

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

Tuesday, June 9, 1959

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Richard Hulburt of Hallowell.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate
Conference Committee Report**

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution for Appointment of Attorney General by the Governor with Consent of the Senate (S. P. 85) (L. D. 157) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

HILLMAN of Penobscot
LESSARD of Androsocggin
ROSS of Sagadahoc

—Committee on part of Senate

DENNETT of Kittery
SANBORN of Gorham
SMITH of Exeter

—Committee on part of House.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Final Reports

Final Reports of the following
Joint Standing Committees:

Business Legislation
Election Laws
Inland Fisheries and Game
Judiciary
Legal Affairs
Liquor Control
Natural Resources
Public Health
Public Utilities
Retirements and Pensions
State Government
Taxation
Veterans and Military Affairs
Welfare

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Weekly Benefits for Total Unemployment under Employment Security Law" (H. P. 969) (L. D. 1378) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on May 20.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In accordance with the vote on this Bill in the House on May 20, I move that the House adhere.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that the House adhere.

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

Mr. EARLES: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would move that we recede and concur, and I would speak on the motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. EARLES: If the House will recall the action on this particular document, namely: increasing the weekly benefits on unemployment security, they will recall that the vote was not so sharply defined, not so preponderantly in favor of the indefinite postponement, I feel, to warrant an adherence. It is not unnatural perhaps that I would speak on this particular item inasmuch as I made a few remarks on its appearance here previously. As you will recall, this particular bill, since it arrived in the legislative halls, was a matter of adjustment and compromise so that ultimately as it appeared before us the benefits accruing to those who were unemployed would amount to a \$2.00 increase. I realize there are references that have been made to the fact that this will create a tremendous impact upon the fund, so-called. I am cognizant or aware of the fact that there is a difference of opinion as to how much of an impact.

Be that as it may, I think we should realize that the House here

not so long ago took a vote to increase — well at least on the books it is called the legislative salary, but as time goes on it looks as though it is almost a legislative unemployment fund. Also we have passed in this body legislation increasing the salaries of department heads and in my recollection of three terms, it is not the first time that that has been done. We have passed a current services budget that denominates an increase over that which was passed two years ago. The \$2.00 that you would be voting for by receding and concurring would simply insure a little more dignity for the person who is unemployed. I think some people feel that those who are unemployed and take advantage of this fund do so unwarrantedly. Perhaps there are some instances where they do, but in the vast majority of cases, they do not. If they did not have the unemployment fund, they might not actually be pauperized but they would come back upon their respective cities and towns and the fiscal impact there would be burdened upon and borne by the local municipality.

I believe that the House membership can, with good conscience and in common sense, vote to recede and concur for this modest step increase, shall we say, in the unemployment compensation bill before us.

The SPEAKER: For the benefit of the gentleman from South Portland, the Chair would advise the gentleman that the proper motion at the moment is to recede. If that motion prevails, the Bill would then be given its third reading, and then a motion to concur in the adoption of the Senate Amendment would be in order.

The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, that the House recede.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is true that on May 20 this House did vote to indefinitely postpone this bill. The vote was seventy-two in the affirmative and sixty-three in the negative.

Because we voted to indefinitely

postpone the bill at that particular time is no reason why we should change our mind at this particular time. Now I believe that the reason we voted to indefinitely postpone this particular bill was the constant drain on the fund as was pointed out at that particular time, and also in relationship to other labor bills that have been passed in this particular session which are going to cost the employer money.

Two years ago in the last biennium, this bill was once more before the House and at that particular time the benefits were increased to what they are today from \$30.00 a week to \$33.00 a week and at that particular time the number of weeks from which an unemployed person could receive benefits was increased also from twenty-three weeks to twenty-six weeks. Previously in this session we have also passed a Workmen's Compensation bill increasing the benefits under that bill from \$35.00 a week to \$39.00 a week.

There was an article which disturbed me to some extent, written by Mr. Leonard J. Cohen in the Portland Evening Express following the hearing that we had here when that particular bill was defeated by this House in which is stated and I will quote: "Dennis A. Blais, treasurer of the Maine AFL-CIO Council, said today he planned to ask for an investigation of James L. George, Waterville, employer member of the Maine Employment Security Commission.

"Blais charged that George was 'guilty of a disservice to the Legislature' because he had supplied 'completely distorted' cost estimates to Rep. Vinal G. Good (R-Sebago) in connection with a bill to increase jobless pay benefits which was killed in the House Monday."

Now George was not guilty of a disservice to the Legislature, and I don't believe that this House is going to condone the threatening dismissal of a State employee because he has to furnish or does furnish public information to a legislator. Now we all know that we get information from department heads all the time, and if these employers are going to be threatened with dismissal because they furnish this particular information, it

is going to be almost difficult for us to get any kind of information at all. The fact is that particular morning I played the initiative on this matter, I called George myself. He never contacted me, he has never contacted me. And I went down to his office myself, and I said I have a publication here with some figures on it which I want to use, and I want to verify these particular figures before the morning session. And that I did do on May 20, and I verified some of these figures with copies of official documents which are sent to Washington. I have since that time talked with Blais and he does not dispute these figures that I am about to quote.

His complaint seems to be that I used a base year, 1958, which I did use, that being the last available year, and I have an abstract here of the statement that I made at that particular time, and I will quote in part. "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Regardless of the effective date of this bill which is as recited in the bill of this particular time April 1, 1960, based on figures for 1958 being the last complete year available, this bill carries a price tag of \$1,748,712 in full." Several other places in my statement at that particular time I mentioned the year 1958. I don't think that anyone was misled into believing that I was quoting 1957. I am unable to quote 1960 because that year has not materialized as yet.

The figure for the total expenditure for the year 1958 from this fund is also not disputed, and for your information I will repeat it once more, and that figure is \$18,891,229 based on 1958. There was paid into the fund, and these are all official figures, during the year 1958 only \$7,484,538, making a deficit for the year 1958 of approximately \$11,000,000. Well, let us use 1959 figures then. Now I have some 1959 figures, and I won't involve Mr. George in it. I called Mr. L. C. Fortier, the Chairman of the Commission, and I said, "Mr. Fortier, I have a statement here reciting that payments into and withdrawals from this fund for period January 1, 1959 to April 30, 1959. Are these figures correct, and can

I use your name?" and he said "Yes."

And here are the figures which will show that there is a continued withdrawal upon this particular fund far in excess of the amount being paid into it at this particular time, and therefore I would be opposed to the prevailing motion that this bill pass at this particular time because it would make a continued and added drain upon this particular fund and here are the figures for the first four months of 1959. Paid into the fund by employers \$1,739,977.78, and withdrawn from the fund paid in unemployment compensation \$6,159,965.46. I am sorry, I am unable to quote June, but brought you up to April 30 and I have taken these last two sets of figures from a mimeographed copy put out by and up at the top of it it says Maine Employment Security Commission, Trial Balance as of April 30, 1959, and these figures were confirmed by Mr. L. C. Fortier, the Chairman of the Employment Security Commission.

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

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As sponsor of the bill I believe that there are a few things that should be brought to your attention. You have heard a great array of figures and what this extra \$2.00 might mean. I would like to have you think along with me that, and let us be hopeful of the fact that, we are recovering from a recession. The figures that have been shown here were ones that applied to the winter months in which, due to seasonal activities here in our State, we do have considerable unemployment. Now our unemployment rate is dropping off. More and more people are going to work as of now. You will also note in the bill that it does not apply until April 1, 1960, so therefore it is going to be very difficult to say how much money will be taken from the fund one year from now because as we hope with the unemployment being done away with there will be very little drain on the fund, and I would like to go along with this

\$2.00 increase because I feel that it will be of value to the working people. It is one of the few bills that we have put out here in the line of labor that has been of any consequence and not only that but it will be of value to all of the communities, to the welfare and to the individual. I would like to go along with the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, that we recede and I request a division.

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

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, rather than prolong the debate, I would just like to make this point that up until 1943 the employers were paying into the fund 2.7 per cent and that they are now paying only 1.5 per cent. I would also request a roll call when the vote is taken.

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

Mr. WHITMAN: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would like to heartily agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good. This bill has come back to haunt us a second time. It has been brought out that this was voted down once in the House by seventy-two to sixty-three. I don't think the arguments have changed one bit from the time that this thing was all debated back on May 20. I don't think the arguments have changed and I don't think the picture has changed. If anything perhaps the picture would indicate that we should continue with our line of thinking of May 20 and I shall continue to do so.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, being House Chairman of the Labor Committee maybe I should say a few words about this bill, and at the outset I hope that the motion made by the gentleman from South Portland does not prevail, and I also have a newspaper clipping here that says: "More jobs needed, not more compensation," and a few days ago there

was a newspaper article that disturbed me a little bit that sort of covered all the financial picture of the Legislature and said that these figures we were struggling with were peanuts. Well, one single set of figures might be peanuts but the overall picture is not peanuts and I would just like to remind you that it was the final straw that broke the camel's back, and there is one segment of our economy in here that is being continually overlooked and that is the consumer. The consumer, oh he can pay this, he can pay this, it is only peanuts, but finally the consumer is going to be pretty hard put. And there is one statement I would like to straighten out, that is on the one and one-half per cent that the different companies pay, as I understand it every company has a different rating depending upon their lay-offs, etc., and many, many of our small companies are paying three per cent. They pay two and one half per cent to the fund and then they pay three tenths of one per cent to the federal government when they pay their income tax to administer the fund.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is true as has been stated that the unemployment compensation has been increased to \$33.00 a week, but I would draw to your attention that this is the maximum that the unemployed can receive but the vast majority of the unemployed get much less than \$33.00 per week. Now we have raised everyone's salary in the state government practically and the county officials and employees on the ground or reason given that the increase was caused by the cost of increase in living. Now shouldn't that be just as true of the unemployed? They too have the cost of increase in living, and I would draw your attention to the fact that it was not for the reason that the employer could exploit the unemployed to the extent that they could earn this little fund that they are putting into this. The employer could not do it. Therefore it is the unemployed while they are working who do earn this amount and who

make it possible for the employer to pay it in. It is their money after all because the worker pays all the bills of luxury and waste and the employer pays, unless he is working himself, he does not contribute anything to this fund. It is the worker himself who contributes.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, that the House recede. A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call the Chair must have an expression of the desire for a 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 ordered.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state the question once again. The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to Weekly Benefits for Total Unemployment under Employment Security Law," House Paper 969, Legislative Document 1378, the House recede from its previous action whereby it indefinitely postponed this Bill on May 20.

If you favor the motion to recede you will say "yes" when your name is called, if you oppose the motion you will say "no."

The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YES — Aliberti, Beane, Boone, Briggs, Cahill, Call, Caron, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Coyne, Curtis, Cyr, Augusta; Cyr, Fort Kent; Davis, Westbrook; Desmarais, Dostie, Doyle, Dudley, Dufour, Dumais, Earles, Edwards, Raymond; Gallant, Haughn, Healy, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Karkos, Kellam, Kilroy, Kinch,

Knight, Lacharite, Lancaster, Lane, Lantagne, Lebel, Lemelin, Letourneau, Lowery, Maxwell, Miller, Nadeau, Pert, Plante, Prue, Rankin, Reed, Rowe, Madawaska; Russell, Saunders, Tardiff, Walsh, Walter, Warren, Young.

NO — Bacon, Baker, Baxter, Ber-
man, Brockway, Brown, Cape
Elizabeth; Brown, Ellsworth; Car-
ter, Carville, Caswell, Chapman,
Gardiner; Chapman, Norway;
Choate, Christie, Clark, Cousins,
Cox, Crockett, Danes, Dean, Den-
nett, Dennison, Dodge, Dumaine,
Dunn, Edgerly, Edmunds, Edwards,
Stockton Springs; Emmons, Fraz-
ier, Good, Graves, Hancock, Han-
son, Bradford; Hanson, Lebanon;
Hardy, Harrington, Heald, Hilton,
Hobbs, Hodgkins, Hughes, Hutchin-
son, Jewell, Kennedy, Knapp, Lind-
say, Linnell, Mathews, Mathieson,
Mayo, Monroe, Moore, Morse, Per-
ry, Easton; Perry, Hampden; Phil-
brick, Pike, Pitts, Rowe, Limerick;
Smith, Exeter; Smith, Falmouth;
Stanley, Storm, Treworgy, Trum-
bull, Wade, Weston, Wheaton, Whit-
ing, Whitman, Williams, Winchen-
paw.

ABSENT — Barnett, Bragdon,
Brown, Bangor; Davis, Calais;
Dow, Ervin, Harris, Jewett, Mad-
dox, Parsons, Porell, Rollins, San-
born, Turner, Walls.

Yes 60, No 73, Absent 15.

The SPEAKER: Sixty having voted in the affirmative, seventy-three having voted in the negative, with fifteen absent, the motion to recede does not prevail.

The pending question now is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, that the House adhere. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The following Communication:
STATE OF MAINE
SENATE CHAMBER

June 5, 1959

Hon. Harvey R. Pease
Clerk of the House of
Representatives
99th Legislature
State House
Augusta, Maine
Sir:

The President of the Senate to-
day appointed the following mem-

bers of the Senate to join with members of the House in a Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on:

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

Senators:

DOW of Lincoln
BATES of Penobscot
COFFIN of Cumberland

Respectfully,

(Signed) CHESTER T. WINSLOW
Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

The Speaker appointed the following Conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing action of the two branches on House Paper 108, Legislative Document 181, Bill "An Act to Authorize the Construction of Housing for the University of Maine and the Issuance of not Exceeding \$24,000,000 Bonds of the State of Maine for the Financing Thereof":

Messrs. ERVIN of Houlton
FRAZIER of Lee
Miss CORMIER of Rumford

Orders

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

ORDERED, that Mr. Harris of Greenville be excused from attendance for the remainder of the week because of business.

On motion of Mr. Wade of Auburn, it was

ORDERED, that Donald G. Heron be excused from attendance as Page for the remainder of the present session.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the Speaker is hereby authorized to appoint an Acting Page for the remainder of the session.

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to the authority granted to the Speaker by this order, the Speaker will appoint as acting Page for the balance of the session, Mr. Stewart Gerald at my right. (Applause)

Emergency Measure Tabled Until Later in Today's Session

An Act to Make Valid the Incorporation of School Administrative Districts Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (S. P. 285) (L. D. 747)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, due to the amount of material that has been placed on the desks relative to this showing up both sides—the other side, I would like to have this tabled until later in the day.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson, moves that this bill be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session pending passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, we have been here a terribly long time —

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

Mr. BRAGDON: I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. The question before the House is that this bill be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session. Will those who favor the tabling motion please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-eight having voted in the affirmative and seventy-nine having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

Thereupon, this being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 94 voted in favor of same and 32 against, and accordingly the bill failed of enactment not having secured the necessary two-thirds vote.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, would I be in order now to move reconsideration?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman would be in order to move reconsideration.

Mr. ERVIN: Having voted on the prevailing side, I move reconsideration of our action whereby this bill failed of passage to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it failed to enact this measure. The Chair will order a division.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask for a roll call on that motion?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman would be in order.

Mr. ROLLINS: I request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call the Chair must have an expression of a desire for a roll call from at least one-fifth of the members of the House. Will those who desire a roll call on the motion to reconsider please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Less than one-fifth of the members arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously less than one-fifth of the members having arisen, a roll call is not ordered. The Chair will order a division. Will those who favor the motion to reconsider the action whereby this Bill failed of enactment please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-five having voted in the affirmative and forty-one having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did prevail.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rules may be suspended in order that I may move reconsideration of the action whereby the act was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that suspension of the rules does not require

unanimous consent, it requires a two-thirds vote.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I would request that. The reason if that is slightly debatable, is that there are —

The SPEAKER: The gentleman cannot debate a motion to suspend the rules. The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House suspend the rules that he may move reconsideration of the passage for engrossment of this bill. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I move we reconsider our action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it passed to be engrossed Bill "An Act to Make Valid the Incorporation of School Administrative Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6" on June 5. Is it the pleasure of the House that the engrossment shall be reconsidered?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, Mr. Bragdon of Perham offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 285, L. D. 747, Bill, "An Act to Make Valid the Incorporation of School Administrative Districts Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the emergency preamble.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that House Amendment "A" be adopted.

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

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, as a point of information, could I ask what this amendment will do? I think some of the other House Members are probably a little bit confused too.

The SPEAKER: If the gentleman is addressing a question to the Chair, the Chair would advise the

gentleman that the amendment does exactly what it says. It strikes out the emergency preamble. Would the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, care to answer the question any further?

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I was preoccupied with something else.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford addressed a question asking just what this amendment does.

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think what is confusing here is we have just had passed out filing 488 which is House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A". I think some are looking at that. The one that we should be considering at this time is just House Amendment "A" filing 487.

The Chair would recognize the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I think that the House now has the explanation of this amendment. Obviously we felt that this validating act, that it was desirable to have it as an emergency. However, if we feel it can be operated otherwise, we simply — these districts that are asking to have this can, after ninety days after the adjournment of the Legislature, operate on it without the emergency clause which we feel should have been justifiably put on it and which we were just denied. The reason for offering this amendment is that if you don't wish the emergency, we are perfectly willing that we go along without it. I hope the House will go along.

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

Mr. ALIBERTI: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I would then ask another question or two. First, does this meet with the approval of the Education Committee and secondly, does it also meet with the approval of the Department of Education?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, has addressed two questions through

the Chair to anyone who may answer if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking for the Committee. I am speaking as an individual. I will say that the Educational Department and the Educational Committee have tried to keep up with the amendments, etc. that are on this and have tried to find out as much as we could about the effect of these things, and it was the reason I asked for tabling of this until later in the day so that we could really get down to the bottom of some of these things that are being stuck on.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must rule that the gentleman is not answering either of the questions. The question was, has this amendment the approval of the Committee and does it have the approval of the Department?

Mr. MATHIESON: Let me say that it does not have the approval of either. We have never met to even consider it.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Rumford consider his questions answered?

