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that what I have to say is exactly germane to the question before the House, but I think it does concern this. I shall not vote for this and mainly from the fact that I am not yet convinced that we have got to raise three hundred and three and a half million dollars more to satisfy what we can afford, what the people of the State of Maine can afford in taxes. I call your attention to the fact that in 1951 when this sales

tax was enacted we needed considerable extra money, and we raised for that biennium around sixty million dollars. Now we have a proposed budget of something over a hundred million in each year increase. Now we will all admit that the cost of living has increased, the dollar has been devaluated to some extent but not sixty-five or seventy per cent in those eight years. There is an old saying, rather trite and over worked, that history repeats itself, and I would like to relate a little bit of history.

In 1951, in the closing days of the session, in the closing afternoon of the session in fact, the Governor, it came from the front office, that we had appropriated either a little bit over the amount of expected revenue but so close to it that he would feel it necessary to veto the general Appropriations Bill unless some cuts were made. We chewed that over the rest of the afternoon and the evening and we were tired, out of sorts, we didn't get anywhere. Nobody could give up his pet bill. We stayed here until the sky was growing red in the east and Sunday morning we went down to the hotel in broad daylight, having adjourned until the following Monday night. We came back Monday night and it took just about twenty minutes to adjust that matter.

What had we done? The taxation authorities had decided to increase the estimate of expected revenue enough to take care of our appropriations and leave something in the budget. And that proved to be the case, because when we came back in '53 we had a nice, large amount of surplus. I think the gentleman from Lewiston will corroborate that statement because he was here and was on the Appropriations Committee that year, and if I make any further misstatements I hope he will correct me. Then in '53 the closing days of the session we had three bills that had received pretty general approval in both Houses. One was for a bookmobile, that was very dear to the heart of a member of the House that year. That was for \$20,000, it was to equip a small panel truck, provide a driver and carry books from the State Library out to the

hinterlands where they didn't have any libraries, and in due time they would trade the books for others, and it didn't have a show of passing because we had used up all the money.

There was another bill equally worthy to make certain adjustments if I remember correctly in the salaries of the Justices, and that called for a small appropriation, and that had died practically. There was still another one that we were interested in in the House that we didn't press too hard, because that was a bill to raise the salary of the Legislators for the coming session. We didn't say too much about that, but those three bills and there was another matter, I don't know whether it was in a bill or not, but those three bills totalled a little less than \$100,000, and they were gone as far as we were concerned because there wasn't money, and then word came out of the front office of a device that could be used. That was to increase the State's share of the take in the pari-mutuels from I don't recall whether it was one-half of one per cent or one per cent, but anyway it was coming out of the bettors, it wasn't going to interfere with the cost of running the races, and that amount, the estimated amount would take care not only of these three bills which I mentioned, but also the fair association, the Agricultural Fair Association had been complaining that they had been injured somewhat by the pari-mutuels, and that they weren't getting revenue enough to keep them going, and so half of this money was to go for this — this extra fund that was being derived in this way was to go to the passage of these bills and the other half would go to raise the State stipend. And we discussed that pretty warmly and heatedly some ways, and the next day the various interests that were concerned, the pari - mutuel interests, the harness racers and the runners were called in to see how they felt about it and they were agreeable to it, and incidentally as I recall it there had been a little difference of opinion between the harness people and the racers as to the amount of time allotted to them for the races and inci-

dentally they adjusted that matter during their discussion, and the bill was accepted, the thing was accepted and passed and everybody went home happy.

Now, as I say I am not yet convinced, I think we probably will need some more money for what we actually can afford, and it seems to me that some device, either those devices that I have mentioned or some similar device may be brought out that will take care of the money that we actually can afford to spend at this time.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I vividly remember the two occasions referred to by Representative Caswell, the gentleman from New Sharon. The first item he mentioned is the morning that we adjourned and reconvened for thirty minutes on Monday afternoon. It involved stepping up the anticipated yield of the sales tax, which involved millions of dollars \$250,000 to meet and to balance the budget. The second topic that he talked about in 1953, which were the bookmobile at \$20,000 and the hike in the salaries for the members of the House, the third item escapes me. In any event, this involved some \$75,000 to \$80,000, and it was picked up after half of one per cent went to the fairs and half of one per cent went to the State take and after the compromise had been arrived at between the trotters and runners, but before that had happened the reports of the Appropriations Committee then was unanimous "Ought not to pass." The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs then re-met, had considered the items would be worthy, but the only reason they gave that they had not passed them before was because of lack of money. This involved a very small sum of money, and devices to catch up with three and a half million dollars I can't find.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would just like to go on record with this thought, an old saying that we hear

