

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

One Hundred and Fifth

Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1971

KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

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 total was taken, 125 voted in favor of same and one against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act Prohibiting Dragging for Fish in Spruce Creek, York County (H. P. 264) (L. D. 353)

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 total was taken, 124 voted in favor of same and one against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act Authorizing the Mars Hill Utility District to Enforce Liens to Secure Payment of Rates (H. P. 1097) (L. D. 1485)

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 total was taken, 121 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Incorporate the Andover Water District (H. P. 1098) (L. D. 1504)

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 total was taken, 128 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Increasing Minimum Wages (S. P. 16) (L. D. 44)

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

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration of engrossment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell moves that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration of engrossment. Is there objection?

(Cries of "Yes")

The Chair hears objection and will order a vote. All in favor of suspending the rules will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

61 having voted in the affirmative and 71 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move that this lie on the table one legislative day.

Whereupon, Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley, moves that L. D. 44 be tabled until tomorrow pending passage to be enacted. A division has been requested on the tabling motion. All in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

63 having voted in the affirmative and 72 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House this Bill be passed to be enacted?

Whereupon, Mr. Emery of Rockland requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested.

Whereupon, Mr. Martin of Eagle Lake requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The yeas and nays have been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and

voting. All members desiring a roll call vote will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker, is it debatable at this point?

The SPEAKER: It is debatable.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My position on this bill I think is well known by this juncture. I would like to call your attention, however, to some material that I distributed to this House this morning and I just want to make reference to one statement.

This material was a commentary written by Yale Brozen, Professor of Business Economics at the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago. This commentary was written in reference to the prospects of passage at the federal level of a \$2.00 Minimum Wage and I just want to call attention to one point that I think is significant.

He says, "In these states with Minimum Wage Laws unemployment is 20 per cent higher than the states which do not have Minimum Wage Laws." Now there are states, as I am sure you people are well aware, that have not enacted any Minimum Wage legislation whatever at the state level and rely entirely on the imposition of federal standards to set the wage rates in their states.

I would like to point out that this state is in competition for industrial development with these states. I would further like to point out that industries in this state are in direct competition with these states. Of all the states in the United States this one, the State of Maine, from the point of view of good economics, is the least likely candidate that I can think of to establish the highest state standards in the United States for this type of labor.

I think that we are making an extremely serious economic mis-

take here this morning. I think we are placing this state in a very serious disadvantage as it seeks to replace industry in this state. I think that you are going to live to regret that you participated in what in my view is an extremely serious error, one that is going to be extremely costly to the state as it seeks to make industrial development, one that is going to add immeasurably to your welfare load in the state, and in the last analysis the effect of which is to injure the very people that some of you think you are helping by the passage of Minimum Wage legislation.

The people that are injured by this action are the people who are the least able to compete in the job market. You are injuring the teenagers, you are injuring those that are physically and mentally handicapped, you are injuring the marginal workers in this state by making them permanent welfare cases. Mark my words, in about two years, as we sit here scratching our heads wondering what has happened to welfare costs, the root cause of some of the future increases is right here today.

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

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I do appreciate Mr. Haskell's view on this bill. I will agree that the paper he distributed to us was true. But, there should be some rule or regulation of any lobbying unit to put propaganda on our desks here that is not true.

I have in my hand a letter under the heading of Maine Merchants Association, signed by Robie M. Liscomb. Concerning a minimum wage law he states in paragraph 3 — "Consider the Cost to the State itself. . . Maine has 550 employees today, making less than the proposed minimum. This will cost the state \$381,400 plus the ripple raise which must go to every state employee to maintain a normal wage differential. If current differentials are maintained, it will cost the state \$20,000,000 in the biennium."

I have checked this out most thoroughly with the Department of Personnel and I find quite a different story. Mr. Harris, former director of the Department of Personnel informs me that with the exception of a few students who are being paid to go to Vocational School, there is absolutely nobody in the state employment who starts in for less than \$1.83 an hour. This is 3 cents above the proposed Minimum Wage.