Mr. ALIBERTI: Yes I do Mr. Speaker, and I would now move that this be tabled until further in the day.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, that this bill be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session pending the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House adopt House Amendment "A". Will those who favor the motion to table please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted, a division of the House was had. Seventy-four having voted in the affirmative and fifty-one having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act to Allocate Moneys for the Administrative Expenses of the State Liquor Commission for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961 (H. P. 978) (L. D. 1389)

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. 110 voted in favor of same and 12 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Finally Passed Constitutional Amendment

Resolve Providing for the Date when the Amendment to the Constitution to Provide Continuity of Government in Case of Enemy Attack shall be Voted Upon (S. P. 511)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being a proposed Constitutional Amendment and a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a division was had. 130 voted in favor of same and 2 voted against, and accordingly the Resolve was finally passed, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted Enactor Requiring Two-Thirds Vote

An Act to Provide for the Date in Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-nine when the Bond Issues Proposed by the Legislature shall be Voted Upon (S. P. 509)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. In accordance with the provisions of Section 14 of Article IX of the Constitution a two-thirds vote of the House being necessary, a division was had. 126 voted in favor of the same and 3 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 Increasing Salaries of Various Department Heads and Commissions (S. P. 468) (L. D. 1331)

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.

An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage (S. P. 472) (L. D. 1337)

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

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a signer of this bill as "Ought not to pass," I feel that this Legislature should not put this law on the books just for the sake of having a law on the books, and with all the amendments on this law this law will cause more trouble than it will do good, and I for one have been over to the Department of Labor and Industry and we have asked them several questions and they say they cannot answer those questions, so I think the wisest thing to do would not be to put this law on the books so at this time I move indefinite postponement of L. D. 1337.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, that Bill "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage" and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have debated this many times. It has come to us. It is true we have placed many amendments on it, but nevertheless we have established the principle that there should be a minimum wage law in the State, that it should be one dollar and even with all of its amendments, I think that we certainly at this late date after all of the discussion that we have had that we certainly should not go along with this motion to indefinitely postpone, and I would request a division.

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

Mr. KENNEDY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At the very beginning and inception of this bill I opposed it because I did not think that we needed such legislation in Maine. We have a federal bill of a dollar an hour which covers just about every working person. Those who are not

working in interstate commerce are receiving a dollar an hour because of the competition of these plants and various industries which pay anywhere from a dollar to a dollar and a quarter or more.

It was my feeling at that time that this would only be an expense to the taxpayers in Maine. There is an administration cost, of course, to every bill that is passed by the Legislature. It seems to me that this was poorly conceived legislation in the beginning because we were already under a federal minimum wage law. I still don't see the need of a State minimum wage. As it is now with the various amendments, it is a minimum wage for few, but exemptions for many. I personally am not handicapped by this bill. I have three establishments, and by having three establishments I am able to employ three in each one and still not come under this bill. Now if you ladies and gentlemen of the House in all honesty believe this is true and honest legislation, I can't see how you feel that way because if one should come under it so should all. What is good for one is good for all.

There are a few elderly women that work in we'll say Grants or Freese's in Bangor, some of the places that are not laboring perhaps too strenuously, who are paid less than a dollar an hour. They choose this mode of work because they can take it easy. They are not driven every hour of the eight hours a day or the forty hours a week. I am disturbed too about the hodgepodge language in the amendment covering the waitresses in the hotels, motels, restaurants, and so on. As I recall this amendment, it says that the major portion of the salary or gratuities, — whichever is the major portion, now does that mean the lesser half or the greater amount of the half? Just what is the interpretation of this amendment?

Several weeks ago I was on a committee in Augusta and the department head of Labor and Industry was at that meeting. At that time she did not know that I was a legislator. I can't substantiate this statement but believe me this is what she said at that time. She was discussing it with some of her local

friends and she made the statement: "I respect most heartily those people who opposed the bill at its inception. I respect them more than I do those who have put on these various amendments." Now I believe she was very sincere in this statement because — what do these amendments do? It exempts just about everyone in the State of Maine. Now, if this is good legislation, can you say it is good legislation in all honesty? Who is covered by this legislation? As I remember one amendment that did not pass in this House was presented by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner. His amendment would be to exempt people working in laundries and dry cleaning plants. That is the only amendment that I know of that did not pass in this House, so evidently all we are legislating against are the people that run laundries and dry cleaning plants.

The administration cost of this bill so Miss Martin stated, was \$6,700. Now that was at the very beginning without the exemptions. What is the cost going to be with all of these exemptions, the clerical work entailed in the next biennium? Does anyone have that answer? If they have this answer in the debate, I would like to hear some real good figures of how much this is going to cost. If they hire one inspector, they must pay him anywhere from \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year and probably \$6,000 to do the State of Maine. Now he is going to be a superman, it seems to me, to be able to chase down all these exemptions, file and then do the clerical work and so on for \$6,700. Now, I do believe that once this man is employed, and I doubt very much in my own mind if one man can do this job, but once all this is done it must because of the nature of this bill and its structure with all of its amendments when it comes back into the Department of Labor and Industry, there must be some clerical work go on there too, so that must be a cost to the taxpayers. I have been speaking here since I came here about cost to the taxpayers, and I think this is going to be a tremendous cost to the taxpayers.

Now some would argue that this bill is better than no bill at all.

Well, I believe it is just cluttering up the statutes with another bill that has no benefit actually to the working people of the State of Maine. It is going to be a handicap too to those people who are under the exemptions, the employers. It is going to mean clerical work for them too, but don't forget it is going to be a tax burden added to your citizens.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this before. I stated at that time in debate that if the thing could not be killed in one fell swoop, the next step was to amend it to death. I think now the attempt is to debate it to death. I will not become a part of that attempt to kill this minimum wage by debate. All I will say is that I supported the minimum wage previously. I urge all to support it now and when the vote is taken, I would ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? A roll call has been requested. The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, that the House indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage."

For the Chair to order a roll call, the Chair must have an expression of the desire for a roll call on the part of at least one-fifth of the members of the House. Will all who desire a roll call please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, that Bill "An Act Establishing a Minimum Wage" Senate Paper 472, Legislative Document 1337, be indefinitely postponed. If you favor the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill you will say "yes" when your name is called, if you oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone, you will say "no." The Clerk will call the roll.

ROLL CALL

YES — Bacon, Baker, Bragdon, Brockway, Brown, Bangor; Brown, Ellsworth; Carter, Carville, Caswell, Chapman, Gardiner; Chapman, Norway; Choate, Christie, Danes, Dennison, Dumaine, Dunn, Edmunds, Edwards, Stockton Springs; Ervin, Graves, Hancock, Hanson, Bradford; Hardy, Harrington, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Hutchinson, Jewell, Jewett, Kennedy, Knapp, Lindsay, Linnell, Monroe, Morse, Perry, Easton; Philbrick, Smith, Falmouth; Stanley, Whitman, Williams, Winchenpaw.

NO — Aliberti, Barnett, Baxter, Beane, Berman, Boone, Briggs, Brown, Cape Elizabeth; Cahill, Call, Caron, Clark, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Cox, Coyne, Crockett, Curtis, Cyr, Augusta; Cyr, Fort Kent, Davis, Westbrook; Dean, Dennett, Desmarais, Dodge, Dostie, Dudley, Dufour, Dumais, Earles, Edgerly, Edwards, Raymond; Emmons, Frazier, Gallant, Good, Hanson, Lebanon; Haughn, Heald, Healy, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Hilton, Hughes, Jacques, Jalbert, Johnson, Karkos, Kellam, Kilroy, Kinch, Knight, Lacharite, Lancaster, Lane, Lantagne, Lebel, Lemelin, Letourneau, Lowery, Mathews, Mathieson, Maxwell, Miller, Moore, Nadeau, Perry, Hampden; Pert, Pike, Pitts, Plante, Prue, Rankin, Reed, Rollins, Rowe, Limerick; Rowe, Madawaska; Russell, Saunders, Smith, Exeter; Storm, Tardiff, Trumbull, Turner, Wade, Walsh, Walter, Warren, Weston, Wheaton, Whiting, Young.

ABSENT — Cousins, Davis, Calais; Dow, Doyle, Harris, Maddox, Mayo, Parsons, Porell, Sanborn, Treworgy, Walls.

Yes: 43, No: 93, Absent: 12.

The SPEAKER: Forty-three having voted in the affirmative, ninety-three in the negative, with twelve absentees, the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

An Act Restating and Revising the Law Governing Insurance Companies, Agents, Brokers and Fees (H. P. 928) (L. D. 1312)

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.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.
(Off record remarks)

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that unless previous notice is given to the Clerk of the House by some member of his or her intention to move reconsideration, the Clerk be authorized today to send to the Senate, thirty minutes after House action, all matters passed to be engrossed in concurrence, and all matters that require Senate concurrence; and that after such matters have been so sent to the Senate by the Clerk, no motion to reconsider shall be in order.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request? Does the gentleman object?

Mr. HAUGHN of Bridgton: I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is objection and the request is denied.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As you know when you arrived this morning, you found a little food to enable you to eat for the rest of the week. On your desks this morning you found products which originated from the County of Cumberland. Senator Charles, Representative Clark and myself, a couple of weeks ago decided that whereas all of the counties were having these county demonstration days that we thought it might be in order for Cumberland County to sort of come up with some of these victuals in the closing week.

On your desks this morning we have the Golden Sugar Corn, cream style, made by Baxter Brothers, a famous Maine name and a famous Maine product. We have Snow's Clam Chowder, known the world over, and Nissen's Old Home Bread,

a Portland product with branch bakeries in Bangor and other parts of New England. Humpty Dumpty Potato Chips, good for you and the kiddies. We have nuts by Nutter. We have Burnham and Morrill products and these products are also known the world over, featuring their famous corn relish.

I want to at this time say thanks to Baxter Brothers, Burnham & Morrill, the Humpty Dumpty and Nuts by Nutter, Nissen's Bakery and Snow's Canning Company for the helping hand in this demonstration this morning. It is well to note that Mr. Fred Snow of the Snow Canning Company and Mr. Charles Morrill of the Burnham and Morrill Company were former members of the Maine State Legislature. Also that Mr. John Baxter, connected with the Baxter products, is a member of the 99th.

On behalf of the Cumberland County delegation, I say thanks for the splendid cooperation. It is also well to note that the sponsors were aware of the fact that we were serving our third week without pay. This is their contribution to our hungry stomachs. And in conclusion, Nutter says "nuts, let's eat." (Applause)

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Wade of Auburn,

Recessed until two o'clock in the afternoon.

After Recess 2:00 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Order Out of Order Indefinitely Postponed

Out of order and under suspension of the rules, Mr. Desmarais of Sanford presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that there be paid to the members of the Legislature the sum of \$10 for each legislative day for expenses, such amounts to be included in weekly lists certified to the State Controller by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, respectively; such amounts to be retroactive to May 21, 1959 and are to be paid from the legislative appropriation.

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

Mr. DESMARAIS: Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen: Before I start on this, I would want to tell you that I spoke with the Attorney General and with Mr. Slosberg on this order, and they told me that this order was possible, that it was legal, and it could be done by us legislators. We are here. We have been here for the last four weeks and we have not received a cent for our efforts for being here. I know that they are holding our checks back for the last two weeks of pay, but still that does not put the money in our pockets. I am not a rich man. I have to work for a living, and while I am here I am not earning money. My business back home while I am not there, I have to pay my help when I am here, and whatever profit I make on my business goes towards my help. My bills over there are accumulating and I am not here asking for charity. I am only asking for what I think is owed me.

We have been raising these county officials' pay and all these heads of departments pay and we are not raising our pay. I don't know how far this session is going to prolong, we are going to go along with this session here, but I sure can't afford to stay here much longer without being paid, and I believe that we should be getting paid here. My constituents back home, if I should say to them, that I am down here every day without pay they would tell me that I am crazy, and sometimes I really believe it. I really do. They told us while we were in session during the wintertime, a lot of my constituents would say: "Well, you boys are down in Augusta on a vacation getting paid." Well if we are getting paid, we might as well go back home and tell these people that we are getting paid. Why try to tell them that we are not, because they won't believe us in the first place. They believe that we are getting paid so let us get paid for the days we are down here.

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

Mr. WHITMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I too am a very poor man. I am getting poorer by the minute. However, I elected to run for this office on the premise of \$1,400 salary. I may be crazy along with Mr. Desmarais as he claims to be down here working for nothing, but I did make a bargain and I intend to stick by it. I think we are working some overtime here in an effort to save the taxpayers a few dollars, and I think we should be realistic and continue along those lines.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK: Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the various newspapers reported that many if not all of the economy bloc voted for an increase in our own salaries. I am a member of the economy bloc. I did not vote for an increase in my salary, and I definitely want to go on record today as being very much opposed to raiding the State's funds for any more money for us.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that I am in complete accord with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Desmarais, to a certain degree, to the effect that whether I know that I agree with him that he is crazy, I know I agree that I am crazy to stay here, probably to have ever come here in the first place. However I am here and I intend to stay. I thought that the donations that we received from the — the most gracious donations from the Cumberland County delegation this morning, I thought that that was something to keep us going temporarily and I certainly hope that some other area will take up where Cumberland left off, but I am going to try to stay here and see this thing out as much as I would like to get home this weekend.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I am probably going to do the unexpected today and oppose my good friend from Sanford, Mr. Desma-

rais, because you all know that I have sponsored for the past three sessions of Legislature pay increase for legislators, but I hope the Press will certainly relay to the public that we are working for nothing. We are doing a job as a public spirited citizen. We are trying to do it in their interest with a minimum of cost and I do not want to jeopardize any future legislative pay increase, so therefore I am forced at this time even though I feel as he does, we are working for nothing we are working for nothing and it is a hardship, but that is a sacrifice and penalty for the honor and privilege of serving our people, and I hope the motion does not prevail.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I fear that if this order should pass we would not care whether we got home and we would be staying right along so I am in opposition to this. Seriously I have been in opposition to every pay raise that has been instituted here in this Legislature since I was a member and I am in opposition to this for the simple reason that I feel that while it may not be legally out of order, I believe it is morally out of order when we came here for \$1,400 to ask for more regardless of time.

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

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am probably the poorest man member of this Legislature but, however, I knew what the job paid when my constituents sent me up here, they did not ask me whether they were electing me for one week, two weeks, three weeks, twenty weeks, thirty weeks or fifty-two weeks. I believe my obligation is to stay here as long, at my own expense if necessary, as hard as it is, to take and give what my constituents wanted, good, true legislation. That is what we are here for and no hurry-up job.

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

Mr. BRIGGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It was stated in the Portland Telegram on Sunday that it cost the State of Maine \$5,000 per day while the Legislature is in session and we twaddled here now for I believe about twenty extra days at a cost of \$100,000 to the State of Maine. Therefore, I believe we are entitled to expenses, not salaries, but expenses of \$10 per day, and it will cost the State \$200 more a day on top of the \$5,000. Therefore I will go along with the motion of Mr. Desmarais from Sanford. I hope I said that correctly, it will cost us \$5,200 per day including the other branch, instead of \$5,000.

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

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur heartily with the opposition to this order, and if I am in order I would move indefinite postponement of the order.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from St. Albans, Mr. Hughes, that this order be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. DESMARAIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I was elected to this office I knew what I was getting myself into. There is no doubt about that, but let us be realistic about the whole affair. I did not believe that this was going to continue for a whole year. Two years ago we ran over one week. Well, that was all right. That was not too, too bad, but here we are now in our third week here and I know that by being obligated to these people and everything to do our duty they are not paying our bills when we get back home, and I have got some bills to pay, and that is the reason why I presented this order.

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

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think at the rate we are going we are getting just about what we are worth. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order.

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

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of this order, and I think when we came we knew what money we were going to get, but it seems peculiar that we should have passed an order for an increase of our local officers of the court and so on. They knew what they were going to get, but we passed an order that they would get an increase in wages. Now I voted against that and I will vote against this, but I can't understand why we should not be consistent on that as well as this.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. WHITMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from St. Albans, Mr. Hughes, that this Order be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been requested.

For the Chair to order a roll call the Chair must have an expression of a desire for a roll call on the part of 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 did not arise.

The SPEAKER: Obviously less than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is not in order. The Chair will order a division. Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of this Order please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-eight having voted in the affirmative and eight having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone the Order did prevail.

Order out of Order Tabled and Assigned

Out of order and under suspension of the rules, Mr. Wade of Auburn presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that the Clerk of the House, when the Legislature is not

in session, grant the use of the Hall of the House to instrumentalities of State Government and State Departments, Bureaus, Divisions and Boards, provided the Director of the Bureau of Public Improvements certifies to the Clerk that there is no other adequate or suitable place in the State House or State Office Building for holding such meetings;

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the Clerk of the House grant the use of the Hall of the House to organizations solely for the purpose of studying legislative procedure and conducting model Legislatures.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, moves that this Order be reproduced and be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending adoption. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair now lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961, House Paper 976, Legislative Document 1386, tabled on June 5 by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, pending passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, this Legislative Document is number 1386 and I am going to speak on an item on page five. Now that is the item for the University of Maine showing \$500,000 for the years 1959 and 1960 and \$500,000 for the years 1960 and 1961. Now I just want to briefly point out there has been some indication that those entire amounts would be stricken out so in defense of that position, I wish to speak at this particular time.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GOOD: I would like to go back to the years 1955, the biennium 1955 - 1957 and point out for current services during that biennium there was spent by the University of

Maine \$3,521,296. I checked those figures with Roland M. Berry, the State Budget Officer. Now there has already been appropriated for this biennium in a bill which has been signed by the Governor, L. D. 1313, the sum of \$6,172,277. Now if the amounts shown on page five of the bill now before us should be reduced to \$250,000 each year, this would be the result. Now you know that the Governor's recommendation for this particular item for current services for the University of Maine was \$6,172,277 and that has become law. Now this particular item as shown on page five calling for \$500,000 each year making a total of \$1,000,000 is in addition to the Governor's recommendations. If that could be increased only to \$250,000 for each year making a total of \$500,000 for the biennium, the University of Maine for current services would have this to work with. They would have \$6,672,277 to work with. That is an increase over the biennium 1955-1957 of \$3,150,981. Now I know these figures are confusing. All I can say is this, that the Legislature has been increasing the amount of money given to the University of Maine each biennium which is good. No question but what the University needs it, and it is making great progress, probably making greater progress than the amount of money is that we are giving them. However, in light of the fact there was a movement to cut out this entire extra amount that we are giving the University above what the Governor has recommended, I wish to at this time make a motion that the House suspend the rules for the purpose of reconsidering our action whereby we passed this bill to be engrossed for the purpose of introducing an amendment which would show an increase over the Governor's recommendation for the biennium of half a million dollars instead of a million.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good, that the House suspend the rules for the purpose of reconsidering the House action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed. The Chair will order a division. Will those who favor the motion to suspend

the rules please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred four having voted in the affirmative and nineteen having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I now move we reconsider our action whereby L. D. 1386 was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed on June 3. The Chair will order a division. Will those who favor the motion to reconsider the action of the House whereby it passed to be engrossed Bill, "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961." please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred and ten having voted in the affirmative and twenty having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider prevailed.

