

# 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 Second  
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1965

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

Bill "An Act relating to Sunday Sale of Liquor," H. P. 1118, L. D. 1525.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Meisner.

Mr. MEISNER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move that this bill L. D. 1525 be indefinitely postponed with all its papers.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Meisner, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MEISNER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope you will not think I'm arrogant at this time by moving this motion because I can assure you that I've never felt any more in earnest than I am at this moment on speaking to this bill.

I definitely oppose this bill for several reasons and I will try to give you those reasons as briefly as I can because of the lateness of the hour.

As I have said on previous occasions, I am definitely opposed to the broadening of the sale of liquor. This bill is such a bill, sets out to broaden the liquor base, the sale of liquor. We have liquor enough now. I do not propose—I'm not a prohibitionist, neither do I expect to take away that social glass that you have now and again, but I think that we have plenty of problems now that are connected with the drinking of liquor. We not only have them in this state but we are told that forty states in the Union are confronted with alcoholic problems which they are trying to solve. Not only do we have this problem in this country, but practically all the civilized countries are trying to solve this problem of alcoholism in some way. We in this country seem to be trying to promote it.

We have here in the State of Maine, they tell us, thirty-five thousand alcoholics. Perhaps that is disputed, but anyway, whatever the problem may be we are having too many I can assure you. Now I'm opposing this bill in the first place because I think it's

making too much of a drain on our economy, it is costing us too much. I wonder if you know just how much we are spending for liquor. These are official figures that have been gathered by a research committee appointed by the Christian Science Monitor. It's costing us, we have spent in the year of 1964 13.6 billion dollars for legalized liquor. They tell us that there is 1.1 billion dollars spent for illegal liquor, that making a total of 14.7 billion dollars that we're spending for liquor.

There is only one item that's costing us more and that is our automobiles. Automobiles, used and new, are costing us 17.3 billion dollars. This is making a drain on the people of our communities. I'm sure that if you have been interested enough to check on the people who are going to the liquor store, the people who are carrying beer out of our grocery stores, you'll find that in all too many cases it is being done by people who are living below the level of real subsistence.

I see them going in as I pass by the liquor store in my town, and I wonder how they can afford, some of them, and I know some of them are complaining, and I do not know from experience of course how much a quart of liquor costs, but I imagine a quart of liquor could buy a good many quarts of milk for some of these families that I know about, some of the children that really need milk. It's costing too much. That's what other states are saying too. In California, they are having a real problem, they tell us from statistics from their own figures that eight hundred and eighty-five thousand people who have to have help are being depleted in their ability to earn because of alcoholism. They have the problem of seven hundred thousand minors who are subject to drinking alcohol. They seem to need it. And along with this they tell us that crime is increasing and that problems of the highway are increasing, and they have appealed to Washington to do something about it. They're asking that they return a percentage of the money that they turn in from liquor reve-

nue to the Federal Government in order that they may cope with this problem.

Not only California, but other states. Georgia just appointed a Senate Committee to look into the problem in their state. Massachusetts is a fourth problem state as far as alcohol is concerned. It received attention from the Governor last year in his address, inaugural address, he called upon the Health Department to do more about it and to raise more funds to cope with this problem of alcoholism in their midst.

Rhode Island too says that sixteen percent of their social problem is attributed directly to the cause of alcohol. So does Connecticut, say out of 8,100 cases come to them 3,300 are alcohol addictions in one way or another. I could go on here for all the time and more time than I should be taking to tell you that this is a national problem. It is a world-wide problem, and for us today it is a state problem because and this liquor business is being broadened. This is a real concern to me, not only because of that, but because they are overstepping the bounds and going into our Sabbath Day which is our Holy Day.

I am opposed to this bill too because of the broadening of the liquor base. It's not only a costly problem to our economy, but it is costly in human life. Sylvia Porter, the other day in her article said, that there were 47,800 deaths by highway accidents in 1964. Now I realize these were not all caused because of drinking, but I think that we can suppose that at least one third of them were. They tell us here in our own state that one third of our highway accidents, liquor is involved. Other states are much higher than we are, so I think it can be a fair supposition that between fifteen and sixteen thousand were killed on the highway during 1964. Now I submit to you ladies and gentlemen, that this is too many lives to lose in this way where liquor is involved. What is a life worth? I've heard it discussed here this morning and during this legislature that perhaps a human life is valued at

about \$30,000. Thirty thousand dollars for a father, thirty thousand dollars for a mother, how can you value a life like that? Thirty thousand dollars for a youth, for a boy or a girl. What value can you put on that youth? What do you know of the possibilities of that youth? A great statesman, a poet, historian, a great emancipator, somebody, we do not know what's tied up in the lives of these youths.

Every day we have young people coming here in our gallery. As we look on them we feel we get an inspiration and we wonder what they are going to do when they come to the time when they handle the affairs of our state. What is a life worth? I do not know what it is worth. I know that the Bible says about it, and I'm not ashamed to quote that. It says that though a man should gain a whole world and have it all in his hands, if he should lose his life or his soul it would be nothing to him. What is a life worth? Well you just think it over and see and if we continue to broaden our base in the sale of liquor, more and more youths drink it, more and more accidents happen upon our streets. Can we realize at all the great loss which is ours?

Now in this bill, I mustn't detain you too long on this side of it, there is a second reason why I am opposed to this bill, or the next reason is, major reason, is because it invades our sacred day, the Sabbath Day.