I think this speaks for itself.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Webster, Mr. Cooney.

Mr. COONEY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Reading through the debate of last Thursday, there were some points in favor of this measure that I don't think were brought out. They relate to where the majority of this money, or a large percentage of this money, will be spent by the people who earn it, and that is on housing. I think you are all aware that in this state, and in my own district I am acutely aware of it, housing is a real problem.

The more or less prosperous people in our state, of course, are eligible for conventional mortgage money. If they are veterans they can get VA loans. FHA loans, farmer loans are available to these people. Then when we drop down into the moderate income or lower income categories we find the people are eligible for HUD programs, 235, 236 and 237.

But when we drop down into the lower incomes, the Minimum Wage people, the people who are working hard, regular hours, we find that there is no way that these people are eligible for any kind of home ownership and housing loan. You are aware that on our present Minimum Wage laws, a person earning I believe it is \$1.60 an hour is only taking home or earning a gross wage of \$3,128 a year. With the \$2.00 Minimum Wage of course this is going to go up to about \$4,000 a year.

In talking to people in the banking industry, people working with the government agencies in charge of these different programs, the \$2.00 Minimum Wage and this

increased earning would make a significant number of our citizens eligible for low income HUD programs that they are not now eligible for and I think it would have a significant impact on our housing problems here in the state. That is one more thing that I think should be in the record in support of this measure.

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

Mr. EMERY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I regret that I am going to have to vote against this this morning if it is not amended to include only the 20 cent increase to \$1.80. I am very sorry because I feel that an increase to \$1.80 would be beneficial to the citizens of Maine and to the workingman. However, I believe that a 40 cent jump over the two-year period is too much. I don't think it is wise economically for some of the reasons that have been mentioned this morning.

What concerns me most of all is the job situation with respect to our high school and college students. I have talked with a good many businessmen in my area and they tell me that if the Minimum Wage is increased to \$2.00 an hour in two years they are going to find it very very difficult to hire kids during the summer; and we all know that with the expense of school as it is these days it is very important that these kids help defray some of the costs of their education.

I feel that the \$2.00 an hour Minimum Wage is too high, especially for the economic status of the State of Maine as it is now. If the bill comes back from the other body, or if we ever see it again, amended to \$1.80 without any increase, I shall support it at that time. I cannot support the \$2.00 an hour increase. I felt that I ought to make my thoughts as a matter of record.

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

Mr. MARSTALLER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I voted against this bill the other day and I expect to vote against it this morning, and

I want to give my reasons why and I hope you will join me.

If we raise this Minimum Wage, what we are going to do, we are going to hurt the young people, the limited person and the older persons. I have talked to several small businessmen about this bill, one who hires an older person to work in the store, and he said that right now the economics are questionable whether he should hire this person; but if he has to pay a high Minimum Wage for this person his only choice is to let this person go.

I talked to a filling station operator who hires a young person part time to come in to help him, and he said that if he has to pay more, that this person isn't doing that much, that he will have to let this person go. I think we have a very serious problem here.

The people that are in production and are doing a good job, are getting over these wages now. So it really doesn't affect them and it will hurt these people that are limited and our young people. I am going to vote against this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have heard these same arguments over a good many years against the Minimum Wage. And yet in spite of these arguments the Minimum Wage has been raised and I don't think that it has reflected in the results that these people have projected. I feel that this is a good thing for us, a good thing for the economy, and I certainly am in favor of it and I hope you will go along.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: As I mentioned the other day, I sponsored the first Minimum Wage bill in 1959. At that time, in order to secure passage of the bill, we had to have eleven exemptions. There have been many changes since then and they are difficult to find. I did do some work and I thought you might be interested to know what people are exempt now.

Persons in agriculture, domestic help, working on commission basis, working for a non-profit institution, counselors at a summer camp, employed in certain fishing occupations, a switchboard operator with 750 stations or less, a home worker, members of your own family, or an executive if he earns at least \$100 per week.