many times, the power to tax is the power to destroy. I would like to read a very short quote from an article in the May Craig column recently: "Michigan cannot pay its legislators and its State University cannot pay its bills. Michigan was hard hit by the recession and the slow sale of cars. It is true, but Minnesota and Ohio are awful short of money and are looking for new taxes to cover the deficit. The dark truth is that most of the states were ahead after the war, they had surpluses, they spent the surpluses to cover the fact they were spending beyond income. Now the surpluses are gone and the deficits come into naked view. Many other states are in financial trouble. Newsweek estimates twenty - nine states."

It was my feeling when I came to this session of the Legislature that I would come with a determination not to vote for the enactment of any new tax measures. I still feel like that, and in spite of the fact I realize there is some reason why perhaps I should go along, I do not feel that I can go along with this or with any other tax measures that may be presented.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: You have heard the Taxation Committee and its members referred to here today in glowing terms and the words of one of our more illustrious members. I was one of those who voted in the Committee ought to pass on this bill, and today I am going to vote in favor of the move to indefinitely postpone. I would like to just say a few words on why. Now in the course of the Taxation Committee hearing we never at any time had any words or any ideas of how much money there was to be spent in this legislature. In other words, when we considered these bills, the only basis on which we could consider them was whether it was a proper source of taxation. Now of course in all of these matters and all bills and particularly in taxation bills there are a great many pros and cons lying on both sides of the scales. There were a certain group of bills which as we

heard the testimony on them we felt were heavily weighted with cons. In other words, the evidence seemed to indicate that the items suggested to be taxed were perhaps taxed enough already and that the tax should not be increased further. Then there were certain bills that were perhaps about even in the minds of many of us, and since we had no idea what the fiscal requirements would be, we reported these out as ought to pass on the basis that revenue could be gained from these sources. Now when it comes to voting on these, it is a different problem. When it comes to using these as a fiscal vehicle it seems to me that we have to know how much money we are going to raise. It has been my understanding that in past Legislatures the tax bills are usually held until after the appropriation problems are determined. In fact I think I have also understood that frequently the Taxation Committee met with the Appropriations Committee so that as the Taxation Committee reported out its bills they would have a semblance of fiscal base to them as well as a taxation base.

Now what is happening here today and in this debate it is said that evidently we are going to spend three and a half million dollars and we must pass this tax bill now to accommodate it. To me that is somewhat like a license to steal or certainly a license to spend. It is a blank check. It means that we are going to go ahead and pass all these things because we have got some money, we have passed the bill and we have got the money and now let's scramble around and see how we can spend it. We have seen that happen in the Executive Department at times at the end of years to avoid lapsed balances and so forth, and I don't think it is a healthy situation. Also, if it is going to be three and a half million as some people contend, we are asked to accept this tax here and now and there are obviously other taxes which could be used and I am sure that some of these other taxes are favored by some of the people in this House. The mere fact that this is one tax and it might be two other taxes to accomplish the same

ends, I don't see that that is any argument at all. What we are interested in is the amount of money we are raising, and whether it is one or two taxes it seems to me it is somewhat beside the point unless you are going to put one or two taxes on the same specific item. So the point simply is that we are going to raise the money if we pass this tax, but on the other hand we certainly haven't decided how much money we are going to spend, and I don't think that this is the time to approve of this tax and I further think that in my own list of priorities as we reported these taxes out, if we are going to spend this amount of money or perhaps less money which I think we should consider, there are other taxes in the Taxation Committee Report which were reported out also as ought to pass which I would prefer to this one. Therefore, I will vote against this one.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am voting for this tax against the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, for the simple reason that it is the most just tax that we have before us in my opinion, and also in the opinion of the Taxation Committee who voted out ought to pass nine to one. There is no other tax bill that has got anywhere near that vote. Also I am opposed to any taxation and if we can get along without any taxation I am for it, and this tax bill, my voting for it today and against the motion is to keep it alive so that if we cannot live within our means and have to have additional revenue, this is the place to get it. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton does not prevail.