I know that the interests have been very generous with us and they tell us that we can have the Sunday afternoon for our family day, or our Sunday morning I mean, we can have Sunday morning for our day, for our worship, for the opportunity to visit with our family and go out on the streets without any thought of perhaps coming in contact with drunken drivers or alcoholism anywhere, where we can go to a place to eat with our family without being confronted with liquor. You know that they tell us that 75 million of our people drink in this country. Well that leaves a

large number of people who do not drink. Seventy-five million who do drink, they have six days of the week. Are we asking too much, who do not drink, to ask for one day out of seven whereby we can rest and we can worship without this liquor being put before us?

Now we know that this is one of the Commandments and I'm not going to apologize for calling your attention to its being one of the Commandments. The Commandment of God, back in the time of man's innocence, to direct him in the welfare of his life. The first part of it went when God asked us to give allegiance to Him, then He said, remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy. Now I believe in God. I believe He knew what was best for us in the beginning. He knew that we should have one day, one day to rest. Medical science agrees with that. And while we work all the week and perhaps tear around all the week, we use up too much oxygen that should be restored and we should rest one day in the week.

Then, too, it is natural for a man to worship. Man has not been found anywhere that does not have a religion. It's natural for us and as Saint Augustine said in his prayer, we are made for Thee and our souls are restless until they find their rest in Thee. A day of rest and worship is also a day for a family day, and this is one of the reasons why the people today are hoping that this bill is going to be defeated because they want this day for a family day.

Now according to a survey that was made by a man by the name of Ruber two years ago, he contacted thousands of people and he found that half of the people in this country attend church on Sunday, two-thirds of them attend once a month; half of the people said that they look forward to Sunday because it was the day that they could attend Church and the same number said that they looked forward to it because it was a family day when they could all get together. According to this survey, Sunday is a meaningful day

to the people of this nation and they would like to have it remain that way.

So this morning I call upon you to go along with me and to vote for the indefinite postponement of this bill. There are people in very many of our communities today who are thinking about us, in fact there are prayer groups, established, praying that this bill shall be defeated and that we shall have Sunday free from the fear, free from the fact that we shall have more liquor.

As I have said in the beginning, I am very humble on this, and I am very earnest on it, perhaps the reason that I am is because of my experience throughout the years.

Some people ask, why are you preachers so much opposed to drinking, the liquor business? I think it is because perhaps as one man in Florida said, he went out of the liquor business, he had a business that netted him two million dollars a year, making a profit of two hundred thousand and he gave it up. The Readers Digest had a report on that. The honorable Senator, who was Senator Augusta Christie, wrote to this man and he answered her and he said, I am not a rabid prohibitionist. He said, word kept coming to me as the results of the liquor I was selling. So he said, I followed the bottle and the more I followed it the less I slept. And when I found what my bottles of liquor were doing to families, to individuals, and to the young people, he said, I gave it up. The results have been good. He specialized on something else and his business in other ways grew. He said I am done with the liquor business now and for the future.

This bill here before us opens up on a Sunday 180 hotels, 110 clubs, 68 class A restaurants, 2,130 store take outs. Now I realize of course all these stores will not be open, but there will be plenty of them so that our young people will be able to get all the beer they want. There is always somebody, if they can't get it, they get

it from them. We all know that from our own experience. Because of these reasons and many others that you can think about I hope you will go along, ladies and gentlemen, with the indefinite postponement of this ball and all its papers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It seems that we will be going all out in further liberalization of our liquor laws when we consider that Sunday sales will breed in 180 hotels, 110 clubs, 68 class A restaurants, and 2,130 take out stores.

Attorney General Dubord says we already have a problem with out minors. Shall we increase the problem by opening 2,130 new beer outlets on Sunday?

Do you realize that the United States is the only country trying to further liberalize liquor? Poland, China, India, Sweden, Finland, Norway, and Russia have taken steps to sell less liquor to their people, recognizing that an economy based on the sale of liquor creates more problems than it solves.

As a result of new laws passed in the last three years, the youth of France are now drinking less liquor. Consumption of wine and beer has dropped ten per cent in France, while soft drinks have increased 140%. The total number of deaths in that country due to alcohol is down 25%.

Most everything has been said against this issue that I might have said at the committee hearing in this House a few weeks ago, so I'm not going to bore you with repetition of arguments against this measure. However, there are a couple of points that I would like to stress.

I think it would be senseless to put another law on the books with our liquor laws and the enforcement in the present state of confusion. In spite of the report of the Attorney General, we all know that something is definitely wrong. Where there's smoke there's bound to be fire. With this cloud hang-

ing over us we shouldn't consider for one moment the liberalization of our liquor laws. First let's police to the satisfaction of all our present liquor laws before adding to the obvious inability to enforce our current statutes.

In this House there are many religious denominations — Methodist, Catholic, Baptist, Congregational, Unitarian, and undoubtedly many more. The clergymen of these denominations, we'll call them the shepherds who tend their flocks, have been praying and will be praying today for the defeat of this issue, that if passed, will desecrate the Sabbath Day.

Let us remember that liquor, unless used in moderation, is the most colossal and ruinous social sin that afflicts mankind. We cannot reconcile Christ and liquor. This is the essence of the matter. This is the challenge which today should stir the conscience of every member of this House.

So I say to each one of you, let your conscience be your guide.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am definitely not a prohibitionist and I am not opposed to Sunday liquor on any moral or religious grounds. I am strictly opposed to it from a standpoint of traffic safety. Definitely there's going to be more liquor sold and consumed on Sunday or the proponents wouldn't want this bill. The more that's consumed, you all know how the traffic is on Sunday, and I claim that there are going to be more accidents. Now I can't prove that. Time alone will tell, but surely I believe in the old adage that alcohol and gasoline don't mix.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to call your attention first to these 180 hotels, 110 clubs, and the 68 class A restaurants which now sell liquor in the state. They only represent approximately nine per cent of the liquor being sold in the State of

Maine. The other ninety-one per cent is being sold in your state stores, which is not included in this bill, so you can see that as far as the State is concerned, as far as the revenue is concerned, the State is not going to get too much out of it. According to the figures of the State Liquor Commission the sale of hard liquor to clubs, hotels and class A restaurants last year amounted to just nine per cent as I have just said of the total sales in Maine. The other ninety-one per cent is the State liquor stores. They then conclude and I quote "As far as anticipated revenue from the Sunday sale of liquor is concerned they personally do not feel it would be too great... an increase of fifteen to twenty per cent on only nine per cent of sales would not be appreciable". You can see that this is not a revenue producing bill for the state. It benefits only these who sell.