Thereupon, Mr. Good of Sebago offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 976, L. D. 1386, Bill, "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961."

Amend said Bill under the caption UNIVERSITY OF MAINE by striking out the line:

"All Other 500,000 500,000" and inserting in place thereof the line:
 'All Other 250,000 250,000'

Further amend said Bill by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. TREWORGY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The salary situation at your State University is desperate. The University of Maine asked for an increase over the previous biennium of \$2,924,000 for their operating budget. The Governor has recommended an increase of \$966,224 over the last biennium. Average salary increases of only ten per cent for the first year and five per cent the second year would require a biennium increase of approximately \$1,400,000, but the University is short by approximately \$445,000. Now the average salary of the teaching staff at the University is slightly over \$5,900. The average salary of teaching staffs of the other sixty-eight land grant colleges in the country is \$7,900 or approximately a \$2,000 difference. In order to bring salaries up to the average of the other land grant colleges in the country, the University of Maine should have asked for an additional \$1,500,000. Taking into account the Governor's approximate million and the million as proposed in the supplemental budget, the University would still be short by two and a half million dollars. Unless at least an average ten per cent increase in the first year and five per cent average increase in the second year is granted, the University will continue to lose top faculty members. Already as of last Monday twenty-six resignations have been submitted out of the total teaching staff of two hundred and eighty-nine, or slightly under ten per cent.

The \$966,224 that the Governor has recommended provides no money for such urgently needed items as modern equipment and apparatus for the technology laboratory and resource material for the library. Take the department of electrical engineering, for example, whose accreditation a few years ago was five years and is now down to two. They are trying in that department to teach theory and practical application covering today's modern field of technology on antique Model T equipment. I wish you could see the equipment they are forced to use. The switchboard which controls much of this machinery used in these courses dates back to

before the first World War. Electric motors of 1922 vintage and earlier.

The accreditation committee has said that approximately \$300,000 worth of equipment must be purchased over the next few years if the college of technology ever expects to again regain full accreditation. In order to achieve this the University should start at once to spend approximately \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year over the next five years in order to replace old and obsolete equipment and for the addition of new equipment in order to stay in step with this modern age of technology.

What will be the effect on students? Given a 2.9 million asked for by the University, enrollment could have increased by six hundred. That is three hundred additional students could be taken in at Orono and three hundred additional at the University of Maine in Portland. The extra million which the Republican leadership has recommended, if approved by you folks here today in the supplemental budget, will allow between three and four hundred additional students split between Orono and the University of Maine in Portland. If no money beyond the money recommended by the Governor is forthcoming, the ceiling of four thousand students will have to remain at Orono and the ceiling of three hundred at the University of Maine at Portland will have to remain.

Tuition — In-state students pay a tuition of \$318 and the prospect is this will increase. Out-of-state students pay tuition of \$703. Already the University of Maine is among the highest of the publicly supported institutions in the country, standing forty-seventh in this respect. I will read you a brief paragraph from a letter to me dated April 28 from President Elliott: "If we want more of our mentally capable youths to go to college, we must not raise cost to the student further. If we want college reserved for the financially able then charges mean very little. Of course we must remember that our State University is one of the land grant institutions of the country founded in order that boys and girls without financial resources but with intellectual capabilities

could have a chance for a college education."

Mr. Speaker, I now move that this amendment be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Appropriations Committee of this Legislature, I went along with the program which provided the million dollars increase for the University of Maine. I did so feeling that it was a very sound and a very desirable program and it was necessary. However in the process of coming out with a program which we in this Legislature can eventually buy and go home and I think it is very important that we do do something like that and do it very soon, I do now very reluctantly yield in the interest of practical economy from the stand which I originally took and I find myself in accord with the motion of the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good.

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

Mrs. HARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I wish to remind you that Maine is really fortunate in having a land grant college. It not only educates our young men and women, but it also helps us in agriculture. It helps your boys and girls in 4-H Clubs and it puts on the Farm and Home Week which you all enjoy. I really and truly believe that the University of Maine is in dire need of this million dollars at this time, and I hope you will think of that when you vote.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Thank you, sir. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: As a member of the Appropriations Committee who brought out this supplemental appropriation, I signed it without any misgivings whatsoever as to the amount of money for the University of Maine. You will remember that for the first time, at least in my memory and probably in the memo-

ry of all, that the University last year was closed to a number of students. There were a certain number of students who could go there and that was it. We have heard a great deal nationally as well as in the State about doing something for the exceptional child, providing education for the exceptional child, scholarships and what have you, and we in this Legislature can do this type of thing by providing money for the University of Maine so that they can take more students than they are now taking.

It has been brought out several times that the percentage of students from the State of Maine who go to college is the smallest except for one state in the Union. We have a good University. It has been improved over the years but I feel now that we have to spend a good deal of money to take care of the education for the young people who will be the leaders of our communities in the years to come. In the Governor's Budget Message, he mentioned the fact that if funds were available he would put in his budget \$1,034,500 for the University of Maine feeling that it would be a good investment in the future. Since the time the budget was proposed by the Governor income has increased to the State. Our expected revenues are up over \$2,000,000, so I am sure that the \$1,034,000 can be spent from the \$2,000,000. It just seems to me that this is one thing that we should take care of in this Legislature, that we should not in the rush of trying to compromise, in the rush of trying to get home, that we should compromise on things that are going to have an effect not only on we who are sitting here wanting to go home but all of the people of this State and particularly the students whom we have tried to do so much for.

I certainly hope that the indefinite postponement motion goes through.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, for clarity I just wish to briefly point out that the Governor's recommendation was approximately \$900,000 more than the preceding biennium

and that this amendment will give the University an additional \$500,000 for the biennium, making a total available to the University for the next biennium of approximately \$6,600,000.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Treworgy, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes that gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of this amendment please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-two having voted in the affirmative and ninety-eight having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is the motion of the gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good, that the House adopt House Amendment "A". Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask a question. This is just the supplemental appropriation budget, L. D. 1386, that we are working on?

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Well, it is my understanding, as being against any new tax at the moment, that if we buy this without any further amendment we are also buying a new tax of some kind. I just wanted to point that out to the House. I think I am correct in my supposition from machines I have here that amending this down \$500,000 does not eliminate the possibility of no new taxes. This should be held back until we buy some tax measure, I believe. I don't know what to do about it unless its —.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the passage to be engrossed of Bill "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the

Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961," House Paper 976, Legislative Document 1386.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, could I move that that be tabled unassigned?

The SPEAKER: Such a motion would be in order.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: I make that motion.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw, that this Bill be tabled unassigned pending passage to be engrossed. The Chair will order a division. Will those who favor the tabling motion please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fourteen having voted in the affirmative and ninety-nine having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, An Act Amending the Maine Housing Authorities Act, House Paper 967, Legislative Document 1373, tabled on June 5 by the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Edwards, pending passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the rules be suspended in order that I may make a motion to reconsider the passage of this bill to be engrossed on June 3rd and also the adoption of House Amendment "B".

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, that the House suspend the rules so that he may move reconsideration of the action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed in the House on June 3. The gentleman also wishes to suspend the rules in

order that he may move the adoption of House Amendment "B". Will those in favor of the suspension of the rules please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Fifty-six having voted in the affirmative and thirty-nine having voted in the negative, the motion to suspend the rules did not prevail having failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, do we not have more than ninety-five members of the House here?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to rule the gentleman's question out of order.

The pending question is on the passage to be enacted of Bill "An Act Amending the Maine Housing Authorities Act".

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope you will extend the courtesy of tabling this until later on in the day because this is a very important piece of legislation, and there has been an agreement made on this with the members of the Senate, the City of Portland, and two or three of the members of the Judiciary Committee which reported the bill out, and I know you do not want to see anything drastically wrong done within the legislative session and you would be doing the right thing by going along with the tabling motion until we —

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, to move that this bill be tabled and specially assigned for later in today's session pending passage to be enacted. Will those who favor the tabling motion please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act to Clarify Procedure for Reorganization of School Administrative Units," House Paper 977, Legislative Document 1388,

tabled on June 8 by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Kellam, pending adoption of House Amendment "A."

The pending question is on the adoption of House Amendment "A."

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, I believe when this bill was tabled yesterday by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Kellam, he was asking that an explanation be given as to what this bill does and so on. If the House will permit, I will attempt to tell you what the different sections of the bill does do. That is a kind of peculiar grammatical expression. I will not attempt to go through the whole bill because I don't think that any one person perhaps should take it upon themselves to go through it. However, I will explain the first three or four sections and somebody else from the Educational Committee can pick it up and go on from there, and I trust this meets with your approval.

If you will take your bill which is 1388, I will go over it with you section by section the first three, four or five, and then somebody else can pick it up from there and go on. Now, in section one, section one provides that tuition pupils from towns with fewer than ten resident pupils must be accepted by other towns and other districts. All right, there it is if here is a town with only ten pupils in it, they must be accepted by another town or another district for education. That is the first section, section one.

Section two which is on that same page, page one of 1388, is designed to encourage action in disproportionate areas and would give building aid of eighteen per cent to towns which contracted to take secondary students from school administrative districts. Now as I understand this section, it provides that if a group of towns form an administrative unit and they don't want to build a high school they may contract with a larger town to educate their secondary students of that administrative unit. We will just take, for example, my home town, the Town of Houlton, supposing the smaller towns around the Town of Houlton

bind themselves into an administrative school district and operate their elementary schools as they see fit, but they do not wish to build a high school, they may contract with their larger town, we'll say the Town of Houlton, to educate the pupils of their administrative district. If the Town of Houlton accepts those pupils then they may receive eighteen per cent construction aid if they have to build their building larger in order to accommodate these children from this administrative unit. In this section two the contract must be on file with the Commission and the contract must also run for a period of twenty years.

Now in section three which is on page two of this document, this is a secondary school contract between the towns and the districts. The contract shall be reduced to writing and be signed. The contract may not be revoked for a nine month period. The contract is to run for twenty years. The tuition will not exceed the legal rate. The contract may only be changed by a special act of the Legislature and this provision is designed to protect both the receiving town and the sending towns of the school administrative district, and a certified copy of the contract shall be forwarded to the Commissioner of Education. That takes up the third section which is on page two.

On section four which is on page two, all this section does is to allow the election of directors at the same town meeting that they had when they were joining the district and by doing this, this eliminates the cost of additional town meetings or additional city elections.

Those are the first four sections, and I think from here on I will let somebody else on the Education Committee pick up and go on with section five, six and seven.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Kellam.

Mr. KELLAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I asked for the explanation I had in mind the differences between the two bills 1391 and 1388, I find most of the bill seems to coincide with the amendment and there are about

three or four items that are different. One which stands out is the omission of two or three lines on the last page pertaining to construction subsidies for schools with a resident high school of over seven hundred pupils. This particular phase of the amendment strikes me as being undesirable in that I can ascertain no valid reason for leaving out the towns with this size high school from the construction subsidy. It appears to me from my discussion with people who know more about education than I do that the reason for the act is to attain a certain development among high schools whereby the school reaches a size where the teaching is most economical. The number of students desired might be in question, but most people that I have heard anything from have agreed that seven hundred is enough, and reports that I have seen indicate that there is a point in which it is undesirable to have more students in the high school. Since it is possible for some of these cities and towns to have schools with seven hundred or more resident students and since they are meeting completely with the desired results that were contemplated in this act, I see no reason for omitting them from these construction subsidies since for them to join a district or to come under the Sinclair Law in some other way would necessitate their joining other cities with large enough schools already and making schools that are even larger which I believe will be agreed it is undesirable to have.

Since it is unfeasible for towns with over seven hundred resident students to join with other towns to form a district, I believe they should be continued in their construction subsidies. My understanding of the construction subsidy is that it is based on a sliding scale and that the larger cities would receive the minimum amount but that smaller communities having united in a district would receive a larger amount based upon their need. For these reasons I oppose the adoption of the amendment which has been reproduced as L. D. 1391 and now move for its indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the

motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Kellam, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to go into the history of this L. D. just a little bit and perhaps I can clear up a little of the confusion that now surrounds the whole thing.

Earlier in the session there was introduced by the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson, Legislative Document 1263 which was entitled "An Act to Make Changes in the Sinclair Law." That went before the Education Committee and the Committee on Education held that bill and studied it for some considerable length of time, and during that time made several changes within the bill itself. We then reported it back in new draft form 1360. However, before that new draft had been accepted here on the floor of the House it was tabled.

Later on the Appropriations Committee wanted this particular bill and there was a conference of the two committees, it was agreed that it should go to the Appropriations Committee but unfortunately due to the mechanics of this Legislature the motion was made that this bill be referred to Committee on Appropriations. Consequently, instead of our redraft 1360 going to the Committee on Appropriations, the original document 1263. Naturally they made their changes dealing with the financial aspects of it and sent it back here in their redraft 1388, and the Appropriations Committee redraft 1388 eliminated several of the proposals which the Educational Committee felt educationally should be included and consequently there now has appeared another redraft, number 1391. All four are similar in content but with some specific changes. One of the changes, the one to which Mr. Kellam is opposed and on which he has based the indefinite postponement of this particular amendment dealing with the figure seven hundred which we have heard about now ever since the conception of our Sinclair Act.

I think reference was made on the floor of this House yesterday

in that section of the bill which has prompted the introduction of such bills as the gentleman from Scarborough's bill to make a school administrative district for Scarborough. It was the inclusion of that section which prompts such men as the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Brown, to introduce special legislation to make a special administrative district of his town, Cape Elizabeth. It is that particular section of the bill which prompts such gentlemen as Mr. Letourneau of Sanford to introduce L. D. number 12 which would reduce the size of the school administrative district resident pupils from seven hundred to three hundred, and I think that they are justified in the introduction of their legislation because as the situation now stands, there is a group of schools numbering somewhere in the low fifties, I believe, which have a resident per pupil enrollment of between three hundred and seven hundred students.

Some of those schools are doing as fine an educational job as can be done here in the State of Maine. However, because of the fact that they do not reach that magic figure of seven hundred, they are not entitled to school construction aid as a single municipality. The cities of over seven hundred resident pupils are entitled to school construction aid as single municipalities. This does not bear out the thinking of the original Jacobs Report, neither does it bear out the thinking of people who are sincerely interested in the education in the State of Maine, because those people realize that the need today of State money funneled back is to go to the smaller towns and get them organized. If in future years, after the smaller townships have been organized into districts, it then becomes possible for the State to see its way clear to pay school subsidy aid to these towns of three hundred, four hundred, five hundred, six hundred as single municipalities, I certainly would be one of the first to support that idea, but at the present time I feel there is a great injustice being done by granting school construction aid to some of these larger cities where some of these that are in between, mind you, they have over three hundred resident

pupils and go as high as seven hundred, and they are doing an excellent educational job. I feel it is quite unfair to say to the large cities, you can have it, but to those others who lie in that unfortunate area, you cannot. Therefore, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Kellam, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark.

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I think it might be also interesting to just very quickly run through this, the listing of who are and who are not receiving aid: Auburn, Augusta, Bangor, Brunswick, Caribou, Lewiston, Portland, South Portland and Westbrook are now currently receiving or are eligible to receive construction aid. And here is a list of the towns who come in the three hundred to seven hundred category who receive no aid: Bath, Belfast, Biddeford, Brewer, Bucksport, Calais, Camden, Cape Elizabeth, Dexter, Ellsworth, Fairfield, Falmouth, Farmington, Fort Fairfield, Freeport, Gardiner, Gorham, Houlton, Kennebunk, Limestone, Lisbon, Livermore Falls, Madawaska, Madison, Mexico, Millinocket, Old Town, Orono, Presque Isle, Sanford, Scarborough, Skowhegan, Waterville, Winslow and York.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, this simply goes to point up the things that we spoke of yesterday, that the Sinclair bill in itself was intended to correct a situation which we find in the State of Maine, a situation where small towns have been endeavoring to give boys and girls a high school education and not having the wherewithal or the means with which to do that job and do it as it should be in order for those children to be entered into colleges or other institutions of learning.

Now the Sinclair Act in itself when it started out was a survey of the State, and I suppose they took into consideration the actual ability of the State to pay and they said that these figures should be corrected and corrected fast. It was not a case where you are taking

anything away. It is a case where it never was intended to be given until such time as the State was financially able to do so. There has been a number of suggestions that we should not expect to take this away. If you help to take it away, we are just wondering where the money will come from to do the thing that you expected to do and that was to change the educational program in the rural sections of Maine.

As I mentioned yesterday, the rural sections of Maine are growing less in population all the time. The principal reasons of course are that things are being done differently. They are being done on a larger scale. One man operating a great deal more territory, consequently that population is dwindling. I doubt if you want us in the cities. I just wonder what you would do or what you would find for us to do, and I don't believe that you want the economy of the State of Maine to lose your rural people, and I am afraid that is what is going to happen unless adequate schooling is provided in those sparsely settled areas that we have in the State of Maine, and for that reason and as it was specified in the Jacobs Report that this group that were not able to maintain their own schools and maintain them as they should be, should be assisted and they specified that in order to gain assistance that they should group themselves together into groups, large enough groups so they could have an adequately equipped and stamped high school so that they could get as good an education there as anywhere else in the State. Now then we are being constantly reminded that some of the city places are reaching their capacity and are notifying small towns that they have got to find other places to educate their children than they have in the past. I need only mention such places as Gardiner, Augusta and several others if you wanted to go into it that have notified people who have been sending children to their schools that they have got to find somewhere else to go, that they are reaching their capacity and have to take care of their own first.

Those are the conditions that you have actually got in the State of Maine, and I think you intended to

clear them, and I think your intention was the Sinclair Bill and in the first place this seven hundred group was not put on there. It was not intended and the extra sacrifice you are making for subsidizing buildings in the rural sections after groups got together into large enough groups to maintain a good high school, and it was not intended for the city places, and the other groups from three hundred up to seven could if they wished take in other groups on and provide an educational program in that way. Those things are all possible. This is not a hasty thing. It has been considered in this State now for six years, and like any other bill there are things in it which probably can be corrected.