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

Mr. DUMAIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: To hear some of the comments here today I would certainly think that the State of Maine is on the verge of being broke, but from what I have heard, we are far from that. I think the motorist today has been taxed to the utmost. There is an article

in the Kennebec Journal of May 27 on page 26 that explains pretty well everything. I think the motorist has been forced to pay and pay and pay, and this here when this tax came back in 1953 we were seventeen Democrats in the House, and everyone of us was glad to see this tax measure repealed with our Republican friends that helped us. Now it apparently seems that we have turned our coat about. Indiana had the same tax and we based ourselves on Indiana. Indiana repealed the tax — I mean they went along and did the same thing that we did. Indiana this year has not turned around and taxed the motorist on the full value of his automobile as yet, and I don't believe that we are in that much need of money. I certainly can see plenty of other sources where we can get revenue without taxing the motoring public. This is just like taxing each and every one of us that owns a decent automobile \$15.00 per year, and if we had, as automobile dealers, and I am sure that the automobiles, the 80,000 people that will trade their automobiles this year had a chance to sign a petition, give us ninety days from now and we will bring you petitions, we will bring you twenty-five per cent of the total votes that were cast. I have been through one of these initiative referendum clauses and I will guarantee you that for the Dealer Association and for us in general we can get that many names. There are so many people. Every time that I sell a car or a jalopy or whatever it is, I have as much of a hard time to collect that \$3.00 as I do the \$25.00 I'll assure you, and most of the people that have to pay \$25.00 or \$30.00 will add it onto their financing bill, and if you repossess the automobile then you have to repossess the tax which you have paid also. I think it is a very unfair way of taxing the motorist. I believe that the motorist is taxed right to the hilt right now, when you are paying close to \$2.25 per day in taxes alone, I believe that we have reached the point where if we are going to pay any more on taxes, that we will have a little more than some of us can afford. Therefore, I will go along with the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, and I will

support his motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mr. COUTURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise opposed to the motion of indefinite postponement. If we are going to talk about fair taxes along this sales tax I remember back here in last session for a way out to exempt clothing under sales tax for people with families and I did not succeed at all, because it was going to be discrimination at that time. If it was discrimination at that time to exempt clothing for people with large families up to eight and ten children in the home, furnishing them with clothing and shoes and everything else and send them to school, how are you going to face yourself in discrimination of taxes on cars? At least I can say this. Any one of our people in the state here that can afford to exchange their car certainly can afford to pay taxes. A good many of the people in our state have paid the sales tax on clothing when they were not able to pay. I pointed out here that a good many of them will have to do away with a quart of milk today for their children to be able to buy clothing and pay taxes. But that wasn't good enough. But now it's the word to back out those that can pay taxes into the State and it is going on and on and on. And I think that we have heard enough about this at this time, Mr. Speaker, the hour is getting late, and I will now move for the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Couture, has moved the previous question. For the Chair to entertain a motion for the previous question the Chair must have the approval of one-third of the members of the House. Will those who favor the Chair's entertaining 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 before the House now

is, shall the main question be put now? This motion is debatable with a time limit of five minutes for each member.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, this may not do any good but a long time ago I learned to hate the previous question, and I personally had had just a few sentences I would like to read in the record to back up what the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell, said, but if the previous question is put in force why I am ruled out of order and I think there are several other people in this House would have liked to say a few words. And this is probably one of the biggest issues before this body this session, so I hope that the previous question isn't put at this time.

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

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Sales Tax on Motor Vehicles Traded In," House Paper 179, Legislative Document 250, both Reports be indefinitely postponed, and the gentleman has requested a roll call.

For the Chair to order a roll call the Chair must have the expression of a desire for the roll call by 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 in order.

The Chair has been doubted and orders a division. Will those who desire a roll call please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Fifty-four members arose.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-four having arisen and that being more than

one-fifth of the members of the House, a roll call is in order.

The Chair will state the question. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that both Reports be indefinitely postponed. If you favor the indefinite postponement of both Reports 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 — Baker, Baxter, Brockway, Brown, Bangor; Brown, Cape Elizabeth; Brown, Ellsworth; Carter, Caswell, Chapman, Gardiner; Choate, Christie, Clark, Crockett, Curtis, Danes, Davis, Calais; Dean, Dennett, Dumaine, Dumais, Dunn, Edgerly, Edwards, Stockton Springs; Ervin, Good, Graves, Hanson, Bradford; Hanson, Lebanon; Hardy, Haughn, Heald, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Hughes, Hutchinson, Jacques, Jewell, Jewett, Kennedy, Knapp, Knight, Linnell, Maddox, Mathews, Mathieson, Mayo, Monroe, Philbrick, Sanborn, Smith, Falmouth; Treworgy, Trumbull, Turner, Walter, Weston, Whiting, Whitman, Winchenpaw, Young.