This redraft is a combination of three bills, which would open up everything in the state for Sunday sales, except the one big revenue producing one, the state stores. Every grocery and variety store will be able to sell beer and ale and would only add to the already perilous situation on the highways. To me the argument of the proponents of this redraft in favor of it do not begin to measure up to the disadvantages of it, of this tremendously long step to liberalize the liquor laws. I surely believe that we are up to our ears in liquor right now, our enforcement officers are in trouble now, and this will only add fuel to the fire.

Let's leave the one day closed to the purchase of liquor and ale and maybe a lot of people will be able to get to work on Monday morning if they continue to have this day to taper off on. Maybe too, the fact that Maine was the only state in New England to show an increase in tourism last season was because of the fact that the people feel a little bit safer on our highways because we do not sell liquor on Sundays. I ask you all, are these disadvantages worth the few arguments that the pro-

ponents of this bill have been telling us? Thank you.

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

Mr. LENT: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: As the sponsor of this bill in its original form which is L. D. 690, I would like to speak briefly in support. As you know, this bill calls for the controlled sale of liquor on Sunday. This is something that is desperately needed by the tourist people and some of the owners in the State of Maine. The number plates on our cars proudly proclaim Maine as a Vacationland, yet we are the only vacation state that does not allow a guest to purchase a drink on Sunday.

Much of our business is from conventions, banquets, weddings and such. Many of these activities at times go to other states because of the fact that liquor cannot be served on Sunday.

Statistics show that when neighboring New England States have passed laws for the controlled sales of liquor, which they all have, on Sunday that they have enjoyed a twenty per cent increase in their liquor sales, a tremendous increase in their food sales and an increase of up to thirty-three per cent in the hotel and motel rentals.

The Department of Economic Development at the present time is increasing its budget for advertising Maine nation-wide as a Vacationland and it is in the process of taking a survey at the present time to determine when will conventions come here to Maine. Yet, when they come here, we tell them that we are sorry but in Maine they cannot drink on Sunday. Sunday is the poorest day of the week for this industry, when it should be second best as it is in other states.

The ski industry, which is now in its infancy in Maine, which we so definitely need, could grow much faster and better if we passed this bill. Fishermen and hunters, which are usually only weekend guests, would also come to our State in larger numbers if they could get a drink on Sun-

day. This additional business would be a big factor in the expansion of our present hotel and motel facilities and in building new facilities, which in turn, would create more business and add many tax dollars to our economy.

I urge you to vote for this bill and put us in a position to compete with the other New England states as a true vacationland state. Now just briefly in closing I would like to read from an editorial in the Bangor Daily News one month ago. Its heading, Let's catch up with the times. "If there ever was a state where the Sunday sale of liquor should be permitted that state is Vacationland Maine. It caters to hundreds of thousands of out-of-staters, most of whom are accustomed to being able to buy a drink on Sunday. If this is their way of life who are we to impose our ways on their brief two weeks vacation in the State of Maine?" So I urge you to support this bill so that we can really help our second largest industry.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Thomaston, Mr. Kittredge:

Mr. KITTREDGE: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I request that it be by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The Gentleman from South Thomaston requests that when the vote be taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. KNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I agree with many of the things that have been stated here today by the fine gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Meisner, as far as alcoholism being a problem in this state and in this country. It is one of the most serious problems that face the American people today. This I am in wholehearted agreement with.

But I must make this statement that you most certainly cannot legislate alcoholism. I have had the privilege of attending the Yale School of Alcoholic Studies in 1958 and at this school I met

with the foremost authorities on the problem of alcoholism from all over the world. And this problem was discussed from every area. The problem of alcoholism is this. One person out of fifteen who takes a drink of alcohol will become an alcoholic. Who this person is there is no possible way to distinguish when these fifteen people take their first drink of alcohol, which one is going to become an alcoholic. Until the alcoholic becomes an alcoholic there is no way the medical profession or any other profession has of recognizing this problem.

I am certain that as far as the sale of liquor in the State of Maine or any other state whether it be one day a week or seven days a week, it is going to have absolutely no effect upon the problem of alcoholism, because I can assure you that the person who has a problem with alcohol and the person who is a problem drinker, certainly is going to be in a position where on a Saturday he is going to have his alcohol or his liquor for Sunday and if he doesn't have it for Sunday I can assure you that he knows where to get it.

Now shall we penalize the fourteen people who can handle alcohol and to whom it is no problem whatsoever? Shall these people be penalized for the one person to whom this problem—alcohol is a problem to? Certainly we should not penalize these people. I like sugar. I like it in my coffee. I certainly don't want sugar taken and legislated as to the sale of sugar because there are some people who become diabetic from the use of sugar. I look at alcohol the same way that I look at sugar. There are many people who can drink alcohol, drink it and it is no problem whatsoever, but the one person out of the fifteen to whom this is a problem is the whole concern.

Now we here in the State of Maine vote the wets and the dries. I have no quarrel with either one of them, but if we as a combined effort between the wets and the dries were to take the efforts we are putting into being a wet or a dry and divert this effort to the



area of helping the Division of Alcoholic Rehabilitation that we have in this state to do something about the poor person who is suffering, who is afflicted with this illness of alcoholism, we would be getting somewhere.