The idea of the amendment we have here and we are considering now is the bill that the Legislative Educational Committee worked on and accepted and recommended to you. It is unfortunate that it was mishandled as it was in the Appropriations, but it was something that they were not to blame for and had no intention of it, and I assure you that members of that Committee will tell you the same thing.

This amendment simply puts back on your bill, the same bill that was considered, the same bill that was recommended by the Committee and that is all it does and if there is anything in that that you in your judgment think should be changed, that is your prerogative, but this bill under the form of an amendment was just taken as the old bill 1360 and made an amendment of and if there is anything there that you wish to change, that is your prerogative, and is subject to amendment and I think that that brings forth most of the things that are in that bill.

Now in regard to the uniform effort of taxation, that was a recommendation which was fostered by Jacobs, both in his first report of three years ago and also this last fall when he was called in a second time to go over this district again and see how it was functioning. He still recommended the so-called uniform tax effort for the districts. There are several other

phases in this and if there is any question that I can answer I will be glad to, but I think I ought to stop at that point right now and give someone else a chance to either ask questions or bring out points that they would like to.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question through the Chair from any member of the Appropriations Committee. The question is, was L. D. 1388 the bill reported out by them and have they ever heard in Committee L. D. 1391 which is now in the form of an amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, asks a question through the Chair of any member of the Appropriations Committee with reference to L. D. 1388.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the bill 1388 which was reported out of Committee was a redraft of L. D. 1360. The amendment which has been suggested and is 1391 I believe has never been heard before the Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, consider his question answered?

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, my name was on this as reporting this unanimous out of the Committee "Ought to pass." We intended to go along with the lines which had been suggested by some of the leaders and it was not our intention to make any change in the last section of 1360 which the Educational Committee had taken out of the seven hundred pupil high schools. It was the feeling of many in the Committee that that should come before the floor of the House and should be decided, and I think that some took the exception that they would use their own judgment when it came to the floor of the House. Now it has also been called to my attention that there are other things

which were not just as they should have been in this redraft of 1388, and I think that before we go any further that it will be well enough if we table this until later in the day so that if it becomes necessary it can be referred back to the Appropriations Committee, and I so move.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Edwards, that the adoption of this amendment be tabled and assigned for later in today's session. The Chair will order a division. As many as are in favor of this tabling motion will rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty having voted in the affirmative and sixty-six having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith — with a question?

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if given a little more time, I would like to find out where they were — I was lost on one amendment they were speaking about.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalburt.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My seatmate, the Representative from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, who is House Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, before he was called out informed me that the original bill that had been heard was 1360, the Committee reported out 1388, and that 1391 now reappears which was formerly 1360, and 1391 was not heard as such by amendment or reproduced in bill form.

I move the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion previously made by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Kellam, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have just

been informed by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee from the other branch that there definitely is something here that has been called to their attention by the Department, and consequently I think rather than acting in haste it would be advisable that we do table this until later in today's session. Therefore, I would move that we now table this.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, that this matter lie on the table until later in today's session.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, I would move that we reconsider our motion whereby we refused to table this item.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair would advise that we cannot at this time reconsider our motion to table, that such a motion would be in order after some more debate, a new motion to table.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, may I approach the rostrum?

The SPEAKER pro tem: Permission granted.

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalburt.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The motion that I am about to make is merely one to expedite matters. Mention has been made that additional information has been given to the Senate Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. There seems to be some confusion as I have stated and my questions have been answered that 1391 as such has never been heard by the Appropriations Committee. I think you will agree with me that the 1391, even though it says House Amendment "A", is very definitely a new document and there are certain items that might be clarified that certainly involve cities in this thing that would prohibit us from construction; and I think that none of us, outside of many of the members of the Education Committee and other people that have heard and sat in on hearings, know too much about this, we are kind of being guided thereby. So consequently I would now move that this bill and its amend-

ment be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee and they could certainly report to us tomorrow and probably the air would be clearer where we would stop a tremendous amount of debate. I personally want to consult with my superintendent of schools as I know many others do also, to get my legs out.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that this bill and accompanying papers be re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, I have to take exception a little bit to what the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, has just said about 1360 never being heard. 1360 is the redraft of 1263, which was the unanimous report of the Education Committee, and in the recommitting of the bill to the Appropriations Committee, if you will compare it, 1388 with 1360, with the exception of the three sections that they took out, the bill is identical. The other thing I have to object to is, why is this recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations? This is an Education bill and if the Education Committee wants to reconsider, OK. We worked on this bill for three and one-half months and then it was re-committed to the Appropriations Committee. We might as well have sent it to the Appropriations Committee to begin with and do away with the Education Committee. They had it for a couple of weeks and come out with it, we study it for three and one-half months and made our recommendation and it was a unanimous recommendation by the way too.

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

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, I now move that this item lie on the table for later in today's session.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, that Bill "An Act to Clarify Procedure for Reorganization of School Administrative Units," House Paper 977, Legislative Document 1388, lie on

the table until later in today's session.

The chair will order a division. As many as are in favor of the tabling motion will rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred eleven having voted in the affirmative and none having voted in the negative, the motion to table prevailed.

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER EDGAR: The Chair would thank the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wade, for his services as Speaker pro tem.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act relating to the Amount of the Annual Excise Tax on Railroads," House Paper 254, Legislative Document 365, tabled on June 8 by the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, pending adoption of House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I speak with the consent and the knowledge of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, and I want to thank him for this privilege. Yesterday in the hubbub of all the motions, I was a bit late and I did not get around to point out to you before this was tabled that House Amendment "B" includes that material that was originally in House Amendment "A." I had moved for the indefinite postponement for this Amendment "A" and was defeated, but I think if you compare the two amendments, which are under filings 484 and 375, you will see that the objection to indefinitely postponing House Amendment "A" is taken care of by the fact that the very same language does appear at the beginning of the amendment which I will offer if House Amendment "A" is indefinitely postponed.

Would I be in order to again move indefinite postponement, Mr. Speaker, or shall I just urge that they do not adopt House Amendment "A?"

The SPEAKER: The gentleman would be in order.

Mr. FRAZIER: In the light of the fact that the amendment which I will offer has exactly the same language within it, I will now offer—plus more language—I will now make the motion that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed and I hope that the House will go along so I can offer the next amendment.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from Lee approach the rostrum please.

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier. The Chair must advise the gentleman that his motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" is not in order since there was no intervening action since the defeat of that motion yesterday.

Mr. FRAZIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I then will simply urge this House to vote against the adoption of House Amendment "A" and I will accomplish exactly the same thing if you will do that. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the adoption of House Amendment "A." Is the House ready for the question? Will those who favor the adoption of House Amendment "A" please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. This has been a tedious spot. I now offer House Amendment "B" to L. D. 365 and move for the Clerk to read the amendment, and I would like to speak briefly.

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

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 254, L. D. 365, Bill, "An Act Relating to the Amount of the

Annual Excise Tax on Railroads."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning of the first line the underlined word and figure 'Sec. 1.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined words "transportation Property" in the 24th line and inserting in place thereof the following underlined words 'railway property used in transportation service'

Further amend said Bill by inserting after the underlined word and punctuation "receipts." in the 31st line, the following underlined sentences:

'Provided however that for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961 only, total diminution in tax shall not exceed the amount by which on April 30th of 1960 and 1961 respectively, total general fund undedicated revenue during the preceding 10 months shall have been in excess of general fund estimated undedicated revenue due for the same 10 months, according to the records of the State Controller. Following determination of such excess as of each respective April 30th, such excess shall be made available to eligible railroads in diminution of their taxes, and shall be apportioned to each such railroad in the same proportion as its own diminution but for this proviso, bears to total diminution of tax for all eligible railroads which would have occurred but for this proviso.'

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This body has gone on record in previous votes of, if there were money available, favoring some relief for the railroads. The prior question seemed to have been throughout the debate, were the funds available and that question, of course, still has not been answered. But I have here a vehicle by which, if it is your intention that the railroads shall be relieved, possibly may find some of that relief. What this amendment would do would say that if there is income for the State, general fund income, over and above anticipated revenue which would have been allocated

by this Legislature, then these railroads might participate in some of that money which would be an increase in income over which has now been estimated. That fundamentally is what this particular amendment would do.

I know that there may be some who would oppose that type of an amendment because they are aware of the fact that in the history of the State our excess of revenues over estimates has sometimes been set aside for brick and mortar money. I would like to point out to you the history of this, however, in the past few years. In 1954 our general fund unappropriated surplus was over \$15,000,000. However, out of those \$15,000,000 only about \$1,-\$600,000 accrued from excess of revenues over estimates. The rest came from unexpended balances. In 1955 the general fund surplus was over \$12,500,000, and out of that the excess of revenue over estimates was only \$3,000,000. In 1956 the general fund unappropriated surplus was about \$12,500,000 and excess of revenue over estimates was about \$2,-500,000. In 1957 the general fund unappropriated surplus was \$13,-441,000. The excess of revenue over estimates that year was \$5,500,000 approximately. In 1958 the general fund unappropriated surplus amounted to \$13,351,000 but it is interesting to note that in that year of our recession year within the State, the excess of revenue over estimates did not exist but rather there was a negative figure on this ledger that year of over \$1,000,000. I tell you this to point out to you that if our estimated revenue does not exceed that, then the railroads will get absolutely nothing. If we took the year 1958 for an example, there would be no money in the next two years to go to the railroads. In some of the other years, they would have received some money. Never all of it.

I also would point out that during the same period of years the railroads have been some of the prime factors in paying in tax money which has created the surplus which has made it possible for us to have the brick and mortar money. I would also point out that this amendment will in no way affect the law which is already written

here for us, the bill to which this amendment would be attached which says that never would that one per cent figure be demanded. This does not delete that particular figure, and I would also just like to add that the latter part of this amendment simply establishes a way in which the railroads can, if there is money available, divide that money up for themselves. With that, I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the adoption of House Amendment "B."

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I appreciate the fact that my good friend the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, has given the first half of what this amendment means. The second half which he did not define and explain to you means that after the year of 1961, they come in for full and total amount, so by passing this amendment you will have given the authority and made it law that they shall come in under the total bill which is L. D. number 365, which has a lot of gimmicks. And I will certainly say that if this amendment is allowed to pass, you will force upon the people of Maine a new tax, which I have heard on the Floor of this House this past week, the determination of this Legislature not to increase a tax or place a burden upon the people any further than is necessary and essential.

I might say too that we have involved several items on this thing which certainly should be brought to the attention of this Legislature. Number one, by passing this measure under filing number 484, in my opinion would be intruding upon the rights and privileges of the 100th Legislature because you will be committing them to action of our acts by the second part of this amendment. Secondly, I believe this thing has not been given the thorough and careful study that it needs so we certainly should send this for Legislative Research study to determine the needs and desires of the railroad industry, because there are certain things pending now in the Federal Congress which could

be of relief to the railroad industry and be of help to them. This is not only a problem for the State of Maine but is a problem of the entire country all over the United States.

Number three, they tell me that they would if this bill passed be able to employ more employees because they would have the funds with which to do so. At the present time they are undermanned because of the actions that occurred over the past year because of lack of inspection which has been because of inadequate or insufficient help. I would like to read an excerpt from a Boston newspaper, the title is "Featherbedding." We read many articles continuously charging featherbedding and unreasonable wage demands by unions, also increased operation costs always charged to labor.

Let us review the record. The cost of supervision on thirty-four railroads increased from eight percent to one hundred and twenty-four percent between the years 1955 and 1957 and here is just one example that I would use. The Boston and Maine of a man who last week made the headlines in the Boston newspapers, has proven his ruthless actions once again, his disrespect and thought for the public in general and their welfare by stating before a group of businessmen, namely, Mr. Pat McInnis, that they should charge all the cost to the operation of the car owners and put a used car tax in the State of Massachusetts for relief of railroads. He would not only liquidate the properties of the railroads, he would liquidate the car owners and the rights of people upon the highways by his announcement. His salary as I said before in 1955 of a person who was then President, was only \$25,000. Mr. McInnis now receives \$75,000 per year plus \$50,000 expense account plus other unknown profits. The number of officials increased from six to seven. The number of employees in 1955 was 10,571, they are now down to 9,237, a reduction in the force, but an increase in official capacity.

When you see facts like these publicly, they are something to be reckoned with and something to be considered. I do not say that holds

true for all our railroads, but it does hold true for one and it is something that certainly should be looked into to check on others to see if the same condition exists. That is one reason why I think this should go to the Legislative Research Committee for study and come up with the facts and real and truthful answers.

In other words, if Mr. McInnis is sponsoring a tax in Massachusetts, I do not know if the railroads here are sponsoring a tax on cars, but they certainly in the lobby in the past week in the halls of this House have on two occasions to my knowledge that I have overheard sponsored or recommended the transient rental tax to make possible money to be available so they will certainly come under the coverage which this bill and this amendment they have offered before you.

They have also increased or made a promise of increase of the labor force if they get this money. I don't blame them. If they have the money, certainly they can hire more. They do have a problem and we know it is a serious one, and it has never been my intention at any time to kill this bill entirely until today, when I received telephone calls by labor unions, by individuals, by lobbyists who represented other people not on the railroad lobby speaking for them and a dozen or so railroad lobbyists here who have been in action since last September who visited your homes as many of you know and have kept up a steady siege upon the Legislature through pressure. Never in my three terms that I have been here have I seen a bill lobbied so heavy and so hard. Now that costs money. \$100,000 to \$200,000 would look like peanuts for the cost that this operation of lobbying expense has been. If they can spend that kind of money I question whether they are in the predicament or the position they claim they are — but they have in their own ranks and their own rights an opportunity to clean house, correct their own positions and try to help themselves instead of expecting the taxpayers' dollars of the State of Maine to do it for them.

As far as taking surplus money that we may have in the next bi-

ennium '60 and '61 we have scraped the barrel in this Legislature to this point and denied a lot of worthy and worthwhile projects because we found inadequate monies available. How can we as Legislators sit here and vote this type of money out and then sit here and vote for a new tax upon the people, and that is just what you will do if you pass this amendment and this bill. We have four out-of-state railroads, one within the state that runs without the state, the Boston and Maine which has offices in the state but which runs out of the state, you have your Canadian Pacific, Canadian National. I should say the Maine Central runs within the state and without the state. Boston and Maine their offices are out of state. Canadian Pacific and Canadian National are out of state but they do run into Maine. The Bangor and Aroostook to my knowledge is the only complete and full outfit within the state. If I am wrong I stand corrected, because there are men here available to tell me so. And I respect my good friend from Exeter, Dr. Smith. I will not use the word subsidy for his operation, I will use the word relief, but I will use subsidy for the remainder of the railroads because that is what they are asking for. When you study the cold facts of what this amendment really means and how vicious it is, and what they are asking for, I hope you will give it due consideration and vote against this amendment and at this time with reluctance I now move the indefinite postponement of this amendment, the bill and all accompanying papers and request a roll call.

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, As I originally stated I am not going to debate the merits of the bill itself, only this particular amendment which I have introduced. In relation to the remarks of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, who says we are, this is not his exact quotation, but I believe he implied that we were telling the 100th Legislature what to do, I don't feel that way at all. I feel that we have and I certainly shall sup-

port that bill on the special Appropriations table for a \$50,000 tax study within the State of Maine. This amendment I think would simply relieve a situation or possibly relieve it for a two-year period. If this tax study that is going to be made by a group of experts, supposedly in the field, feels that this gross receipt tax should be replaced upon the railroads, I see no reason why the 100th Legislature couldn't repeal any action that we may take here today and therefore I don't think that we are tying the hands of the 100th or any future Legislature.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to advise the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that a motion to indefinitely postpone the bill at this time is not in order. The only motion in order along those lines would be indefinite postponement of the amendment.

Mr. HAUGHN: I so move, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, moves the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "B."

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly did not intend to get into this discussion. However, it has come up again and I feel that I do here and now want to repeat the stand that I took earlier in the session. If I remember somewhat near what I said, it was to the effect that I felt that this method of taxing the railroads of this State was completely outmoded and antedated and that I was ready to see it corrected. My feeling in regard to this amendment is that the railroads feeling that we might be hard pressed in this session of the Legislature to find the available money, if I understand the amendment correctly, it does say to me that if no money is available they are willing to forego their tax relief for another two years. To me I think this is a good gesture and I see no gimmicks in it. Certainly I am going to go along with the motion of the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, for the adoption of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must remind the gentleman that the

pending question is the motion to indefinitely postpone the amendment.

Mr. BRAGDON: I certainly oppose the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, to indefinitely postpone Mr. Frazier's amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Edmunds.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The question that is under discussion here today, while we are discussing an amendment to the bill, is a discussion of a monopoly tax on an industry which does not, I repeat, does not enjoy a monopoly in the State of Maine at the present time. Now the merits of this bill have been discussed a good many times on the floor of the House and I am sure in the corridors and many other places around and about, I don't expect that too many souls are going to be saved at this time by debate here on the floor, but the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, intimates that the railroads are asking for a subsidy from the State of Maine, and I would like at this time to pose a rhetorical question. I do not need an answer to this question, but I would like to pose it in order to emphasize the point which I feel the railroads and this Legislature should try to make.

If taxes were needed at this time, and taxes obviously are, and this law was not already on the books in the State of Maine, would this Legislature then consider passing a tax of this type, a monopoly tax on an industry which does not have a monopoly? If they would, and taxes are needed at this time, would it not be fair for us to start considering a gross receipts tax on trucking, a gross receipts tax on agriculture? We could do away with all this squabbling that we have had over the past four months on what is the proper tax measure for the State of Maine at this time, and I repeat if taxes were needed and this law was not on the books, would this Legislature then impose a three per cent gross receipts tax on the railroads of the State of Maine? I feel very certain what the answer is. I think the answer

is no, because I think the majority of this House has agreed as they have indicated in votes in the past that this is an unfair tax.

This bill proposes to offer some relief to the railroads but, one, only if the money is there. Two, in any case the railroads will pay a one per cent gross receipts tax which, I repeat, is not assessed against any other industry not enjoying a monopoly in this State; and three, should the railroads earn a minimum return on the investment they have in property and equipment in this State, they will pay the full three per cent as they are paying it at the present time.