NAY — Aliberti, Bacon, Barnett, Beane, Berman, Boone, Bragdon, Briggs, Cahill, Call, Caron, Carville, Chapman, Norway; Cormier, Cote, Cousins, Couture, Cox, Coyne, Cyr, Augusta; Cyr, Fort Kent; Davis, Westbrook; Dennison, Desmarais, Dodge, Dostie, Doyle, Dudley, Dufour, Earles, Edmunds, Edwards, Raymond; Emmons, Frazier, Gallant, Harrington, Harris, Healy, Hendricks, Hilton, Jalbert, Johnson, Kellam, Kilroy, Kinch, Lacharite, Lancaster, Lane, Lantagne, Lemelin, Letourneau, Lindsay, Lowery, Maxwell, Miller, Morse, Nadeau, Perry, Easton; Perry, Hampden; Pert, Pike, Pitts, Plante, Porcell, Prue, Rankin, Reed, Rollins, Rowe, Limerick; Rowe, Madawaska; Russell, Saunders, Smith, Exeter; Stanley, Storm, Tardiff, Wade, Walsh, Warren, Wheaton.

ABSENT — Dow, Hancock, Hendsbee, Karkos, Lebel, Moore, Parsons, Walls, Williams.

Yes 59, No 80, Absent 9.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-nine having voted in the affirmative, eighty in the negative, with nine absentees, the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

Is it now the pleasure of the House to accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report?

The motion prevailed.

The Bill was then given its two several readings.

Under suspension of the rules, on motion of Mr. Carville of Eustis, the Bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Linnell of South Portland, by unanimous consent, the Bill was sent forthwith to the Senate.

The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, was granted unanimous consent to address the House:

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As you all are aware, the Representative from Eliot, Mr. Dow, has been confined to his home with a more or less serious illness. He did make a valiant attempt, we might say, to almost crawl here last week, but due to the recurrence of his illness he was forced to return. It appears that a situation has arisen in his town which is rather difficult. Unfortunately this too has disturbed him terribly. There is on your desk a filing which states very briefly what it is hoped to do. It is something that simply will not delay this session for one moment. And as a courtesy to a fellow legislator who is ill, not for myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, requests unanimous consent to introduce a bill notwithstanding the cloture order. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

The CLERK: Bill "An Act to Extend the Charter of the Eliot Water District."

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the introduction of this bill notwithstanding the cloture order? The Chair does hear objection and the bill is not admitted.

The gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Bacon, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. BACON: Mr. Speaker, we have had county days here and members have received gifts from different counties, and I feel sure that all the members of the House are very appreciative of it, and not until yesterday did we receive such a gesture from a city. I want to read to you from the record on your desk, the last speaker of the day on May 26 made the statement and it is on your desk and I will say that Mr. Rollins of Belfast made the statement: "and I will say this, if we are in session June 1, which it looks as though we might be, I will see that each of you get a broiler." (Applause)

Now it looks to me as if Monday being June 1, that we will still be here, and I know that Mr. Rollins is a man of his word, and I just want to question whether this is the official record or not, and I would say to the members now that if they will keep the potatoes that Aroostook County gave to them earlier in the week, that it looks like they might have a chicken dinner Monday night.

The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: To substantiate the comments of the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Bacon, I received a call this morning from Lewiston which houses one of the largest poultry concerns in this State and they asked me what the idea was of someone promising broilers on June first. The date that had been told them was a different one. I assured them that the record was straight and I assured them that the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, was certainly a man of his word and that we could expect mashed potatoes, boiled potatoes and a broiled chicken.

The gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Rollins, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not one that reads the record, Mr. Bacon just passed it back to me, and I find myself in a precarious position here. At least I will correct

one thing, the date of the Broiler Festival is July 11, and that was my motive in saying that I would see you would all have a chicken if we were in session on that date, and I didn't think I was taking too big a gamble, but somebody put

something over on me. The record I think is a little crooked. (laughter)

On motion of Mr. Wade of Auburn,

Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.