We cannot legislate alcoholism. It isn't a question of how much a person drinks, how often they drink or how long they drink that determines whether they become an alcoholic. If alcohol caused alcoholism every person who took a drink of alcohol would be an alcoholic. There is something about the chemical makeup of each and every one of us as individuals, some people can tolerate alcohol and others cannot. I'll agree alcoholism is the most serious problem facing this nation. There are perhaps seventy million people in the United States who drink and perhaps there are between five and six million of these people who have become alcoholics. But to legislate alcoholism, this is an impossibility, it just can't be done.

And as I say again, if we would divert our efforts into doing something for the person who is a victim of this vicious illness. The medical profession describes alcoholism as a disease. It is a sickness. I have no quarrel with whether it is or whether it isn't. The medical profession, this is their statement not mine. It is a sickness and it is one of the most vicious sicknesses known to mankind. The cause of this has not been found and until the cause is found there can be no cure. And I can't emphasize enough and would only relay to you people that if we would divert our efforts and try to do something about this problem rather than to try to say that we shall not have liquor or that we will have liquor. This is the only way that this problem is ever going to be solved.

We can go back to the time when I as a youngster can remember a member of my family had consumption. It was a disgrace at this particular time for a person to have consumption. There was a stigma attached to this disease. The stigma was taken away

from this disease because the medical profession then instead of calling it consumption they called it tuberculosis and each and every one of us here know what has been done for the sickness of tuberculosis in this country. It is almost now completely under control. Why? Because the stigma was taken from the word, the sickness, and the people accepted it exactly at face value for what it was. It was a sickness.

It was a disease and the people accepted this and they did something about it and this is the same thing that can be done about alcoholism, until the stigma is taken away from the word alcoholism and we as individuals try to do something to help these poor unfortunate people. I'll agree that there are people who are afflicted with this sickness to whom it is a problem and they deprive their family of the worldly goods that are needed. But I can assure you, that not every person who is on relief or in these situations are there because of alcoholism. I happened to have the privilege and opportunity to serve on the City Council of my home town of Westbrook and I had access to the records of who was on the relief payrolls there. And, I can assure you that the amount of people who were on relief rolls in my home town were at a great minimum as to those that were on relief for many other reasons.

We cannot legislate alcoholism and I must state this once more emphatically. Regardless of how much you drink, how often you drink, or how long you drink, this does not cause alcoholism. The person that becomes afflicted with this is a person who is unknown to each and every one of us in this room. I have had the opportunity to work with alcoholics throughout the State of Maine. For many, many years I have been closely associated with this problem. I have children and I have grandchildren and I certainly don't want these people to go through the throes of alcoholism. I wouldn't stand up here today and say that I am for the Sunday sales of liquor if I thought this was going to have any effect whatso-

ever upon my children or my grandchildren. It is going to have no effect whatsoever upon them or anyone else's children or grandchildren. There are many, many people who became alcoholics during Prohibition. Statistics will bear this out.

And as I say I am not an authority on alcoholism, but I have been closely associated with it and I have attended many seminars and many conferences throughout the United States as far as the problem of alcoholism is concerned. And I would be the first one in this House to vote against liberalizing our liquor laws if I thought it was going to have any effect whatsoever in furthering the problem of alcoholism. We cannot legislate alcoholism.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freedom, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: We have been told that we have lost conventions and skiers to Maine by not having Sunday sale of liquor. How many conventions have refused to come to Maine because of lack of Sunday liquor? No one has ever reported any by name to me. They say we have lost them and that's all you get out of them. And surely skiing would not be the business it is today, as fast as it is growing, if people wanted Sunday liquor so bad that they wouldn't come here. They also say that they are going to drink anyway, why not sell it on Sunday? It seems quite ridiculous to argue this way, because especially for liquor. People will break a speed law. Does that mean that we should rescind the law?

Now, as far as the moral part of liquor, I have no objections if anybody wants to drink all the liquor they want, but I think in deference to the different divisions, we're about fifty percent divided, half dry, half wet. The dries are entitled to one day that it isn't sold and I say that we shouldn't sell liquor on Sunday. If you can't buy enough in six days, I say go dry.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to rise in support of the motion to indefinitely postpone. Some weeks ago you will recall that we were circulated with a letter which outlined to us how our various communities had voted with regard to the sale of beer and liquor in our local communities. After receiving that letter, I went down to the largest store in beer sales in the Town of Stonington and asked the owner what his opinion was of the Sunday sale of beer. He informed me that if I voted for Sunday sale of beer that he would kick me where it hurt the most. I would submit that perhaps there are many other stores throughout the State of Maine as well as hotels who do not wish to see this in effect.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Waltz.

Mr. WALTZ: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: Six years I was sheriff of my County of Lincoln and at grass roots level had an opportunity to observe the misery caused by the misuse of alcohol. I am confident that if you ask any law enforcement officer today, that he will tell you that at least seventy-five percent of his problems are caused one way or another by the use of alcoholic beverages.

I read, as probably many of you did a few days ago in the local paper, about the coming big sports event in Lewiston. Apparently some gentleman was very much concerned as to whether or not there would be an adequate supply of beverage to go around. He contacted Mr. Ellis, Chairman of the Liquor Commission, and was assured that with the two stores in Lewiston, one of which was operating until eight-thirty on Saturday night, and with his trucks available, he would see that no one who attended this event became thirsty. In the same article it was pointed out that the Chief

of Police of the City of Lewiston was asking for assistance from his brother officers in policing this party. Here is a loyal, efficient officer who is bound to maintain law, order and public safety asking for assistance and yet he has to combat an unlimited supply of alcohol dumped into his area for this particular occasion.