Now it is fine to talk about submitting this to the Legislative Research Committee. That is a very easy gimmick to get around considering an issue which we must face up to now, because the fact is this, that the railroads of this State need relief and they need it now. Maine is one of three states of forty-eight which still impose an antiquated tax measure such as this on any of its transportation industries. Now the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, has indicated that the Congress is considering various measures which would relieve the financial plights of the railroads. To the best of my knowledge, the only measure currently before the Congress which would relieve the plight of the railroads in any way is a tax relief bill which would take into consideration such tax relief as states on a local basis choose to give to the railroads. Any relief, if this legislation is passed, will not be funnelled to Washington, it will stay in the State of Maine to help to promote one of our greatest industries. I certainly feel, and I would like to repeat again that we are considering a monopoly tax on an industry which does not have a monopoly, and I certainly hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone the amendment does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that the House indefinitely postpone House Amendment "B."

Mr. HAUGHN: I will request a division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman withdraws his request for a roll call?

Mr. HAUGHN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman now requests a division. Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "B" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty having voted in the affirmative and fifty-four having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "B" did prevail.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I believe I am now in order to make my first motion, and I would certainly offer, before I make the motion I will certainly bring in a Legislative Order for study, and I would now move indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers and I request another division.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that Bill "An Act relating to the Amount of the Annual Excise Tax on Railroads" and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for that question?

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

Mr. PHILBRICK: I move that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's motion is in order. The Chair will order a division.

Will those who favor the motion to adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Three having voted in the affirmative and one hundred nine having voted in the negative, the motion to adjourn did not prevail.

(Off Record Remarks by the Speaker)

The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that Bill "An Act relating to the Amount of the An-

nual Excise Tax on Railroads," House Paper 254, Legislative Document 365, and all accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. DUMAINE: I move for a roll call so that it will go on the record that those people who have voted to put out the railroads and the people who are working on the railroads will know who to vote for the next time they come in.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Dumaine, has requested a roll call. For the Chair to order a roll call, the Chair must have an expression of a desire for a roll call from at least one-fifth of the members of the House.

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

A sufficient number did not arise.

The SPEAKER: Obviously less than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is not in order. The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, has requested a division.

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, that Bill "An Act relating to the Amount of the Annual Excise Tax on Railroads," House Paper 254, Legislative Document 365, be indefinitely postponed. Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of this Bill please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-four having voted in the affirmative and sixty-four having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: This Bill, having had its three several readings and the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading having reported no further verbal amendments necessary, is it now the pleasure of the House that this Bill shall be passed to be engrossed?

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Whereby we killed Amendment "A" we killed Amendment "B", and in the protection of the interests of

the Tax Division of this State to clarify the point for taxation purposes, I think House Amendment "A", or it would have to be "C" now I believe, should be reinserted. I think my friend from Lee, Mr. Frazier, will bear that fact out. That the Tax Division was the one who had House Amendment "A" originally drafted for clarification purposes for taxation problems within the State of Maine, which I believe should be back in the bill before it is engrossed.

Now if it is the pleasure of the House, so we can prepare the amendment right away, to table it for about ten minutes to allow us to prepare the amendment, I will so do.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman make a motion?

Mr. HAUGHN: I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the motion? The gentleman did not state the motion.

Mr. HAUGHN: I moved that the Bill be tabled for roughly a half hour to prepare, and get back into this bill, what was originally House Amendment "A," which is clarification of taxation problem of state.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman approach the rostrum?

(Conference at rostrum)

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker, I will now ask reconsideration whereby we failed to adopt House Amendment "A."

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, to withdraw his tabling motion and to move that the House reconsider its action whereby it failed to adopt House Amendment "A".

Is it now the pleasure of the House to reconsider its action whereby it failed to adopt House Amendment "A"?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. HAUGHN: I now move that we adopt House Amendment "A."

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Haughn, now moves the adoption of House Amend-

ment "A." Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, Bill "An Act relating to the Amount of the Annual Excise Tax on Railroads, House Paper 254, Legislative Document 365, was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House item number one under Enactors, Bill "An Act to Make Valid the Incorporation of School Administrative Districts Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6," Senate Paper 285, Legislative Document 747, which was tabled earlier in today's session by the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Aliberti, pending adoption of House Amendment "A."

Is it now the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "A" be adopted?

The motion prevailed.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I now move the adoption of House Amendment "B." This is simply a clarification that takes care of dates, corrects dates in this bill.

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

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

Mr. BRAGDON: I ask permission to approach the rostrum.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may approach the rostrum.

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, before this removing of the emergency measure is taken up, I would like to read you a letter or a notation from the Commissioner of Education. You asked a question this morning of me if the Commissioner had made any such recommendations, and this is what the Commissioner has to say in regard to it: "To answer your inquiry with regard to the withdrawal of the towns school administration district,

I would advise you that the Commissioner is unequivocally opposed to such action. The Commissioner is not presumed to advise the Legislature as to what it should do or what action it should take with respect to the request for the withdrawal made by the towns of Liberty and Perham. It has under date of May 18, 1959 advised the Educational Committee of the problems inherent in such withdrawal. It is the Commission's intention that legislative action based on amendments offered to L. D. 479 would be most unfortunate in three respects. It would create confusion with respect to the status of the existing proposed districts, discouraging the joining of towns and weakening the prospects of improving education. It would undermine the fiscal status of the school administrative districts, increasing the difficulty of obtaining funds for either operating expenses or capital outlay programs, and it would create a number of legal problems concerned with the dissolution of school administrative districts, the transfer of property, the standards of contracts, and the right of the various parties involved.

"Any withdrawal from an already organized administrative district could seriously impede the reorganization of schools throughout the State, and thereby slow down some sorely needed school improvements in rural Maine.

"Students of Mapleton and Freedom, because of lack of facilities, have been working under extremely unfavorable conditions to the detriment of the education of the boys and girls. General education welfare of these high school students would be greatly damaged by the withdrawal of any town from either school administrative district now under consideration.

"It is imperative," in the Commissioner's opinion, "that no legislation be enacted without a clear determination of the legal problems involved." Now that was signed by the Chairman of the Maine School District Commission, and I have here a letter addressed to the Superintendent of Schools in School Administrative District Number 3, and I quote from it: "Mr. Stone, President of the First National

Bank of Belfast, Maine, has notified and informed the Board of School Directors of School Administrative District Number 3 of action by the bank regarding loans of money to the District. Mr. Stone notified Mr. Johnson, Superintendent of Schools for District, that the bank had conferred with legal counsel who has advised the bank that because of legislative action taken last week, the bank should not loan any more money for operating expenses to District Number 3. This remains true until the situation is clarified and until the legal counsel has clarified the loan as a legal and valid debt of the School District and has defined exactly what the School District is and the number of Towns actually responsible for the debt of the District." That was submitted to Robert W. Johnson, Superintendent of Schools in District Number 3.

The haste with which this has developed has placed the school situation in no pleasant circumstances, and I think before the Legislature takes any hasty action, questions such as were placed on your desk last week should be answered before this Bill is changed in any particular. The validating act in itself is just a matter of saying whether or not the proper procedure in the law has been followed up to a certain point. The amendment stuck on here has nothing to do with that bill and in no way in my estimation is even germane to it.

The Sinclair Law specifically states that by special act of the Legislature they can get out, and that to me means the same thing as telling any town that is organized in this State that they can become separated or into two separate groups if they want to, and could so function if the Legislature would grant that and if all requirements were met, and I think before we attempt to amend this bill to fulfill a function of this kind that we had better get legal advice and legal action on this as we had tried to do in the first place.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We debated this bill at length the other day and I did not anticipate having to go

into that debate to any extent again and I will not. I am somewhat at a loss to know just what motion is now before us, if any; however, since the gentleman is debating the bill I would attempt to refute, if that is in order, some of the arguments he has made and possibly add a little to the debate. I would ask possibly the opinion of the Speaker in regard to debate at this time.

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

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now ask that the rules be suspended whereby we adopted Senate Amendment "A", for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, moves that the House suspend the rules that he may move reconsideration of the adoption of Senate Amendment "A". Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, to now move reconsideration of the action whereby the House adopted Senate Amendment "A". Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Mr. Bragdon of Perham then offered House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 285, L. D. 747, Bill, "An Act to Make Valid the Incorporation of School Administrative District Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6."

Amend said Amendment by inserting after the words and figure "August, 1958" in the 8th line the following: 'as amended on the 5th day of March, 1959'

Further amend said Amendment in the 18th line by inserting after the words and figure "Administrative District No. 6," the following:

'from the date of their said incorporation to the date hereof.'

Further amend said Amendment in section 2, in the 4th and 7th lines, by striking out the word "July" and inserting in place thereof the word 'October'

Further amend said Amendment in section 3, in the first line, by striking out the word "July" and inserting in place thereof the word 'October'

Further amend said Amendment in section 4 by striking out the first sentence and inserting in place thereof the following:

'As its proportionate share of the budget assessed by School Administrative District No. 3 against the Town of Liberty for operational expenses of School Administrative District No. 3 for the fiscal years 1958-1959 and 1959-1960, prior to such withdrawal, the Town of Liberty shall pay to School Administrative District No. 3, not later than October 1, 1959, its percentage of the amount due School Administrative District No. 3 for operational expenses incurred during the school year 1958-1959, and ending at the termination of school in 1959, less the amount which the Town of Liberty has paid to School Administrative District No. 3 towards the 1959-1960 budget.'

Further amend said Amendment in section 5, in the 6th line, by striking out the word "October" and inserting in place thereof the word 'November'

Further amend said Amendment in section 9, in the 4th and 7th lines, by striking out the word "July" and inserting in place thereof the word 'October'

Further amend said Amendment in the 2nd line of section 10 by striking out the word "July" and inserting in place thereof the word 'October'

Further amend said Amendment by striking out the emergency clause at the end.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Now, Mr. Speaker, to clarify very briefly and to go in to some extent some of the debate that we went into last Friday on this, which I hoped we would not have to go into again. In the

debate Friday I made this statement, that in the so-called Sinclair Bill which we passed in the 98th Legislature there is a provision under, I believe, Section 111-P that says in effect that when a town has voted by two-thirds vote to remove itself from an existing school district etc., I haven't it here and I can't quote it exactly, but that is in effect what it says, that the Legislature may by special act provide the means whereby this town can get out of the district.

Now, in many of the discussions in the last session of this Legislature, and I think it was pretty much a matter of agreement among the framers of the Sinclair Act, that some such an escape clause as this would have to be provided; and if the Legislature did not mean it certainly they would not have put it in there. The framers of the bill agreed that if you go into a contract and you get to clawing at each other's throats that you have got to find a way out. Nobody wants to live up to a contract that neither party to the contract wishes to continue.

Now, we in the Town of Perham, as I told you the other day, voted a hundred and eleven to fourteen to get out of such a contract, for the reasons that we felt that we could no longer operate with any unity or any agreement with the other towns in the district. In that bill that is now before you, we set up the terms whereby we were willing to pay our way out of the contract, we left it up to the School District Commission to say how much we owed the District for the time that we have been in there. Now it is up to you then, if these terms are not agreeable to you, you set the terms and we will abide by your decision, but we do say that the Legislature in setting up this act agreed that this escape must be made possible. It goes on to say that if there are bonds outstanding that etc. that it may not let us out.

However, in this instance no bonds have been floated, so I contend that there are no obligations which are going to impair anybody's standing, the rest of the district can proceed merrily on their way without us and have the district, just simply that

we want no part of it. And possibly in attempting to refute the argument of the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson, in regards to the fact that bonding companies are getting a little leery of selling bonds down in the Liberty district, I would say this to you, I don't wonder that they are.

This thing has been in a state of uncertainty and is going to be in a state of uncertainty just as long as this Legislature holds off and refuses to make the decision which these districts have asked them to make. I believe that the time when you come to the time that you are willing to make the decision, whether it is for or against, every one of these difficulties will be ironed out, and that they will then be able to proceed and sell the bonds. I have a statement to the effect that bonds have been sold recently in some of these districts which have been formed in the State of Maine in spite of the fact that we are now quibbling over this thing and refusing to make a decision, still in some instances the bonding companies regardless of the fact that we have hesitated to pass the validating act, and in all of this uncertainty in which the whole thing stands, bonds have been sold in the last few weeks or days.

Now that doesn't to me indicate that this matter of holding up financing is wholly justified. I think perhaps that in view of the fact that I made a lengthy talk on this thing the other day, I think that that is all I will say at this time, and I hope the motion to accept this House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A" will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House adopt House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, there is another part of this Amendment "B", it further cuts off the emergency clause. There is only one reason for cutting that off; and furthermore, if this didn't take place immediately just stop and think of the time that you would be holding up schools in that sec-

tion. Here it is the ninth of June, it would mean at least the ninth or tenth or more depending upon when we get through here, as to when schools could take any action in that section anyway. Now I think this is kind of a vicious thing and I don't like the idea of trying to remove an emergency clause that is essential to the other part of the bill, and I am talking not to the amendment but to the validating act as it was intended in the first place.

And I move that this amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson, that House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon. Rockland was one of the first towns or cities to go into a school administrative district. They are now united with Owl's Head, South Thomaston and Rockland in School Administrative District Five. In its abbreviated form it is known as SAD Five, "sad five." It appears that it is getting sadder by the minute. I will not say that bonds are in jeopardy but I will say that there is the possibility that School Administrative District Five and the other districts may be in jeopardy in selling their bonds if this amendment is allowed to pass. I feel that we should not act in haste and repent in leisure.

Previously I attempted to table this bill so that the matter could be taken up to the Supreme Court for an opinion of the Justices, but that was turned down and evidently the feeling of this House is that we must rush. I would remind you that the Sinclair Bill says that the Legislature "may" allow a town to remove itself from a district, it does not say that it "shall." And for those reasons, although I am in complete sympathy with the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, whereas this matter cannot be taken up to the Supreme Court for

an opinion, I must vote against his amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Easton, Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: If this emergency act goes through, is taken off of the bill, it will make that much longer that the schools up there in that district will have no high school building. This senior class that is graduating from the Mapleton High School District there this year has gone the whole four years except a month or two on one session a day, a half a session, and there are students six feet tall trying to sit in grade school seats, and I think this should not be allowed any more.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson, that House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

On motion of Mr. Bragdon of Perham, a division of the House was had.

Fifty-one having voted in the affirmative and fifty-five having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House adopt House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A". Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is on the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "B". Is it the pleasure of the House that Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "B" be adopted?

On motion of Mr. Perry of Easton, a division of the House was had.

Forty-seven having voted in the affirmative and forty-nine having voted in the negative, Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "B" failed of adoption.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is on the passage to be engrossed of this bill as amended by House Amendment "A" and

Senate Amendment "B". The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett.

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Speaker, point of information, you just said this would be as amended by House Amendment "A". Now House —

The SPEAKER: If the Chair said that the Chair — no, that is correct, the pending question is the passage to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "B".

Mr. BARNETT: If I am correct, Mr. Speaker, House Amendment "A" is filing 487 which strikes out the emergency preamble which is what the question was a few minutes ago on filing 488, and when that was taken off the table, this amendment went through under the hammer, am I correct? Therefore, if that amendment is adopted the emergency will be stricken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that he is in error. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, as I recall the pending question was the adoption of House Amendment "A" to Senate — I'll keep out of it and let you straighten it out.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now — The Chair must advise the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, that it is not the function of the Chair to interpret the amendments which speak for themselves.

Mr. BARNETT: Am I correct that House Amendment "A", which is filing 487, was adopted under the hammer when this was taken off the table?

The SPEAKER: House Amendment "A" was adopted earlier today.

Mr. BARNETT: Well then, may I speak briefly?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may speak on the pending question which is the passage to be engrossed as amended.

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Speaker, I interpret this that House Amendment "A" is filing 487 will strike the emergency clause from this bill which is what was discussed here a few minutes ago in respect to House Amendment "B" and therefore I don't know whether the proper motion at this time is that we

reconsider our action whereby we adopted House Amendment "A", but if that is the proper motion, I so move.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, whether or not he was present at the time House Amendment "A" was adopted? Did the gentleman vote on the prevailing side when House Amendment "A" was adopted?

Mr. BARNETT: I would inform the Speaker that I am pretty sure this went under the hammer so quick I didn't even have a chance to get at my papers, that's what happened. That was after the thing came off the table.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that the gentleman is in order in moving reconsideration of the House's action whereby it adopted House Amendment "A". Will those who favor the motion to reconsider the adoption of House Amendment "A" please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to reconsider did prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Speaker, I now move that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Barnett, moves that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did prevail.

Thereupon, Bill "An Act to Make Valid the Incorporation of School Administrative Districts Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6," Senate Paper 285, Legislative Document 747, was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "B" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, please approach the rostrum?

(Conference at rostrum)

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent that un-

less previous notice is given to the Clerk of the House by some member of his or her intention to move reconsideration, the Clerk be authorized today to send to the Senate, thirty minutes after House action, all matters passed to be engrossed in concurrence, and all matters that require Senate concurrence; and that after such matters have been so sent to the Senate by the Clerk, no motion to reconsider shall be in order.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the granting of this unanimous consent? The Chair does hear objection and the consent is not granted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would explain to the House the purpose of this unanimous consent request. It is merely to enable the House to send to the Senate matters acted on by the House and it is merely an attempt to expedite and hasten the business of the Legislature. There are no gimmicks, no ulterior motives, and this particular method of expediting matters has been always handled in the same way in past sessions. The objection to the consent requested by the gentleman from Houlton has now precluded the sending of any papers forthwith to the Senate for the balance of the day.

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. MILLER: To approach the rostrum for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may approach the rostrum.

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER: The Chair will request the Sergeant - at - Arms to escort to the rostrum the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, to serve as Speaker pro tem.

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The next matter to be taken up is the item on page three tabled and today assigned, item number two, An Act Amending the Maine Housing Authorities Act, House Paper 967, Legislative Document 1373,

tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, earlier in the day to later in today's session pending passage to be enacted; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In regard to the action we took on this earlier in the day, I suppose that I should have explained my reason for asking for the reconsideration. At this time I would like to explain to the members of this other body, the other end of the House that in the past few days members of the Portland City Government and members of the other body, the other end of the Hall, have banded together to try to straighten out the difficulties that were involved within this piece of legislation. We feel that we have come up with an answer which will be agreeable to all.