Now the major changes that have been made since then, waiters and waitresses are not exempt now. Taxicab drivers were exempt, but they are not exempt now. And it used to be that a person under the age of 18 could work in any business if they were regularly enrolled in an educational institution or on vacation therefrom. This is just for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Morrell.

Mr. MORRELL: Mr. Speaker, could I pose a question to Mr. Ross?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may pose his question.

Mr. MORRELL: My understanding is that teenagers now in school only have to be paid 75% of the Minimum Wage, and that would be true of the new one. Is that correct or am I incorrect?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Morrell poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, who may answer if he chooses; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. ROSS: Well, probably somebody from the Labor Committee should answer that. It is my understanding that that is not a correct statement.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker, in response to the question of Mr. Morrell, I have before me Title 26, Section 664, which is a portion of the Minimum Wage law. The last paragraph in that section reads as follows: "Employees who are under the age of 19 and are regularly enrolled in an educational institution, or are on vacation therefrom, may be paid a rate of not less than 75% of the applicable Minimum Wage

required for other employees in the same occupation."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that means basically that high school and college students under age 19 may be paid 75% of the Minimum Wage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Morrell.

Mr. MORRELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: If that is correct, this in effect means that the Minimum Wage or the wage that could be paid to such individuals would be going under this law from \$1.20 an hour to a \$1.35.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Donaghy.

Mr. DONAGHY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In reply to the gentleman from Brunswick, who has just spoken, this may be true as far as law and the statutes and this sort of thing is concerned, but as a practical matter once that Minimum Wage is up it would be very difficult to find someone that is willing to work for less than the Minimum Wage, even if it is a youngster coming along to rake leaves or mow lawns or what have you. We have to be practical about these things.

The real reason that I rose is because I have in my hand here a Manpower Resource Study for the area that I represent. I am not proud to present this, but I find here in a letter of transmittal from Mr. Schoenthaler of the Employment Service, that the rate of unemployment in this area is 21.8 per cent. There is in my opinion a very good reason for this, two good reasons actually.

I come from an area that depends primarily on fishing for a living, and the canning of sardines. The fish supply has been very short for two years now. But over this, this is an industry that has been going downhill for at least fifteen years and the prime reason for this is that the food packing industry, not only in this area but all over the United States, is one of the lowest paid industries in the world. And we have to compete with these other places.

It doesn't make any difference whether they are in Chicago or St. Louis, wherever it is, the meat packers, fish packers, that sort of thing, traditionally get the lowest wage. But even with this, this area is not able to compete and you are going to be forcing this entire area onto relief if we go through with this Minimum Wage deal. Because many of the packers are not able — it is piecework primarily and many of the people are not able to keep up because many of them are older people, and they will have to be let go in order for the businesses to survive in that area.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The question arises in my mind why we anticipate what the federal government is going to do in a year or two and sort of jump the gun on this. I am for raising the Minimum Wage, but it seems to me — I would like to have this question answered — why can't we do it up to \$1.80 now, and then in a special session or later when the federal government acts why can't we go to \$2.00? I don't know how many states in this nation now have a \$2.00 minimum limit. I am sort of sorry I am misinformed but these questions arise in my mind at this time.

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

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: To answer Mr. Cottrell's question, my purpose in asking for reconsideration was to offer an amendment, which is on your desks, that would hold this to \$1.80, and I failed to get the rules suspended so was unable to offer the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. McTeague.

Mr. McTEAGUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is difficult today, after the extended debate we had earlier regarding this bill, to think of anything novel or original to say on either side. I think though, as the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Haskell, has

pointed out, there may be a difference of philosophies involved here. One thing that strikes me is the philosophy of this House showed itself well when we approved this bill over three to one, if I recall correctly, some few days ago; and I doubt very much whether our philosophy has changed significantly since that time.

It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that if you took and recorded the arguments for and against that were made this morning, that if you changed the figures from \$1.80 to 25c or 40c, you could have played these same arguments in this same House and throughout the country twenty or thirty years ago. All the dire predictions were made. I ask you to use your common sense. Did they come true? Are we in fact a poorer country? Are people worse off today than they were awhile back?