Recently I had a letter from one of the large hotels in the state in which they were extremely enthused about the amount of money that would come into Maine through the sale of Sunday liquor. This man was a wizard at mathematics. He really painted a very rosy picture and he almost had me sold. And then I thought of the liabilities connected with this and, by gosh, I tipped the letter right into the wastebasket quick.

It seems to me, ladies and gentleman, that we are definitely at the crossroads. Action that we may take here today either pro or con. I think is going to affect the social aspects of our state for many, many years to come. I feel that this loss of revenue because we don't have Sunday liquor is somewhat of a myth. I am firmly convinced that many, many of our vacationers, resorters, whatever you wish to call them, come here to Maine because of its quiet atmosphere. If they wish they may have a bottle in their own homes, but they don't wish to go out on the roads, highways, byways, and observe evidence of excessive drinking. I, myself, feel that this bill is not for the best good of our state. I shall vote against it.

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

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am going to vote against the motion for indefinite postponement and I would like to tell you my reasons why.

When I came here as a Legislator, I set up a personal code as a basic rule for lawmaking in my own mind, and I said that anything that interferes with the basic rights of the individual should not be passed as a law; anything that benefits or deals with the welfare, health and safe-

ty of the public should be dealt with as a law. I submit to you today that the restriction of Sunday sale prohibits the individual's right to make a decision for himself. We have adequate laws covering excessive drinking. We have adequate laws which cover the age at which one shall drink, the age of responsibility. Therefore, I question if we have the right to prohibit the people from drinking at any time if they wish to do this.

Next, I question the source of objection to this bill. I have two telegrams before me, one from a minister, representing his church group, and another from a president of a church association. People of the churches are guaranteed under our Constitution, our National Constitution, and I quote: "The Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This sets these people apart. It sets us all apart, in that we know that we can practice our religions with complete freedom from interference by the Federal Government or any other government, but it also lays on us a heavy responsibility, because it says the government—we cannot ask the government to make laws that favor us or maintain these laws. I submit to you that if we go ahead and vote for the motion to indefinitely postpone, that we are maintaining a law in violation of this Constitutional Amendment, and there is nothing to prevent this Legislature or another Legislature from coming back and making a law that will prohibit the free exercise of religion. It must be a two-way street ladies and gentlemen. If we are going to make laws which enhance any particular sect or any particular religion, then they must be prepared to have laws that will prohibit certain religions. As I said before, it is on this basis that I will vote against the motion for indefinite postponement, for the Legislature has no right to interfere with the private personal decisions of the individual.

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

Mr. MILLAY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am sure most of you have already made up your minds on this question, and I respect your rights to your own opinion, but there is a fact on this subject that I would like you to consider before you cast any vote in favor of liberalizing our liquor laws.

What type of tourists come to Maine? Now last year some 910,830 made use of our state parks, many more went to Baxter State Park and many more went to Acadia State Park, the Federal park, and a great many more went to our 180 private camp grounds. Now a visit to any one of these camp grounds will give you the idea of the type of tourist that Maine is drawing. We are drawing the family-type group, the people that believe in bringing their children with them, and I believe that this matter of environment for those children is a very important thing. I have six of them myself and how I bring them up and the environment I put them in is important to me. Now to make Sunday liquor available to the small minority would be doing this great majority an injustice. The minority at the present time can for six days a week purchase all the alcohol that is good for them, and with a little Saturday planning why you can have a cocktail at home on Sunday. Now I say let Maine build a Sunday environment that is favorable to this type of tourist trade that brings in the children, because I think they are important.

I think there are a great many of us that like to go to the beach on Sunday, people that live in this state, and we wouldn't like the roads cluttered up with drivers that have had even one or two drinks perhaps. For many, it is the only day they have to take pleasure of. There is no question but what liquor does affect the reflexes, and makes every driver who imbibes, even on a small amount, less safe on our highways. Even the behavior of the drinking person does not lend itself to what most of us would

consider a good environment for our young people. I think all of us know that as absorption increases, nerves, muscles, tongue and morals tend to loosen in direct proportion.

Now Sunday is a big day for the tourist business, the number of cars on the highways indicates that, but let us in our responsible position continue to keep it safe and sane for our young people.

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

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am pretty hungry right now, and I suspect that most of you are, and just for the moment I am dry, but the hot and the hasty will do well to reflect that the fundamentals of the problems presented by the use and abuse of alcoholic liquors have persisted for the 5,000 years of recorded human history, and that they may be expected to persist as long as the immutable law of nature sanctions the chemical process of fermentation. That mouthful, ladies and gentlemen, came out of the Democratic National Convention in 1924 and was in answer to a question put to the then dark horse candidate for President of the United States on the Democratic ticket by the Women's Christian Union, I believe they were called the Women's Christian Women then, and at that time we were enjoying, if you will, the noble experiment of the Eighteenth Amendment of the Volstead Act. About every Monday morning you would pick up the newspaper and you would find that a hundred or more had become blind and another fifty or more died of drinking some kind of poison alcohol, and then we created the Al Capone gangs, and the Dutch Schultz gangs and we had the Valentine's Day Massacre where they stood up the beer runners in a garage in Chicago and gunned them to death. Those were the good old days, the roaring twenties.

Now ladies and gentlemen, somebody has said here on the Floor today, you can't legislate the use of alcohol. You can't. People are

going to have alcohol. I have gone through prohibition in the State of Maine before Volstead was ever heard of. We had it up here, but there was always alcohol around; there was always plenty of it, even on Sundays.

The gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, for whom I have the highest regard, quoted a figure here that in this country there are some 11.6 billions of legal traffic in alcohol, and 1.6 billion illegal traffic in alcohol. I submit to you ladies and gentlemen that the illegal traffic in alcohol is our bootlegging business on Sunday. It's got so that you can't get a taxicab to go to church any more on Sunday because of the bootleggers being busy selling their alcohol — the taxi drivers being busy selling their alcohol.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a matter of very serious business. We need the traffic in alcohol legally on Sunday, and I would hope that we would go along with this measure. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winthrop, Mrs. Baker.

Mrs. BAKER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have made a point of taking the time to talk with a great many folks in my town and in fact in this whole central Maine area wherever I could get one or more engaged in conversation on this very issue.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, the rank and file of our citizens do not want the Sunday sale of liquor, any kind, anywhere.

I wish to direct your attention to an article that appeared in one of yesterday's newspapers. On Monday, the Massachusetts Senate killed a bill to allow bars to remain open until 2:00 a.m. Among remarks made during the debate was this, which is pertinent to the issue we are considering today. Quote: "The issue is not sin and corruption and no one has made such an issue. The issue is simply public safety." This would be my feeling exactly, and it is the concern of the many ordinary citizens throughout the state. Thank you.

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

Mr. STORM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: During the past few weeks I have received and I suspect everyone else in the House has received a flock of letters from various restaurants and hotel organizations claiming that they needed the Sunday sale of liquor to attract the tourist business. I submit that this is a myth. Maine, as we have been told on several occasions and we have been told on the Floor here today, is the only state which does not allow Sunday sales. The State of Connecticut, which certainly allows it, last year lost an estimated seventeen per cent of their tourist trade; Rhode Island lost fifteen per cent of their tourist trade; Massachusetts showed an increase only in the Berkshire and Cape Cod areas; New Hampshire and Vermont apparently held their own; Maine increased its tourist trade by nine per cent. I think we are in a competitive position right now, and I hope that we will go along with the indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I hope I am never afraid to stand on my two feet and be counted for unpopular measures or popular measures. I am not going to vote for indefinite postponement of this bill. For many years I have been fighting to see that hotels and restaurants, class A restaurants can serve alcoholic beverages, cocktails or what not for a limited time on Sunday. I do not like features of this bill that is presented before us. I do not like particularly the pattern of referendum which is set up in this bill. I would call the attention of lawyers to that pattern. I am an old football player and football coach and I expect to be mousetrapped in a football game. I hope you all know what that means, but I don't want to mousetrap the people of this state and I don't want to mousetrap the Legislature

of this state by any devious language or unclear pattern. I am going to vote against indefinite postponement. I am for the Sunday sale of liquor in a limited way, and I hope that before this bill gets through finally, and I hope it gets through, that it will be squared up so that it will be understood by all.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Burwell.

Mr. BURWELL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have consistently voted against Sunday sales in the past, and I have felt that the rights of those who object should be respected, and I respect them now.

However, this bill does not compel any one to take a drink on Sunday. It does not compel teenagers to drink, they cannot legally drink anyhow. Now I have changed my mind and I will vote against indefinite postponement and I urge you to do the same. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of able debate here in the last few minutes, and I think it is probably time I put in my two cents worth for what it is worth.

I am going to vote for indefinite postponement and I think for a very good reason. I am not going to make any definite statements on statistics. I think that has been done already and covered pretty thoroughly pro and con.

I think if you will remember here a few days ago we had a statement from our Attorney General, Mr. Dubord, on our desks. In this statement he thought that the State of Maine should have a complete overhaul of all its liquor laws, and I think most of us will agree that this is certainly true. We may become more conservative in some ways if these are overhauled, or we may become more liberal in some ways if these are overhauled, but I think that before, and I want to make it definitely certain that I mean before, we sell liquor on Sunday in any way, shape or manner, or lib-

eralize our laws in any way, shape or manner, we should have this overhaul, and it should be done by people that have no interest in the liquor business, no interest in the drys, completely objective review of the whole matter, and I would like to keep the status quo until that is done. I would hope that that would be done as soon as possible because we have got an awful lot of archaic, obsolete and useless laws in that book and for thirty years or so we have been banging back and forth here and sometimes one group has had the advantage and sometimes the other and the whole code of liquor laws including the enforcement, and I often wonder how the twenty-three men in the Enforcement Division can do as well as they do.

I think personally that the common courts should handle the whole matter. I think the State Police should handle the whole matter or our local law enforcement agency should handle the whole matter. I agree with Lane on that, but I think the whole code should be gone completely over and before that is done, I don't favor touching it in any way, shape or manner.

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

Mr. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman; I believe I would be derelict in my duty if I did not stand up and tell you my position in this matter. I come from a region in which there are quite a number of summer hotels and various individuals who own the hotels have come to me and asked that I support Sunday liquor. I told them at the time that I would support Sunday liquor, but this bill presently before us, I do not support, and if it comes to a final vote I shall vote for indefinite postponement. I would be very happy to vote for Sunday liquor for hotels and restaurants, but other than that, the opening of retail stores, the opening of the liquor store, I would be opposed to and would vote against it. I do hope that someone will table this bill in order that amendments may be made to it.

The SPEAKER: The Chief recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Lund.

Mr. LUND: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have been asked by proponents to speak on behalf of this bill and I declined to do so. However, in view of some of the comments which have been made here in the House and in the Press, questions arise in my mind; perhaps I can clarify them or perhaps it will only result in more confusion. I don't know.