We have conferred with the Public Housing Administration in the New York regional office and received from that office a letter Monday afternoon explaining to us what was necessary to clarify this law so that it would be acceptable to the Public Housing Administration in the event any city or town was to seek assistance or financial aid. Now I have prepared and left on the desks of each of the members of this House the referendum which was proposed by the Housing Authority and which has been accepted by the Corporation Counsel of the City of Portland as a worthy amendment, and several of the Senators in the other end of the House and I have talked to one or two members of the Judiciary Committee regarding this piece of legislation.

Now I hope that we as members of this great body will not be too hasty in not allowing me the privilege of reconsidering this bill, and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the rules be suspended in order that I may enter motions to reconsider the passage of this bill to be engrossed on June 3 and also the adoption of House Amendment "B".

The SPEAKER pro tem: Would the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, approach the rostrum?

(Conference at rostrum)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will have to rule that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, to reconsider is out of order.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, could I ask that this lie on the table until later on this evening, the evening session? I would like to request that.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman is in order that if he wishes to lay this on the table until later in the day's session, the motion is in order. The pending question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, that this matter lie on the table assigned for later in today's session.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Earles, but must remind the gentleman the motion is not debatable.

Mr. EARLES: Yes sir, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of debating the question but merely the matter of the time. Because of the complexity involved in this act, I would prefer that the gentleman from Portland would amend his motion so that this matter would lie on table and be specifically assigned for tomorrow.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to go along with that request and move it be tabled until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, that this matter lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair now lays before the House the matter tabled earlier in the day by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, Bill "An Act to Clarify Procedure for Reorganization of School Administrative Units," House Paper 977, Legislative Document 1388, and specially assigned for later in today's session pending the motion to recommit to

the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For purposes of making another motion which is agreeable to all parties involved, I now withdraw my motion that this be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, withdraws his motion. The question before the House now is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Kellam, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I move this bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Joint Committees on Appropriations and Education.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that Bill "An Act to Clarify Procedure for Reorganization of School Administrative Units," be recommitted to the Joint Committees of Appropriations and Education. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

Thereupon, a division of the House was had.

Eighty-one having voted in the affirmative and four having voted in the negative, the motion to recommit did prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to approach the rostrum.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may approach the rostrum.

(Conference at rostrum)

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As to L. D. 1386, An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and

June 30, 1961, I move we reconsider our action whereby we passed this bill to be engrossed today, and this is for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, that the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A". The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to reconsideration, so I request a division when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A division has been requested. Will those who favor the motion to reconsider our action on this Bill please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative and thirty-six having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did prevail.

Thereupon, Mr. Emmons of Kennebunk offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 976, L. D. 1386, Bill, "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the emergency preamble and the emergency clause.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "B" shall be adopted?

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

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

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

Mr. LINNELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire through the Chair what the purpose of removing the emergency is, if the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons would care to answer.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The

gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Linnell, has posed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, who may answer if he so chooses.

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, partly to expedite matters so that this can be sent forthwith to the Senate and perhaps get this thing through without delaying matters. This bill is one that has been accepted and passed to be engrossed, now we can push it through.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman consider his question answered?

Mr. LINNELL: I would further inquire of the same gentleman, if I may through the Chair, how removing the emergency clause will expedite matters so that it may be sent forthwith to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Linnell, has addressed another question through the Chair of the gentleman from Kennebunk who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. EMMONS: I would suppose also it is because we have a small attendance we may not be able to get at some later date a full two-thirds vote. There are many members that are not going to be here in the next few days.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask of the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, if he is contemplating at this time putting on additional amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Sebago, Mr. Good, has addressed a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. EMMONS: I contemplate no amendments and I certainly hope there will be none offered.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, that House Amendment "B" shall be adopted. Will those who favor the adoption of House Amendment "B" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Seventy having voted in the affirmative and forty-seven having voted in the negative, House Amendment "B" was adopted.

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

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

Mr. EMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I move that under suspension of the rules this bill be sent forthwith to the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Kennebunk that he must have unanimous consent to send the bill forthwith to the Senate. Is that what the gentleman proposes?

Mr. EMMONS: I ask for it.

The SPEAKER pro tem, The gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Emmons, now asks unanimous consent that this bill be sent forthwith to the Senate. Does the Chair hear objection? The Chair does hear objection and the request is denied.

At this point, Speaker Edgar returned to the rostrum.

SPEAKER EDGAR: The Chair would thank the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Ervin, for his services as Speaker pro tem.

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

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Brown, approach the rostrum?

(Conference at rostrum)

On motion of Mr. Brown of Ellsworth,

Recessed until 7:30 P.M. this evening.

After Recess 7:30 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Supplement No. 1 of the House Advance Journal and Calendar and the Clerk will read a Conference Committee Report.

Conference Committee Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act to Authorize the County Commissioners of Cumberland County to Issue Bonds for Construction of a County Jail" (S. P. 264) (L. D. 677) reporting that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

EARLES of South Portland
HENDRICKS of Portland
HEALY of Portland

—Committee on part of House.

LORD of Cumberland
WEEKS of Cumberland
WYMAN of Washington

—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

Senate Reports of Committees Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for a Motor Vehicle Liability Insurance Law" (S. P. 257) (L. D. 670)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WEEKS of Cumberland
WOODCOCK of Penobscot
— of the Senate.

Messrs. EARLES of South Portland
KNIGHT of Rockland
EMMONS of Kennebunk
BEANE of Augusta
COX of Dexter
BERMAN of Auburn
— of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. LESSARD of Androscoggin
— of the Senate.

Mr. CARON of Biddeford
— of the House.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read and the Majority Report accepted in concurrence.

**Ought Not to Pass
Bill Substituted for Report
and Amended in Senate
Tabled and Assigned**

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Ten Million Dollars to Provide Major Repairs, Construction and Equipment" (S. P. 200) (L. D. 539)

Came from the Senate with the Bill substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "C" thereto.

In the House: Report was read.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to substitute the Bill for the Report in concurrence?

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I somehow find myself in opposition to Senate Amendment "C" and Senate Amendment "A". I wasn't aware until I just came in here that there was going to be before us all of —

The SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that the Senate Amendments are not at the moment before the House. The question is on substituting the Bill for the Report in concurrence.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the unfavorable report of the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is the motion of the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, do we know what that report was?

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman repeat what he said.

Mr. JALBERT: I would like to ask what that report was, I can't find it here.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the Committee Report once more.

Thereupon, the Clerk again read the "Ought not to pass" Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" Committee Report.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, first a question of the Chair, this is L. D. 1393, is that correct, in its present form? I would request a division when the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Rockland that L. D. 1393 is Senate Amendment "A."

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

Mr. WADE: Mr. Speaker, I request a division. Inasmuch as Senate Amendment "A," L. D. 1393, is essentially the act to authorize the general fund bond issue and changes the — Senate Amendment "A" which is L. D. 1393 changes the amount and is in effect the bond issue bill.

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

Mr. PERT: Mr. Speaker, this is a question. If we accept the unanimous "Ought not to pass" Report on L. D. 539, does that mean that we kill the bond issue — all bond issues?

The SPEAKER: The Chair can only advise the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Pert, that if the House accepts the "Ought not to pass" Report it will kill the bill that is under consideration.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The Appropriations Committee came out with a bill for \$5,000,000 for capital construction to be paid for under unappropriated surplus and a \$6,000,000 bond issue to cover the other projects. Since that time that bond issue and bill has been split up and we have back in the House here a bill which covered approximately between four and five million dollars for capital construction to be paid out of your unappropri-

ated surplus. This which we have before us now, if you vote to concur with the Senate, would give you an opportunity to vote upon a bond issue which would include the most of those items which were under the \$6,000,000 bond issue in the previous bill.

And I would at this time urge you all to oppose the motion made to accept the Committee's Report, and when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I didn't realize — I didn't notice the 1393 in it and I knew we had passed that bill out "Ought not to pass," so I will withdraw the motion for the time being.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, withdraws her motion. Is it now the pleasure of the House to substitute the Bill for the Report in concurrence?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its two several readings.

Senate Amendment "A" was then read by the Clerk. (L. D. 1393)

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 200, L. D. 539, Bill, "An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Ten Million Dollars to Provide Major Repairs, Construction and Equipment."

Amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A, under the caption "STATE PARK COMMISSION", by adding at the end thereof the following line:

'Park Development — Moosehead State Park —
Lily Bay 150,000 —'

Further amend said Amendment by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A."

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

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A," I wish through the indulgence of the House, of this Park Development, Moosehead State Park, Lily Bay, for \$150,000, shall be tabled until tomorrow morning for the purpose of an amendment from another member.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, moves that the Bill be tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow pending adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A." Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No")

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a division. Will those who favor the motion to table Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twenty-four having voted in the affirmative and seventy-two having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sangerville, Mr. Edgerly.

Mr. EDGERLY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't know whether everyone knows what they are voting on, I don't know as I do, but this park development, Moosehead State Park, Lily Bay, they have got five hundred and sixteen acres from Bear Brook in by Mud Brook and through Lily Bay and there are four miles of lakeside in there, rather on the road part, it would be more on the lake part, that Scott Paper Company has given the State this amount of land for a park at Moosehead Lake and they want to develop that the same as you folks down in Crescent Park, you have to buy the land. This land is already given to the State, but they expected them to put in some money and start developing it, and that will take care of a lot of out-of-state people that come up there and can't find a place to park, come in there with their boats and trailers and want to find a place to tent. There are only two or three places around the lake

that they can get at to build a fire, these little small camp grounds, and if they could get this money to develop that park why, we don't benefit by it — the whole state does, to get the out-of-state people in here and they have no facilities to park whatever. That is what this is for.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bradford, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have been speaking of spending large sums of money in other parts of the State to develop parks for recreational purposes with the idea that it would bring in money from out-of-state travelers. This, as we have been told, this land at Moosehead Lake is given to the State of Maine with the idea that it be developed as a park for out-of-state people. As we should all know, Moosehead Lake is one of the greatest attractions that we have in the State of Maine and people from other states perhaps have not been informed too much about it, and now is a good time to advertise and if we spend a small amount of money here to develop this park without a doubt it would come back to us in revenue within a very short term of years, and I hereby support the motion of the gentleman from Sangerville, Mr. Edgerly.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as being in favor of the acquisition of this land.

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

Mr. BARNETT: I would like to address a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, if I could.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. BARNETT: I was wondering if his purpose in tabling was for this filing number 496 which has now been distributed on our desks?

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

Mr. CALL: The amendment has just been put on the table, Mr. Speaker, amending the bill. I think that answers Mr. Barnett's question, by Mr. Brockway.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman said the amendment has just been put on the table?

Mr. CALL: Excuse me. On the desks.

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

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The economy of the State of Maine depends to a great extent on the proposition of opening up our accommodations to the people who wish to come in here to enjoy the lakes and the seashore. I was particularly interested in Crescent Beach, and although I have never been to Moosehead Lake, I have heard a great deal about it. I would like to go there sometime, and when I go there I would like to find these parking facilities. Therefore, I should be glad to concur with the gentleman who wishes to develop the Moosehead Lake Park. Thank you.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I for many years have lived at Moosehead Lake and it is the largest inland body of water in the United States all contained within one state naturally. It is forty-two miles long and twenty miles wide and it is a beautiful setting among the mountains. To this gentleman from Portland who hasn't been there, he should go and see it, Mr. Healy. There are twenty-five hundred miles of frontage around that lake and there isn't one public place where a man can go onto that lake without trespassing on somebody's property. Of course, the majority of the land is owned by the big timber interests and it is not accessible but along this shore there is about four miles of road on the road to Rippogenus Dam and there is probably eight or ten miles of frontage and it would make a wonderful place. The Scott Paper Company has given that to the State of Maine with the express idea of it being developed

for recreation. Now we have gone way out and bought land down to Crescent Beach, and I believe it is right and proper that we develop something up in the wilderness where the vacationists can go and where our native people can go, put in their boats and park their cars and go fishing, and we do have good fishing up there. I hope the motion prevails.

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

Mr. BROCKWAY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now offer House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" and move its adoption, and I would like to speak on it.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will have to defer until Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" has been acted upon, and also Senate Amendment "C" to Senate Amendment "A."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Milo.

Mr. BROCKWAY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As you know, Senate Amendment "A" was introduced by a member of the other body asking for \$150,000, Senator Parker, to develop this land. We as a delegation from Piscataquis County have got together and talked it over and we feel that if this Legislature will grant us the sum of \$50,000 that we can make quite a good start up there in the next two years with that. This land was given to the State by the Scott Paper Company, there being five hundred and seventy-six acres with four miles of shore line in the Lily Bay area on Moosehead Lake. There has already been transferred from the Contingent fund by the Governor and Council to the State Park fund the amount of \$3,685, and if the members of the House will accept the amendment that is being offered, I will then offer my amendment to amend the amount to \$50,000.

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

Mr. PHILBRICK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If I were wearing a hat, I would be pleased to take it off and tip it in the direction of the gentleman

from Portland, Mr. Healy. It is a noble thing that he has done. He is a true gentleman. I am proud to be associated with him. It is a wonderful thing that he has done to come to the support of the scattered population in the northern part of Maine who have none of the high-powered support which the Beach proposition in Portland had, and I am just pleased to be associated with him.

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

Mr. PERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question through the Chair to anyone who can possibly answer it for me. I wonder if I could have a little bit of information as to the break-down of how this \$150,000 would be spent and how this proposed \$50,000 might be spent.

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

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

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: As I understand it, this money will be spent on roads which will reach into this park area. It isn't too far from the road which we already have that reaches from Greenville to Lily Bay. This park area will be something similar though smaller than we have at Baxter Park. It is in the wilderness and there are no parks or anything around the lake. This land has been offered to us and we expect, if we can develop this to a certain extent, that other land will be offered to go in with this. As it has been stated, there are four miles of lake frontage. While for you people who don't get up around Moosehead Lake, we can tell you that in the spring, especially and all through the summer, there is a continuous stream of cars with boats on trailers behind them going to Moosehead Lake. Many people would like to camp beside the lake, but there are at the present very few places where they can camp. Now, the \$50,000 would be a start. Eventually we will put in more money, but it will pay the State. We need more people

coming into the State, and the Moosehead Lake area is one of the most beautiful spots not only in Maine but in the whole world. We have people from all over the country coming, from all over the world coming. Many people that come into Maine would like to camp out in our woods. We would like to have a place where they can camp and under supervision so there won't be fires started and that sort of stuff, and in years to come it will be something for your children to look forward to if we will accept this park and maintain it, and there will be more land available they tell me later.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ashland, Mr. Prue.

Mr. PRUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to concur with my seatmate, Mr. Edgerly, on this particular park development. Moosehead Lake is one of the greater lakes we have in the State. It is in the wilderness and city people enjoy very much coming into those places. Being from Aroostook County, being in the same type of development that they are working for, I cannot help but think that they would be entitled to this park development. I happen to be one of the ones who supported the Portland development. I was glad to do it and I believe they need it, but I certainly believe that we also need Moosehead Lake Park too.

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

Will those who favor the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A," please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred seven having voted in the affirmative and seven having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will now read Senate Amendment "C" to Senate Amendment "A."

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "C" to SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 200, L. D. 539, Bill, "An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Ten Million Dollars to Provide Major Repairs, Construction and Equipment."

Amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A under the caption "EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF" by inserting after the paragraph entitled "Maine Vocational Technical Institute", a new paragraph, as follows:

'Secondary Area Vocational School

Construction of an area technical and vocational school on the secondary level, the location of such to be determined by the State Board of Education with the approval of the Governor and Council

\$1,000,000 _____

Further amend said Amendment by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is on the adoption of Senate Amendment "C" to Senate Amendment "A."

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Perhaps you will remember that a few weeks ago, it was my privilege to present a bill here for a vocational school to be situated at the site of the Northern Maine Sanatorium and the price tag on that was \$250,000. Now we have this amendment for \$1,000,000. I am trying to think of economy and for that reason I do not feel that I can go along with this amendment for that reason, but that I do feel very much interested in vocational education. I do feel that we should do something about vocational education in the State of Maine. When it was my privilege to speak on this vocational bill a few weeks ago, I have mentioned some of the things which have been found in the survey on vocational education in the State, and we found that there were a great many people who would like

to enter a school like this, but my feeling is that we can't do it in this Legislature. We can't handle this. We turned down \$250,000 so I don't know how we can accept \$1,000,000, but I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment be referred to the 100th Legislature.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to advise the gentlewoman from Presque Isle that only the bill may be referred to the next Legislature, not an individual amendment. The pending question is on the adoption of Senate Amendment "C" to Senate Amendment "A."

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

Mr. WHITMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Woodstock moves that Senate Amendment "C" to Senate Amendment may be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to go along with the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Whitman, in the indefinite postponement of this amendment, and I would like to tell the House that the bill is in the Appropriations Committee and can come out and be referred to the 100th Legislature. We do not have enough details on this nor do we understand it well enough in its implications to pass a bill at this time in my opinion, and I certainly hope that this amendment may be indefinitely postponed and when the bill comes here that it may be referred to the 100th Legislature.

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

Mr. LANE: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: We all cry in the State of Maine we need industry. We need jobs for our youngsters. We need jobs for those that are getting out of high schools. I remember a few years ago I had a few buildings and I tried to get some people to come into the State of Maine. The first thing they asked me, what have they got for help in the State of Maine? What could

I tell them? I could not tell them anything. We did not have any help. Industries are looking today for qualified help. There are all kinds of industries who would like to come into the State of Maine and they are looking for some boys with skill, skilled help, and I think this amendment is the most important amendment we have in our Legislature today. If we kill this amendment, what are we going to tell the industries that are trying to come into the State of Maine? We will tell them we are not interested in technical schools. We are not interested in industries in the State of Maine. This only calls for a million dollars, and I think this would be the best million dollars we ever spent.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I certainly would go along with the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, that this is only \$1,000,000 which we could spend to good advantage for the State of Maine, that we should have vocational opportunities for people who are not going to our schools now, people who are not being educated in our schools because they are not interested in English and Math and those types of things. We cut out \$500,000 from the University of Maine because we did not feel it was necessary to educate them in the arts. We could use that \$500,000 for this vocational institute. We have provided beaches for the people to parade around on Sunday and we could do away with that. We have provided \$150,000 to develop Moosehead Lake which we could use here for educational purposes. I certainly would go along with the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, in moving that we accept this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will remind the House that the question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Whitman, that the House indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "C" to Senate Amendment "A."