We have tears cried, Mr. Speaker, out of concern or a stated concern for the very poor people. And yet I think it is a fact that whenever a few contacts that have been made with members of the Legislature by members of the public have not been these poor employees; they have been some employers.

Mr. Speaker, if it has not been asked already, I ask that when the vote is taken that it be by a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Bernier.

Mr. BERNIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It has been said here this morning that if we raised the Minimum Wage that we will have more people on relief, and somehow I just can't follow that reasoning. Because I know, I have been aware in my work, and my avocation you might say, as a landlord, that many people make out better on relief than they do working at a Minimum Wage. You have to pay them because they have to have a certain incentive to work. What is the sense of working if you are not getting a living wage? And these people, these occupations that we have here in this state — and heaven knows we

have too many of them, that cannot keep up with the economy, I do believe that we would be better off without them. These low paying industries, I mean they don't do us any good. Why not just let them die a peaceful death?

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

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I think first I would like to answer one of the suggestions of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Bernier. It isn't specifically the whole industries that need some low paid personnel. A good many industries do need here and there, they do have jobs that just simply cannot earn two dollars an hour.

I would like to mention something which has not been mentioned. We have mentioned the youths, the young people, the handicapped. We have another type of handicapped individual and that is the factory worker when he gets along near retirement age. Some of the Minimum Wage practices are driving them right away from jobs that they could do part of the year to spell off their Social Security. A good many elderly people would like to work at a slowed down pace. They cannot produce \$1.80 an hour or \$2.00 an hour.

I think that probably I got more reaction against our action last week in passing this bill than anything else that was done this year, and surprisingly so. I come from an area right now which is depressed. We have lost two industries in the last few months and one of the others is slowing down. And also, strange to say, out of about seven people that nailed me on this bill, five of them were factory workers. They said, "What in the world are you thinking of down there?"

Now another thing I would like to mention. It has been said here, usually by some of the younger people who perhaps have not been through what some of us have, that we should pay more money because it would help the economy, it would move along, they could afford to buy homes, and so on.

I wonder what the philosophy is. Can you get blood out of a turnip? Can we just say that industry will pay so much money and let it go at that?

It seems to me that the worker, as I said the other day, has got to produce, otherwise industry cannot afford to pay him. As to letting the industries go that pay a low pay, we have let a lot of them go. It has been mentioned that they thought the economy wasn't hurt any through the years. Maine has one of the highest figures on Minimum Wage; has been for years. One of the highest states in the Union; and still we are one of the lowest brackets in economy. Could possibly that high Minimum Wage have something to do with it?

Now I do know, and we all should realize as we stop to think, as Mr. Haskell said, there are going to be certain fringe employees that will certainly lose out. They will either go on welfare or else in the case of the elderly they will not be able to spell off their Social Security by getting work that they can do leisurely and get just the Minimum Wage, because they won't be able to afford to pay any \$2.00 an hour for their work. Because they only want of work to earn about a dollar or a dollar and a quarter an hour. I have heard that statement said a good many times by elderly people.

So for that reason I feel that if we go along at \$1.80, it seems to me that is a pretty good jump at this time. And if you were to vote this, reconsider and take on that amendment, to hold up for a couple of years on that additional 20 cents, I think it would be a very smart thing. We still would be raising the Minimum Wage, but we wouldn't be going at it half cocked.

Thereupon, Mr. Mills of Eastport moved the previous question.

THE SPEAKER: For the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question it must have the consent of one third of the members present and voting. All members requesting that the Chair entertain the motion for the pre-

vious question will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

The SPEAKER: A sufficient number having voted in the affirmative, the previous question is entertained. Now the question before the House is, shall the main question be put now? Which is debatable for five minutes by any member.