The question has been asked here about a referendum provision on the bill and remarks have been quoted in the papers concerning a referendum provision of the bill. Perhaps I didn't study the bill as carefully as I ought to, but I don't see any referendum provision in the bill and if somebody has something to call to our attention concerning a referendum provision I would be very interested to see it. In view of the questions raised by the last speaker, it would appear that some people in the House, at least are under the impression that this bill would authorize the sale or the opening of our state liquor stores on Sunday. That is not my understanding of the meaning of the language in this bill. Retail stores where it occurs in this bill I believe refers to our grocery stores which are allowed to sell malt beverages.

One of the ladies of the House, some days ago, spoke to me when she had learned that there was a minority of two voted "ought not to pass" on this bill and she asked if I was one of them and I said I was not. In view of her question I think I might explain if I may the reason why I voted with the majority on this bill.

Despite what has been said here today, I think a substantial case has been made by the operators of hotels in this state and by the operators of Class A restaurants, that their business would substantially benefit by allowing sales from noon until nine in the evening which this bill would allow. There is, however, a substantial portion of the population of our state which because of their financial circumstances or for some

other reason do not often frequent Class A restaurants or hotels. For these people the clubs we have in the state which are properly licensed and the retail stores which sell malt beverages are an opportunity for them to purchase intoxicating liquor if they so wish.

I am somewhat disturbed by some of the arguments made by the opponents of this bill. I don't expect to change any votes here today, but I only wish that we had some of the enthusiasm for law enforcement concerning our drunk drivers when bills such as the implied consent law come along and I feel very strongly that if the dries and those others who spoke in opposition to this bill showed the same enthusiasm for curbing drunk drivers when the opportunity came along to present vigorous enforcement measures to carry out the laws that we have, we would have less of a drunk driving problem than we now have. I think that if some of the people who opposed the bill today had stood up and spoken out in defense of our liquor enforcement division when it was under attack in this House, that we might have somewhat of a different problem than we have here today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Phillips, Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I think the question here is shall we allow the bootleggers to sell liquor on Sunday or shall we have it come under state control. I now move for the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Phillips, Mr. Palmer, now moves for the previous question. For the Chair to entertain the previous question, it must have the consent of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of entertaining the previous question will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, more than one-third having arisen the previous question is in order. The question before the House now is shall the main question be put now, which is a debatable matter

for no more than five minutes by any one member and the merits of the bill may not be debated.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am a little confused as to local option on this particular matter and I would pose a question through the Chair to anyone who might answer.

The SPEAKER: The question is not in order. The question before the House is, shall the main question be put now?

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The reason why I feel that we should not ask for the question now under debate is because I feel that certain members of this House have still got many questions to ask relative to this document and some of you have got prepared statements which you wish to make in regards to this bill whether it be for or against. And I don't feel that this House at this time should allow limited debate, that these people—to make sure that these people who have got something to say whether they be for or against this document, I don't feel that this limited debate or abolishing the debate of this particular document because of its importance that the question should be taken at this time. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question is, shall the main question be put now? All those in favor of the main question being put now will say aye; all those opposed will say no.

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

Sixty-four having voted in the affirmative and sixty-five having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

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

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: I agree with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Healy. I am also getting hungry. I move that we adjourn until 2:00 p.m. this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is that we adjourn until 2:00 p.m. this afternoon. All those in favor of adjourning until 2:00 p.m. will say aye; all those opposed will say no.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I will pose a question again through the Chair, regarding local option. As I understand it, each municipality now has the privilege of voting whether they shall have any one of these liquor matters in effect in their municipality. Does this matter, is this matter also included as a matter of whether or not liquor shall be sold by package stores or by state stores and otherwise? My question is, do not the people of the State of Maine in their respective municipalities have the opportunity to vote these matters in or not?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington, poses a question to any member of the House and any member of the House may answer if he so desires.

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

Mr. BERNARD: Mr. Speaker, Members of the House: This bill we are talking about this morning has nothing at all to do with local option.

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

Mr. COTTRELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think all these bills every year, I think we have to vote on local option—I can be corrected, every two years. And it is my understanding and I hope I can be corrected and informed, but it is my



understanding at this point, that when you do vote again for local option in your particular area you have two choices. No selling of alcoholic beverages or selling them for seven days a week. If you don't like to vote for seven days a week, you don't have liquor in your community. It is a choice of having none or having it seven days. I think that is it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Meisner, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from South Thomaston, Mr. Kittredge, has requested that when the vote be taken that it be taken by the yeas and nays. For the Chair to order the yeas and nays, it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present. All those in favor of the vote being taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-fifth having arisen the yeas and nays are in order.

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

Mr. GILBERT: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief. We had a bill here in the Legislature to lower the voting age. I have asked all the teenage kids that I contacted in my town how they wanted me to vote and they have told me to vote no and I shall do it and that is the reason why.

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

Mr. BUSSIÈRE: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, I would like to speak briefly before the vote is taken. Members of the House: I am to vote for this Sunday sale. I would like to mention that about three weeks ago walking down the street, I met the pastor of my church who is a Catholic the same as I am. A gentleman too, he is no hypocrite and I asked him a few things and we get on the sub-

ject of the Sunday sales. I said what do you think of Sunday sales Father? Well, he says, "Frank, they have it in New Hampshire, they have it in Vermont, they have it in Massachusetts." He says "I have a personal friend of mine in Vermont, they have it," he says "and it almost goes unnoticed." He says "for the people to want something is to be deprived of it," and those who want liquor on Sunday have to go to bootleggers. I don't think it is the proper way to do business.

I am for this Sunday sale and I am glad that the vote is taken by a roll call, I witnessed something not too long ago right across the street. I am going to watch the vote today. If there are any Republicans over there, you didn't have to pull the glass to them, they could handle it very good. I was there. I like my liquor myself, but I didn't have a drink that day. I was over there to observe. And I want to mention in reference to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Healy, he mentioned the fact that he was dry. I am dry too. I don't know if you drink yours with water; I drink mine straight. I hope that you vote against the motion for indefinite postponement, but if you do vote in favor of that motion, you are losing a lot of business. It is immaterial to me. If you want liquor, you can always find it. Let's make it legal, and this way it would be much better than it is today.