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

Mr. WHITMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly

am very reluctant to oppose any amendment or any move to institute vocational education in Maine. However, we have been considering many appropriations relating to our various schools that we do have now in existence, and I feel that the State of Maine has not been able to furnish the money that would be adequate to all of these schools. We just haven't been able to afford it, and I would like to point out also that this million dollars as some have said is just a million dollars, but it is a million dollars that we propose to borrow. We are borrowing a million dollars to set up vocational education which comes to us in the form of an amendment. We have no bill, no plan and as far as I can see it has not been thought out too thoroughly at this time. It has been considered but very much on the spur of the moment. We have no outline of how this money is going to be spent, and I cannot justify voting for a million dollars for a blank check of this nature when we have had to trim the University by \$500,000, because we do have schools in existence today that could very well use this million dollars if we had it to provide, but I feel we are borrowing money for something that has not been presented to us in the proper form and comes to us in the form of an amendment, and for that reason I shall have to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question through the Chair to any member of the Appropriations Committee if I might. Would they please explain how this bill was reported out of Committee?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, has addressed a question through the Chair to any member of the Appropriations Committee, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley.

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the bill has not been reported out of Committee.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, this is quite a discussion here over vocational buildings and so on. On page three in this document is \$110,600 for a vocational welding shop and classroom building. On page two in this same document there is a Home Economics and Science Building \$341,500 at Farmington State Teachers College, and I certainly hope this amendment does not receive passage.

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

Mr. HAUGHN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to concur with my good friend from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Lane, we certainly could pass out \$1,250,000 of your tax money here this afternoon and I certainly am going to be in favor of training young men and boys to qualify for livelihood within the State. Other states are doing it. We are so far behind the times in that particular field that we really should take notice of ourselves and take stock of what is going on in the State. And I certainly hope that when this vote is taken, if necessary that it have to be taken by roll call to determine where we are going to spend money feasibly and justifiably within the State.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have somehow been struggling through this session of the Legislature with many proposals to construct buildings both in our municipalities and otherwise which are the outgrowth of our Sinclair Bill which was passed two years ago. We did then embark upon a program of tremendous expansion of our school facilities of all grades. I think many of us have been laboring through this session with the fear that this thing was going to get so big that we could not stand the load in any way financially and now here we are faced with an altogether new type of school construction program. I think there is much doubt in the minds of many of our educators here in Maine, I have heard it expressed by many of them,

whether this thing should be fitted in to our new high school construction under the Sinclair Law or whether we want to embark upon a new venture, an entirely new venture. Obviously if we build this building, this construction, this cost bear in mind is only for the initial cost.

This is \$1,000,000 to build the building and possibly to equip it, then we will have to face the expense of instruction in that building. This is another load added to the load which many of us have been fearing under the program which we did embark on two years ago. I have felt strongly that we should advance along these lines, but I fear we are taking this step too hastily and I think there is still considerable doubt whether this is the right approach or whether we can better handle it within our present school system.

I think perhaps we had better make up our minds whether we can finance our present one before we buy another one. Obviously if we build this one, it leads to many more, and one is not going to do the trick. If one is successful, we are probably going to need thirty more. Now, can we do it? I am certainly opposed to this proposal. This is something many of us have talked about, there are priorities. This thing when we talk about priorities set up under our capital construction program, this thing never was heard of before we came here. How are priorities born? This was born quickly. Now it had no consideration earlier by our Bureau of Public Improvements, etc. It has been conceived hastily and while I say I still like the idea, let us give it careful consideration. Possibly the best idea is to refer it to the next Legislature, but I certainly am opposed to taking this step in view of all of the expense that we now face on our other program. Let us handle one thing at a time.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't think it is commonly unknown here that I am interested in vocational education. I certainly am, but I just can't see embarking on a new

program as the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, has said. Furthermore, the original bill, if my memory serves me correctly was something like \$268,000,000. It has been cut down, and I really think if we are going to pass this amendment we ought to know what the million dollars is going to buy. I honestly do not know. I have heard rumors that it will be located on the grounds of State Teachers College Campus or on the Maine Vocational School Campus at South Portland, but as far as the original bill being concerned, it was to be an area school to serve five hundred pupils to be had within a radius of fifty miles and was to cost a great deal more money, and so through the Chair I would like to ask a question. Would someone please explain what the alternate plans are? I think we ought to know that before we vote.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, has addressed a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, the question of the gentleman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, is rather somewhat ambiguous. I think in order to answer it, it would take quite some time and I might say that as I understand it the amendment before us is actually the bill that is still in the Appropriations Committee and I think that when we get that bill is probably when we would have our explanation thoroughly as to what this would do.

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

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that a million dollars does not represent the bill that the Appropriations Committee has, and there is no connection so far as I can see between this amendment and the bill, and I still think if we are going to pass out a million dollars, we ought to know something about what it is to be used for.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I was trying, but I did not get very

far, to convey to the lady from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, that I was on her side. Now let us start from scratch here as far as vocational training is concerned. My second term in the Legislature I put in a piece of legislation that would ask for a vocational training school post-secondary. Four years ago there were two such measures presented before the Legislature. Two years ago, there were three. I believe the gentleman from Perham had a bill in and the lady from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie, had the bill in for her area. A gentleman from another branch had one for his area, and I had one for my area. Due to the lack of funds the three bills were returned with "Ought not to pass" reports.

An order was presented by me and referred to the Legislative Research Committee to study the problem of vocational training. The hearing was held with people from all parts of the State. We were not talking then about this phase of vocational training on a secondary school level, but a post-secondary level. There was a tremendous amount of enthusiasm, no opposition to it, naturally the old comment money being available. Out of the hearing came a move by the Education Department on vocational training to send questionnaires, I know many of you who are in business received them, and to be answered and sent back for a report by the Education Committee. Again at this session the lady from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie and the same gentleman from the other branch and myself put in legislation calling for vocational training schools in our areas.

When this plan was explained to me I went before the Appropriations Committee and withdrew my measure for my own area and consequently the three bills for area vocational training on the post-secondary level were returned "Ought not to pass," and I believe Mrs. Christie tried to revive hers. At least I let mine go and she did also gracefully. Certainly my past record would indicate that I have not been anything but a champion of vocational training, but my opposition to this measure at this time and bearing in mind that this meas-

ure is still not under the form of an amendment but under the form of a bill, it is still in the Appropriations Committee to be reported out, but we are getting on and I went along with the previous amendment with the understanding that it would be cut to \$50,000 which would not damage this Rogerson bill 1393 calling for a \$5,500,000 bond issue, but this amendment being passed would not indicate where the money would come from. The bond issue would have to be amended. I don't think that can be done successfully and so I would oppose this waiting for the other measure to come along and possibly as has been stated refer it to the 100th Legislature.

Years have been spent on area vocational training post-secondary and now comes a program still in its infancy such as this one which is splendid as I have explained to you and as I have presented my case before the Appropriations Committee. With this million dollars and not to be taken lightly would have to be another amendment, a stepup of the present bond issue as proposed by this amendment, the Rogerson amendment, and that is my reason why I think we should go against this amendment and await the regular bill and refer that justifiably so to the 100th Legislature.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a matter of information, this bill was introduced on February 11. It was referred to Committee in the Senate on March 3, and referred to Committee in the House on March 6. It seems very strange that after all this time, this bill should still be in Committee, not reported out. It has had hearings and yet all of a sudden today there is an amendment to the bond issue to slide this thing in under the table, and I certainly would support the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Whitman, to indefinitely postpone this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair must remind the gentlewoman that she has spoken at least twice and must

have the consent of the House to speak again.

Mrs. SMITH: I realize this. I simply think that it was more or less of a question.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman request permission of the House to speak again?

Mrs. SMITH: Please.

Thereupon, Mrs. Smith of Fal-mouth was given permission of the House to speak again.

Mrs. SMITH: In regards to the bill that is before the Appropriations Committee, I may say as a member of this Committee, I would have been very happy to have reported it out a long time ago and I think there are many other members on that Committee who would have been, but due to certain reasons we were not able to do so.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair must remind the gentleman that he has spoken at least twice. Does he request permission to speak again?

Mr. WHITMAN: I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman asks for a division.

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

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: At the outset, let me state that I am speaking purely as an individual. I feel that a regional technical school of this nature has benefited areas in Massachusetts and Connecticut and that the State of Maine has tried to play it safe too long; consequently, we are not in the same competitive position that our other sister states happen to be. A pilot school of this nature would give recognition to the boy who has mechanical skills. Certainly we are all aware that at the most twenty to thirty per cent of our young men leaving high school attend colleges of some sort. It is about time that the State of Maine did something definite for the seventy to eighty per cent of our young men who do not attend colleges by developing their mechanical skills. Any community throughout the State who has industrial development committees places its skilled labor as the number one drawing card for new industries. I think that it is high

time that we start to attract and train individuals in mechanical skills because in the long run it will pay off.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, I wish only to comment briefly. It is to this, we found that our current services budget this year which represented the amount that we had available for all purposes lacked some \$2,000,000 of enough to provide our educational aid subsidy, and we are now seeking new taxes to provide that subsidy. I still say I think perhaps the idea of a vocational school has merit but we are certainly in a lot of trouble to find the money to maintain what we have got, and let us see if we can't get to where we feel a little surer that we can do that before we embark on these new ventures.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Whitman, that the House indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "C" to Senate Amendment "A." A division has been requested.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "C" to Senate Amendment "A" please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Ninety-four having voted in the affirmative, and thirty having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

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

Mr. STANLEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to present House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A" which has not been reproduced and distributed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Stanley, now offers House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A."

The Clerk will read House Amendment "D" to Senate Amendment "A."

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 200, L. D. 539, Bill, "An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Ten Million Dollars to Provide Major Repairs, Construction and Equipment."

Amend said Amendment, in the 3rd line, by striking out the first word "Five" and inserting in place thereof the word "Three"

Further amend said Amendment, in the 18th line, by striking out the figure "\$5,550,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "\$3,550,000"

Further amend said Amendment by inserting after the 4th paragraph thereof the following:

"Further amend said Bill by adding at the end of section 1 thereof, the following sentence:

'Said bonds shall not run for a longer period than 8 years from the date of the original issue thereof.' "

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A, under the caption "ADJUTANT GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF", by striking out the following lines:

"Saco Armory		
Locker Room	—	2,615
Bath Armory		
Ventilator	—	370
Brunswick Armory		
Gun Pit Lights	455	—
Rumford Armory		
Driveway	683	—
All Units		
Oil Conversions	1,500	1,000

Total Adjutant General, Department of	7,397	3,985
---------------------------------------	-------	-------

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A by striking out the following lines:

"AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF

Shop and Storage	184,000	—
CIVIL DEFENSE AND PUBLIC SAFETY		
Warehouse	82,100	—
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF		
Museum, Phase No. 2.	17,800	—

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A, under the caption

"EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF", by striking out the following lines:

"Aroostook State Teachers College

Remodel Merriman House	—	7,900"
------------------------	---	--------

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A, under the caption "EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF", by striking out from the paragraph entitled "Fort Kent State Normal School", the following lines:

"Gymnasium Renovations	—	56,600
Sub-total	221,900	56,600"

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A, under the caption "EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF", by striking out from the paragraph entitled "Maine Vocational Technical Institute", the following lines:

"Addition—Welding Shop	10,600	—
Sub-total	10,600	110,600"

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A by striking out all of the following lines:

"FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF

Bureau of Public Improvements

Blaine House Interior	26,900	—
Blaine House Exterior	2,300	1,500
Capitol Grounds	8,700	—

Total Finance and Administration, Department of	37,900	1,500
---	--------	-------

HEALTH AND WELFARE, DEPARTMENT OF

Northern Maine Sanatorium

New Tuberculosis Hospital Building	533,400	—
------------------------------------	---------	---

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A, under the caption "INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE, DE-

PARTMENT OF", by striking out the following lines:

"Augusta State Hospital		
Lock System Re-		
placement	6,000	6,000
Windows and		
Frames	10,500	—
Sub-total	16,500	6,000

Bangor State Hospital		
Sun Porches—"C"		
and "E"		10,000
Administrative Of-		
fices and Stor-		
age Area	160,200	—
Sub-total	160,200	10,000

**Pineland Hospital
and Training
Center**

Renovations—		
Staples Hall	28,100	—

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A, under the caption "INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF", by striking out from the paragraph entitled "School for Girls", the following lines:

"Walk-in Refriger-		
ator	—	1,800
Sub-total	11,700	1,800

Further amend said Amendment in that part designated "Sec. 6" of CHAPTER A by striking out all of the following lines:

**"STATE PARK COMMISSION
Development of State Parks**

Minor Park Im-		
provements —		
Sebago	5,300	—
UNIVERSITY OF MAINE		
Renovations to Win-		
gate Hall	50,000	—
College of Educa-		
tion Building	820,000	—
Sewage Disposal	578,760	—
Service Building		
"A" and "B"	218,000	—
Contingencies	76,463	—

and inserting in place thereof the following lines:

'UNIVERSITY OF MAINE		
Renovations to Win-		
gate Hall	50,000	—
College of Educa-		
tion Building	820,000	—
Contingencies	39,546	—

Further amend said Amendment by striking out the paragraph re-

lating to the question upon which the inhabitants will vote and inserting in place thereof the following paragraph:

"Shall a bond issue be ratified for the purposes set forth in 'An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Three Million Five Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars and to Appropriate Moneys for Capital Improvements, Construction, Repairs, Equipment, Supplies and Furnishings for Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1960 and June 30, 1961,' passed by the 99th Legislature?"

Further amend said Amendment by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that because this amendment has not been reproduced the entire matter, Bill "An Act to Authorize General Fund Bond Issue in Amount of Ten Million Dollars to Provide Major Repairs, Construction and Equipment," Senate Paper 200, Legislative Document 539, will lie upon the table until tomorrow pending adoption of House Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A."

For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. BROCKWAY of Milo: Am I in order to offer an amendment?

The SPEAKER: The entire matter has been placed upon the table and an amendment will be in order tomorrow.

Would the gentleman approach the rostrum?

(Conference at rostrum)

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Relieving Children and Certain Relatives of Financial Responsibility in Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Disabled" (H. P. 963) (L. D. 1365) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on June 3.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its action

and request a Committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, moves that the House insist upon its action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed on June 3 and requests a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. LINNELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Linnell, now moves that the House recede and concur.

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is a motion to recede and concur debatable?

The SPEAKER: The motion is debatable, yes.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will merely say this, we made ourselves very clear in the action that we have taken on the bill, and I am going to ask you, and I do feel that a Committee of Conference is quite in line with the decision that we have made here, and I am going to ask you to go along with me and to vote against the motion to recede and concur and to vote for the motion to insist and request the Committee of Conference. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ashland, Mr. Prue.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Linnell, that the House recede and concur. Will those who favor 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.

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Madawaska,

Mr. Rowe, that the House insist and request a Committee of Conference. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will appoint as conferees on the part of the House the following members: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Rowe, the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin, and the gentlewoman from Yarmouth, Mrs. Knapp.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, please approach the rostrum?

(Conference at rostrum)

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

Thereupon, on motion of that gentleman, the House voted to take from the table the first tabled and unassigned matter, House Divided Report, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to State Aid for School Construction," House Paper 3, Legislative Document 12, tabled on May 14 by that gentleman pending acceptance of either report.

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

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now move that we accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, moves that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask a question through the Chair, is this the one that lowers the figure from 700 to 300 for school construction?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, has addressed a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, this is the bill that would lower the figure from 700 down to include secondary

schools with an enrollment of 300 or over.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to this bill because the town that I represent has over three hundred, and it joined the school district because it was represented that that was the only way it could receive construction aid. If this passed, then there would be no need for us to be in a district. That may be negative thinking, but that is the thinking nevertheless, and we would be before you possibly to be out and I feel that others might be affected that same way. Therefore, I would request a division when the vote is taken.

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the Clerk, if he would please give us the members of the Committee Report.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the Committee Report.

The Committee Report was read by the Clerk again.

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Clerk for reading the Report, and I find as was noted there one of the signers of the Education Committee "Ought not to pass" but again I must defend my position for so signing. If we believe in the Sinclair law which was passed by the last Legislature, and if we are going to give the Sinclair law an opportunity to have a real trial to see if it will work, then I feel that we must kill this particular bill.

What this bill says, in effect it is a simple one, simply this, that any town which has 300 resident pupils will immediately qualify as a single town administrative district. If we stop and think for just a moment we can realize what that can do to the small outlying towns. The object of the Sinclair bill was to bring about consolidation. We have in many areas of the state towns that have a little over 300 students. Surrounding that particular town with 300 secondary school scholars we have a series of small towns. The intent of the Sinclair

law was that perhaps the larger town would operate as the center for the smaller towns, they in turn would join with it in a district.

If this particular bill should pass this Legislature, there would then be no incentive whatsoever for the center town which would have the 300 students to go after the small towns to get them to combine with them. Consequently the smaller towns would be left all alone and every town in the state of over 300 would be getting school construction aid. I wouldn't dare estimate and I don't think accurate estimates have been made of what this proposal would cost Maine in the years ahead. Therefore I must move for the indefinite postponement of this particular bill.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As a signer of the minority report, I would like to place in the record my reason for signing with the gentleman from Scarborough on this bill. Two years ago when the Sinclair Bill was enacted there were a group of towns and you heard the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, name them this afternoon, some twenty-five towns, who because of their location either geographically or otherwise were unable to get any of the construction aid unless they consolidated. Now the philosophy of the Sinclair Bill was the consolidation of small towns into a district to effect equalization of opportunity for the boys and girls in the various towns in the State. In my town, and I am going to speak for that because I know it better than perhaps some other situations. We have a mill and our valuation and our tax rate is very high. The little towns surrounding us will not consolidate with Rumford because they cannot afford to assume the burden that would be theirs in the form of taxation. Consequently, it is absolutely impossible for the Town of Rumford to have any con-

solidation with the towns around, which means that construction aid is being withheld from our town.