All in favor of the main question be put now say aye; those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is passage to be enacted of An Act Increasing Minimum Wages, Senate Paper 16, L. D. 44. The yeas and nays have been ordered. All in favor of the enactment of this bill will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Albert, Barnes, Bedard, Bernier, Berube, Binnette, Birt, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brawn Bunker, Bustin, Call, Carey, Carrier, Carter, Churchill, Clark, Clemente, Collins, Conley, Cooney, Cote, Cottrell, Curran, Curtis, T. S., Jr.; Cyr, Dow, Doyle, Drigotas, Dudley, Dyar, Emery, E. M.; Evans, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Finemore, Fraser, Gagnon, Gauthier, Genest, Gill, Good, Goodwin, Hall, Hancock, Herrick, Hewes, Hodgdon, Jutras, Kelleher; Kelley, K. F.; Kelley, P. S.; Kelley, R. P.; Kilroy, Lawry, Lebel, Lessard, Lizotte, Lucas, Lund, MacLeod, Mahany, Manchester, Marsh, Martin, McCormick, McKinnon, McTeague, Millett, Mills, Morrell, Murray, O'Brien, Parks, Ross, Santoro, Sheltra, Shute, Silverman, Simpson, T. R.; Slane, Smith, D. M.; Smith, E. H.; Starbird, Stillings, Susi, Tanguay, Theriault, Vincent, Webber, Wheeler, Wood, M. E.

NAY — Ault, Bailey, Baker, Bartlett, Berry, G. W.; Bither, Bragdon, Brown, Cummings, Curtis, A. P.; Donaghy, Emery, D. F.; Hardy, Haskell, Hawken, Hayes, Henley, Immonen, Lee, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lynch, Maddox, Marsteller, McNally, Mosher, Norris, Page, Payson, Porter, Pratt, Rand,

Rocheleau, Rollins, Scott, Shaw, Simpson, L. E.; Trask, Tyndale, White, Williams, Wood, M. W.

ABSENT — Berry, P. P.; Crosby, Dam, Hanson, Jalbert, Keyte, McCloskey, Orestis, Pontbriand, Whitson, Wight, Woodbury.

Yes, 94; No, 44; Absent, 12.

The SPEAKER: Ninety-four having voted in the affirmative and forty-four in the negative, with twelve absent, the Bill is passed to be enacted. It will be signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

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

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side I move for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey, now moves that the House reconsider its action whereby this Bill was passed to be enacted. The Chair will order a vote.

All in favor of reconsideration will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

58 having voted in the affirmative and 69 having voted in the negative, the motion to reconsider did not prevail.

Enactor Amended

An Act relating to Night Hunting for Wild Animals (S. P. 22) (L. D. 50)

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

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, under suspension of the rules, the House reconsidered its action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed on April 23.

The same gentleman then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" (H-189) was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

An Act relating to Schedule of Rates of Motor Vehicles for Hire by Holders of Certificates of Pub-

lic Convenience and Necessity from Public Utilities Commission (S. P. 254) (L. D. 761)

An Act relating to Installation of Sprinkler Systems in New Hotels (S. P. 329) (L. D. 977)

An Act relating to Compensation of Municipalities for the Loss of Services of Municipal Law Enforcement Officials (S. P. 384) (L. D. 1140)

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

Enactor Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Chiropractic Treatment under Workmen's Compensation Law (S. P. 538) (L. D. 1615)

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

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

Mr. KELLEHER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I received a call this morning from a very good friend of ours and a member of this body, who is not here, Representative Jalbert of Lewiston; and he respectfully asked me to ask this House if this item could be tabled until Friday. I wish some member would so move.

Whereupon, Mr. Collins of Caribou moved that the item be tabled for two legislative days.

Mrs. Doyle of Bangor requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Collins, moves that L. D. 1615 be tabled and specially assigned for Friday, April 30, pending passage to be enacted. A division has been requested. All in favor of tabling this matter will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

89 having voted in the affirmative and 27 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

An Act relating to the Wearing of Fluorescent Clothing When Hunting in the Southern Zone for Two Years (H. P. 64) (L. D. 105)