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

Mr. LENT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify one point here today. There may be a misunderstanding amongst some you. I am not in the liquor business or the restaurant business, but I am in the motel business.

My interest in this thing is the same interest that has motivated me to support legislation that can benefit people in education, farming, fishing, truckers, gas stations, chiropractors and all the activities that go to make this state what it might be. Progress comes

from everybody participating, not a few. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Meisner.

Mr. MEISNER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Just one word. I have had a great many letters from different parts of this state urging me to do just what I have done today. I have canvassed a great many people whom I know drink, especially in my own constituency. I have yet to find one who has been in favor of this Sunday bill. They have told me plainly, you know that we do drink, but we say we don't want an open Sunday, and a great many letters and a great many petitions from communities I have here urging that we vote against this bill.

Now it seemed to me that there was projected in here a little bit of religion here that should not have been. I am sure that none of us have spoken from a denominational standpoint. You know that I am not that kind. We have a great many denominations represented here. Perhaps we have spoken of it from a religious point of view because it is a Sunday bill, and those of us who attend church, no matter what our denomination may be, we would like to have the privilege of riding on the road and not being confronted with liquor.

Now the fact that New Hampshire and some other states have had it and made a lot of money out of it, statistics show that we are the only New England state that has gone ahead in the year 1964 in our tourist business. I do not know why we have to go along with everybody else. We sometimes read and hear the word that Maine leads. Let us lead in this and tell the world and advertise it, that people can come here and spend a quiet weekend in safety and advertise our attractions.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is not my intention now or has it been at any time to stymie debate on anything that is very, very important, but when it comes to

going on the second go-around on all the things that have been spoken, I think time is of an essence. I now move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, now moves the previous question. For the Chair to entertain the previous question it must have the consent of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of entertaining the previous question will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, more than one-third having arisen, the previous question is in order. The question before the House is, shall the main question be put now? This is debatable for no more than five minutes except on the merits of the bill.

Mr. Levesque of Madawaska requested a division.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the main question being put now will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred having voted in the affirmative and twenty-four having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Mr. Hunter of Durham, who would have voted "yes" had he voted, was excused from voting as he paired his vote with Mrs. Carswell of Portland, who was absent, but would have voted "no" were she present.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Meisner, that this bill and its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been ordered. If you are in favor of this Bill "An Act relating to Sunday Sale of Liquor," H. P. 1118, L. D. 1525 being indefinitely postponed when your name is called you will answer yea or yes; if you are opposed to the indefinite postponement of this bill you will answer no or

may when your name is called. The Clerk will call the roll.

**ROLL CALL**

**Y E A :** Anderson, Ellsworth; Baker, Orrington; Baker, Winthrop; Berman, Birt, Bishop, Bragdon, Brewer, Buck, Carter, Cookson, Crommett, Crosby, Davis, Dickinson, Dudley, Dunn, Eustis, Evans, Gifford, Gilbert, Graham, Hammond, Hanson, Gardiner; Hanson, Lebanon; Haugen, Hawkes, Haynes, Huber, Hunter, Clinton; Jewell, Kennedy, Kittredge, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lycette, Meisner, Millay, Mitchell, Mosher, Norton, Pendergast, Pike, Prince, Rackliff, Richardson, Stonington; Ross, Brownville; Sawyer, Scott, Starbird, Storm, Waltz, Ward, Watts, White, Guilford; Whittier, Wight, Presque Isle; Wood, Young.

**NAY:** Anderson, Orono; Avery, Baldic, Beane, Bedard, Benson, Mechanic Falls; Benson, Southwest Harbor; Bernard, Berry, Binnette, Blouin, Boissonneau, Bourgoin, Bradstreet, Brennan, Burwell, Bussiere, Carroll, Champagne, Conley, Cote, Cottrell, Cressey, Curran, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Dostie, Drigotas, Drouin, Dumont, Edwards, Farrington, Faucher, Fecteau, Fortier, Fraser, Mexico; Fraser, Rumford; Gaudreau, Gauvin, Gillan, Glazier, Harvey, Bangor; Healy, Jalbert, Jordan, Katz, Keyte, Kilroy, Knight, Laberge, Lang, Lebel, Lent, Levesque, Libhart, Lowery, Lund, Martin, McKinnon, Mills, Nadeau, Palmer, Payson, Peaslee, Pitts, Poulin, Richardson, Cumber-

land; Ross, Bath; Roy, Ruby, Searles, Stoutamyer, Sullivan, Truman, Wheeler, Wuori.

**ABSENT:** Doyle, Erwin, Harri-man, Harvey, Windham; Harvey, Woolwich; Hawes, Hoy, Lane, Roberts, Sahagian, Susi.

Yes, 60; No, 77; Absent, 11; Paired, 2.

The **SPEAKER:** The Chair will announce the vote. Sixty having voted in the affirmative, seventy-seven having voted in the negative, with eleven absent and two votes paired, the motion to indefinitely postpone fails.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

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

Mr. **JALBERT:** Mr. Speaker, I move we reconsider our action whereby we passed this bill to be engrossed and when you vote, vote against my motion.

The **SPEAKER:** The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, now moves we reconsider our action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed. All those in favor of reconsideration will say aye; those opposed, no.

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

Thereupon, the Bill was sent to the Senate.

---

On motion of Mr. Jalbert of Lewiston,

Adjourned until nine - thirty o'clock tomorrow morning.