Now the Sinclair Bill states that a good high school is a high school of three hundred, and yet it is saying to these towns which cannot evolve any consolidation that we cannot have any construction help. I would disagree with the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, who says that there would be no incentive. The large cities now have construction help without any consolidation. They receive only eighteen per cent of their building aid. The sliding scale which is used to measure the construction aid that is given to cities or towns or districts starts with eighteen per cent and goes as high as sixty-six per cent. If this bill were passed, it would mean that towns of three hundred would get only eighteen per cent building aid. The incentive still remains. If they could find towns around them to consolidate with them, they then would be entitled to more building aid, a larger percentage of their construction.

We from Rumford, for example, can come into the next session of the Legislature and take some little community, I will mention for example Hanover, we have many of the pupils from Hanover coming to our high school because we are doing the work of an area high school. We could take the Town of Hanover which has only three hundred families for example and say that we are consolidating, and thereby get our construction aid, but I ask you if this would not be a fiasco. It would be a farce for the Town of Rumford, merely for the sake of getting construction aid, to consolidate with a small town whose pupils we are already getting into our high school. Now we can do that and come under the Sinclair Law. Now I ask you, that is rather ridiculous, and we feel that it is much better to let these towns of three hundred who, for reasons beyond their control will not permit them to consolidate with anyone else. We feel that it is much more logical and much more realistic to get eighteen per cent building aid than to go along with some small town and consolidate under a farce to get more than the eighteen per

cent, and that is the reason that I signed the minority report.

I think that if the State of Maine has gone into a new area of school construction and it is saying to the large cities you don't have to consolidate, you can have construction help, and it is saying to the small towns, you can consolidate and get construction; but those of us who are in between, some twenty-five or thirty towns, because we can find no one who will consolidate with us because of our tax burden, to say to us you cannot get any construction help, I feel that that is most unrealistic and that is the reason that I would support this amendment and I certainly would hope that you would not go along with the indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. DESMARAIS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: In the 98th session of the Legislature I voted for the Sinclair Act. I knew that Sanford was being left out, but for fear of defeating the bill, being fair minded, I decided to go along. We in Sanford are proud people and we are progressive people. We are now in the process of building a new junior high school to the amount of \$650,000, and we are also building a vocational school to the amount of \$250,000. We are not asking for charity here tonight. We are only asking for what we think is a fair deal. The purpose of the Sinclair Bill was to help the people, help the towns that wanted to help themselves. Well, Sanford is helping themselves and I think that we should be helped. If the small towns under three hundred and the cities over seven hundred can receive building aid, construction aid, I don't see any reason why the towns between three hundred and seven hundred should be left out, and I think that if you people will let your conscience be your guide, you will go along with this bill.

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

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in reply to one question of the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, I have a letter from Asa Gordon, Coordi-

nator of the Maine School District Commission addressed to me dated May 26 in which he says: "On your question of reducing the building aid from seven hundred to three hundred high school pupils, the total cost for the biennium as tabulated is \$256,000. If the provisions for delaying aid until the project is completed are adopted, the first year of the biennium would be \$39,000 and the second year \$217,000. I hope this answers your question." Mr. Frazier indicated he would not dare venture a guess what this would cost. In the overall program I do not think this is an unreasonable request, and when this magic figure was picked out of the air of seven hundred, the Conant report indicates that a high school of three hundred is of sufficient size to come up to all the standards. I think this is a very unfair situation, and I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, does not prevail.

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

Mr. ERVIN: Mr. Speaker, there have been statements made here tonight that I have to take exception to. One has been that when did the number of seven hundred become so magic. For the information of the members of this House, the Education Committee in reporting out their bill on the Sinclair Act for reorganization were unanimously in accord that the number of seven hundred was wrong, and in the bill that we reported out unanimously "Ought to pass" that seven hundred figure was taken out. The present bill having this seven hundred figure is now being recommended to the Committee, the joint committees on Appropriations and Education, and if it is within our power that the seven hundred figure will be eliminated, you can be assured that when this comes back from Committee, it will be out of that bill.

Now the statements have been made as to why should the schools that have resident pupils of three to seven hundred be left out. Well you could ask the same question why should the schools of two hundred to three hundred be left out? And to further acquaint you with

how many of them, there are twenty-four in that list between two hundred and three hundred, and for your information I will even read those so you will know who they are: Boothbay, Calais, Cape Elizabeth, Dexter, Dover-Foxcroft, Ellsworth, Fairfield, Falmouth, Farmington, Fort Fairfield, Freeport, Kennebunk, Lincoln, Lisbon, Madison, Mexico, Old Orchard, Orono, Paris, Pittsfield, Wilton, Windham, Winslow and York. If you are going to include the three hundred to seven hundred, why don't you include these people? They are just as much entitled as the people from three hundred to seven hundred are.

Basically your Sinclair Act wasn't to give this complete construction aid to towns in the three hundred bracket up, of which my town is one of them. The basic principle of the Sinclair Act, as I understand, is to help these smaller towns particularly the ones I just read and smaller so that they could have better educational facilities and better educational opportunities for their children. I don't believe personally the Sinclair Act is going to help the Town of Houlton, my home town, if we take in eight or nine other people rated on other towns, but I do hope that one of these days that the Town of Houlton can consolidate with some of those outside towns because I think we have a moral obligation. We have in the Town of Houlton a school as compared with Rumford and the others. We offer all of the opportunities. The Sinclair Act is trying to get the opportunities for the smaller schools, and for these reasons I have to go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone the break-down from seven hundred to three hundred.

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

Mr. KELLAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I believe the Sinclair Law was passed to provide better education for the State of Maine as a whole, not necessarily for a particular community. I believe it was passed to attain a certain level of education within the State. I have seen reports that admit that a high school of three

hundred pupils is a good, efficient operating school. If we accept that the three hundred figure school is already at the school population for economic teaching, I see no reason why they should be omitted from receiving the minimum State building construction subsidy. Therefore, I favor the passage of the bill and oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Legislature: Again you are seeing the effect of this seven hundred, and here is a group of towns between the three hundred and seven hundred which are conducting some of the best schools in this State, and yet they can't receive and don't receive subsidy where the others above the seven hundred mark do. We figure that that is an injustice any way you might figure it, and you are getting away from the philosophy of the Sinclair Bill altogether in simply correcting a condition which was an impossible condition in the rural situation. There again, we are bothered with your seven hundred mark. Now I don't know whether the economy of this State can pay for the subsidizing of all school buildings. I don't believe it is intended in the first place or even thought of, and I am very certain that Mr. Jacobs who made the study which cost this State about \$30,000 in all, even conceived the idea that they were going to be able to pay a subsidy for these groups, and for that reason I shall certainly have to oppose and wish to go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone this new bill.

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

Mr. LETOURNEAU: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: At the last legislative session two years ago we passed the Sinclair Act, and at that time some of us legislators thought that there were inequalities and injustices because of conditions that were incorporated into the Sinclair Act at the time that it was passed. One in particular which I remember clearly was the inconsistency which is working against the

principle and purpose of bringing about equalization of educational opportunities by consolidation and formation of administrative school districts. This is where any municipality having seven hundred or more high school students was allowed to form a school administrative district by itself without consolidating with neighboring towns as a single unit and receive financial benefits, while at the same time the smaller neighboring towns which are in no position to join with others where they are not eligible to secure the extra funds to bring up their education program and buildings to a better standard because towns which have under seven hundred pupils and are not in a feasible or practical location to join with other towns in a consolidated effort are being penalized by not being eligible for Sinclair funds.

Second, the most costly buildings will be built in these single units where enrollments are seven hundred or more and that means that a large portion of the Sinclair Act benefits will go to the larger cities which already have higher educational standards and facilities than in the average municipality in our State. These situations were not meant to be. They were neither suggested nor intended in the original Jacob's Report. The purpose of the Act was to encourage consolidation of towns that educational advantages would be nearer equalized or standardized for all the children throughout the State. This provision in the law seems to be working in the opposite. The time will come when increased State aid will be available to all school systems in the State and I firmly believe we should help the poorer and smaller communities first. This inconsistency should be corrected before it is allowed to progress further. One in the form of a bill to drop the seven hundred enrollment down to a figure that would take in most of these towns that are now being penalized.

This should not prevent smaller towns to join together for better schools. The purpose of the law was to improve education at the lower level. Perhaps this is the way we should work so that eventually we will raise the standards throughout

the State. Originally, I believe that was the intent of the Act.

I would like to state the position of Sanford in this matter. Sanford, a community of over 15,000 people, is not eligible for school construction aid under section 237 of the Sinclair Act. While the following material pertains to Sanford, it is equally valid for many other communities in Maine, as indicated in Appendix A.

With 15,000 residents the citizens of Sanford are paying a proportionate share of taxes, local, state, and federal, but are not receiving a proportionate share of needed aid. Sanford supports a public high school of seven hundred and fifty-five students, enrollment as of September 3, 1958.

Educators generally agree that a quality program at reasonable costs can be carried out in a school enrolling five hundred or more pupils. The Sinclair Act as presently in force assumes that a high school of three hundred is considered to be the minimum size acceptable in Maine, and that high schools of this size or larger are believed to be capable of offering a curriculum designed to meet the needs of our secondary students. Dr. Conant in the most recent study of the American high school strongly recommends that high schools have a graduating class of one hundred or more pupils in order to maintain a quality program. Sanford High School has graduated over one hundred students each year since 1938 with the exception of 1946 when ninety-one were graduated, and 1956 when ninety-three were graduated.

Sanford High School accommodates, two hundred and forty-seven tuition pupils from nine surrounding areas at a tuition rate of \$298.50. State average cost in 1957-58 was \$330.60. Our neighbors agree that these youngsters receive a quality education at a cost which is considerably below what it would be if these towns supported a high school of comparable quality of their own.

Sanford supports a resident public school enrollment as of September of 1958. School authorities generally agree that a school district of fifteen hundred to twenty-five hundred pupils, two hundred per grade, is large enough to maintain

a quality program at reasonable costs, also selected citizens of Sanford support a non-public school enrollment of thirteen hundred and eight. Thus they are paying for this schooling while helping to support Sanford's public schools and through taxes they are paying a share of the costs of State subsidies.

Sanford in 1954 was subjected to a severe economic depression from which full recovery has not as yet been realized. The taxable valuation within Sanford was reduced as follows: 1954 — \$28,654,000, — 1955 — \$19,904,000, 1958 — \$21,037,000. Fewer jobs are available. More children to educate, the 1953-54 total enrollment, nineteen hundred thirty-nine; 1958-59 total enrollment, twenty-two hundred seventy-four.

Throughout the period of economic distress and increasing enrollments Sanford has maintained quality schools. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the citizens of Sanford to continue to do this, in spite of the fact that we all recognize that the need for quality education has never been greater. Sanford High was the first and, to the best of my knowledge at this time, is the only public high school in the State of Maine fully accredited under the new standards which go into effect in 1960.

Sanford is presently building a five hundred pupil junior high school and a vocational school. Sanford has an immediate need for at least a new fourteen-room elementary unit. Sanford's request for consideration through an amendment to the Sinclair Act appears in no way to violate the purpose of the original Bill which stated the following purposes:

1. Equalized educational opportunities.
2. Established satisfactory programs.
3. Greater uniformity of school tax rates.
4. More effective use of public funds expended for the support of schools.

It begins to appear to the people of Sanford that if some type of building aid is not forthcoming, through an amendment to the Sinclair Act, Sanford may be forced through necessity and not choice to curtail some educational opportuni-

ities now offered. It may be necessary to cut back part of the program. The tax rate will continue to rise even with a curtailed program with the effect that the public funds received for the support of Sanford schools will buy less education in the future than they have in the past. Therefore, it appears apparent that the admirable purposes of the Sinclair Act will be defeated to a degree rather than enhanced here in Sanford. This is completely contrary to the desires and wishes of our citizens.

Why was the criterion "resident high school pupils educated at public expense" selected rather than resident pupils, all grades, educated at public expense?

Why seven hundred resident high school pupils, why not three hundred, four hundred, or five hundred?

Why resident pupils?

We feel in Sanford in some way that we have been discriminated against, and we feel that the law should be amended, and I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone will not prevail, and when the vote is taken, it is taken by division.

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

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I promise you I will be very brief, two minutes. I have hesitated to speak many, many times on many of the educational matters we have taken up thus far because the debate has been carried very well, but this is such an important issue, I will speak tonight and only very briefly.

I think that the whole central core of a question that is involved here is that all of us should take the state-wide look, and for this reason here. My town is the Town of Madawaska. I represent the other towns of St. Agatha and Frenchville. Because of our evaluation in the Town of Madawaska, at this time it looks like we have reached an impasse as far as setting up a consolidated administrative school district. It would be to the advantages of St. Agatha and Frenchville if we, Madawaska, took them in a consolidated. It would be to our disadvantage, however.

If this bill is passed and the figure was dropped from seven hundred to three hundred, it would be to the advantage of the Town of Madawaska, but it would be to the disadvantage of the outlying towns of my region. My superintendent has asked me, and knowing full well that my town and other towns like it would receive this additional help, but he feels and others feel too that we should take the state-wide look. We should look to the smaller, the poorer communities and we should give them a chance to grow and we should not destroy this extra inducement of the three hundred and above towns there of attracting and bringing the other smaller towns into it. Therefore, I do hope that you will go along with the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. DODGE: Mr. Speaker: After having experience with a community school of four towns for a matter of ten years, we are now in a district school. I must go along with this amendment because I don't think that I am in any position to deny to other towns what we have there and the amount of money that we get from the State. I don't think that we are in any position to say that we shall have it and the rest of you shan't.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will be extremely brief. I arise in support of the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier. I must agree with him that this would lose the incentive that the towns have for joining a district. I must disagree with the good woman from Rumford, Miss Cormier. I will cite my town as an example. Rockland has two towns, Owls Head and South Thomaston, who before joining in the district these two towns sent their pupils to Rockland High. They paid tuition and the two towns assumed all of the cost of transportation. Rockland in order to obtain the benefits offered to it under the present Sinclair Act which was passed by the last Legislature joined with

these two towns in a district. Now Rockland gave up the following: On current operating expenses and without the State subsidy they assumed eighty-seven per cent of the cost of transportation of these outlying towns or rather the transportation of the pupils of these towns. They assumed eighty-seven per cent of the cost of increase in pay of the teachers of these towns because the pay standard was sub-normal to that of Rockland and on top of that they gave up the tuition that they were receiving.

Now, if this minority report passes, in the interest of fair play, it would only be fair that this Legislature allow towns of three hundred or over who have already entered into a district to allow them to re-evaluate their situation and to withdraw from a district if they saw fit to do so. Therefore, I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, but believes the gentleman has spoken twice.

Mr. CLARK: I would like to ask a question through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. CLARK: Through the Chair, I would like to ask in the sense of fairness what percentage of building aid, from Mr. Knight, does Rockland now receive?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Knight, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. KNIGHT: I cannot answer that sir, but I would check the answer and give it to him later, if that is permissible.

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

Mr. HEALD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Being from a small town I can see that with the passage of this amendment our chances for consolidating going right out the window, and I am opposed to this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lowery.

Mr. LOWERY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We find that Brunswick is in much the same position as Sanford and Rumford. Smaller towns around us, although we do take their pupils into our high schools, cannot come in with us in a school district because they cannot afford actually to stand the tax commitment that they would have to take. I therefore hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to state very briefly that I am in one hundred per cent agreement with the gentleman from Sanford, the gentleman from Rumford and the gentleman from Brunswick that there is an inequity. However, I do feel that the bill we will have here tomorrow morning will take care of that inequity and this bill will only create a great many more educational problems for us.

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

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, to explain to us how the other bill tomorrow will take care of this inequity.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Miller, has addressed a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. FRAZIER: Mr. Speaker, I think we have answered that several times already today, by taking out the provision that we feel never should have been in the bill in the first place, that is that magic seven hundred figure.

The SPEAKER: Is the House now ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Reed.

Mr. REED: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I dislike carrying this debate on further but at this time I really don't know which way the wind is blowing, and I would like to say that I am very much opposed to this bill. Now, I happen

to represent four towns that surround the City of Bath. The case is that the City of Bath if they form a district with these towns it is going to increase their school budget I believe by some \$60,000 even with the anticipated benefits. Well now I do not blame the City of Bath for not wanting to form the district, but I do feel that the bill that will be here tomorrow, and there again if I am wrong I would like to be corrected, allows these towns to form a district and then contract for their secondary education. These four towns presently send their students to Morse High School, and I feel if that is done, if the towns do form the district and then do contract with the larger cities for their secondary education then I feel that at that time the larger cities should be allowed to receive the building benefits under the Sinclair Bill, but until that is done I don't feel they should. If this amendment is passed as far as the four towns that I represent, or the five as far as that goes, the other one is close to Brunswick, consolidation would be out of the question for them.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montville, Mr. Mathieson.

Mr. MATHIESON: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Woolwich, he is right in regard to the situation in regard to towns around some of these better high schools, and towns not having a high school instead of building one could group themselves together and contract with a central school. In that way the central school would get the benefit of the building. Now that is in the law that will be considered in this House probably tomorrow, and those are some of the features that have been taken up in this revision of the Sinclair Act. I think that would be very attractive to a lot of places. As a matter of fact, I know several that are all ready to work on that.

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

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker, somehow I find myself drawn into

all of these educational discussions. I suppose it is because I know so little about them. My sympathy should very naturally be with the small towns, yet it is very hard for me to believe in anything but fair play for all, and in the operation of this Sinclair Law, I see many inequalities. I see no merit in the magic figure seven hundred. I cannot in good conscience vote to leave in towns with over seven hundred, allow them the benefits of this Act when I deny it to the town with six hundred and ninety-nine, and until we are ready to eliminate the seven hundred, I find myself forced to vote with the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, for what my vote is worth.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lee, Mr. Frazier, that with respect to Bill "An Act relating to State Aid for School Construction," House Paper 3, Legislative Document 12, both reports be indefinitely postponed, and a division has been requested.

Will those who favor the indefinite postponement of both Reports, please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Fifty-seven having voted in the affirmative, and sixty-one having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone both Reports did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is the motion of the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Clark, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its two several readings.

Under suspension of the rules, the Bill was then given its third reading, passed to be engrossed, and sent to the Senate.

On motion of Mr. Wade of Auburn,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.