Severance Pay by Employer" (H. P. 108) (L. D. 1363) reporting same.

Mr. Snow from the Committee on Labor on Bill "The Administration of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act to Inmates of Correctional Institutions" (H. P. 106) (L. D. 1292) reporting same.

Mr. Snow from the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Defining Applicability of Fair Labor Standards Act to Inmates of Correctional Institutions" (H. P. 106) (L. D. 1292) reporting same.

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill "An Act Referring to the Valuation of Farmland" (H. P. 550) (L. D. 678). Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. JACKSON of Cumberland
Mr. WYMAN of Washington
Mr. MERRILL of Cumberland
Mr. DRIGOTAS of Auburn
Mr. W. COX of Brewer.

Minority Report of the same Bill reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H. 223) on same Bill. Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. IMMEN of West Paris
MORTON of Farmington
FINEMORE of Bridgewater
SULLIVAN of Maine
TITCHELL of Norway
DAM of Skowhegan
MAXWELL of Jay

Reports were read.

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

Mr. DRIGOTAS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move that the Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation, reporting "Ought not to pass" be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. COX.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to oppose the motion that the report be accepted. I move the majority "ought not to pass" report.

The purpose of this bill, as it is in the statement of fact, is to expand the definition of farmland, which must be assessed at just value, rather than its highest and best use and the statement of fact goes on to say, this will protect a person who would be forced to sell land on which they could not afford to pay taxes if assessed at highest and best use.

Now, we have one situation in our state which disturbs me, and it is the pressure upon landowners to either sell to developers or to affluent persons, who can afford to pay property taxes on the high valuations which result from the pressure upon both the landowner and the open land. Too often the result is the building up of open land where it might be better if the land were left open, or the land comes into the hands of non-residents, especially along the coast, and the open land effect, squeezed off his land. Now, to me, land is farmland, whether the produce is sold or consumed by the owner, and that is the major change in this bill that I would take into consideration in the classifying of this land as farmland, the produce that was consumed by the owner.

The Maine resident who wants to live on his land and keep it open should have this means of making it possible for him to do so.

I hope the House will reject the majority "ought not to pass" report and I move that the House pass the majority "ought to pass" report as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am in complete sympathy with the motives and the interest of the gentleman from Brewer. I would like to fill in a little more information on the bill. We do now have in the books, the Farm and Open Space Land law, it is known as, and it provides that if there is more than 10 acres involved and if there is $10,000 or more in agricultural products produced from this 10 acres or more, then the owner of this property can petition the assessor to assess it, as it would be as farmland under the existing law.

I think this is an extremely liberal provision in our law now inasmuch as only $1,000 worth of produce has to be taken from 10 acres or more in order for it to qualify as farmland under the existing law.

The bill as it is presented to us provides for a change from 2 acres to 2 acres and staying at a $1,000, and that is not an issue here this morning. There were no members of the committee who supported the bill in its original form.

The majority report was "ought not to pass" and I believe that the principal consideration with the "ought not to pass" signers was this, what to make the limiting fact, that where the improved form of the bill would provide for assessors taking into consideration food that was consumed by the residents of this property and presumably produce, I would think, in my opinion, practically an impossible thing to ask our assessors across the state to ascertain how much food has been consumed from what has been produced on a piece of property. We are involved already with the questions about assessment and we are going to become more involved later, I am sure, because I believe the figure is roughly 10,000 parcels that he can reasonably handle in a year. That is to determine the value of this number and then this bill is geared to determine it for an assessor, but if you start loading assessors to where they are going to have to perhaps spend a day or more talking with a single property owner to determine how much his family eats, it is just going to become hopeless, impossible.

I know that this legislation wouldn't affect much of the state, but there are areas around our principal urban sections, areas like Windham, Gorham, down around Portland and the outlying towns around these cities, where a high percentage of property would be eligible for consideration under this change and I think it would make complete sense to adopt and I would support the report for the majority "ought not to pass" report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pembroke, Mr. CHEVERTON.

Mr. CHEVERTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would be a little remiss if I didn't stand up and speak for this because this was my bill and the intention of it was to help the small farmer instead of causing him to sell his farmlands, etc., if under 10 acres to be divided up into house lots. Anyone who had the misfortune to have read Mr. Susi's report knows that Mr. Susi had mentioned that the assessors would spend a great deal of time with this farmer to prove that they are raising $1,000 worth of produce with this land in the five years. Well, this isn't so. The way it works is that they only go into the town office of the assessor's office and file an application for this farmland exemption, if they have more than 10 acres. Consequently this making it double and making it much worse for the farmer that owns more than 10 acres. The intent of this bill and it has the support of the organization of farmers organization throughout the state and other farm organizations for the simple reason that anyone who has a small piece of land and is trying to make a little assistance in their living or subsidize their small income, they are unable to do so because the land is valued at house lot valuation and especially in my area where you have the highest valuation assessment, these house lots, if you have 8 acres, it is figured at $220 a lot, some $1,620, etc. This is quite a strain on some of the retired and living in accordance and to make this worse for man who owned 12 acres and is filing under farmland, the whole thing is just idiotic and I move that this bill and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed and I hope that you will vote in favor of it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Finemore.

Mr. FINEMORE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I apologize. I might repeat something the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, has said, but I hope not because I was called from the House, and in agreement with Mr. Churchill, whose bill this is, because this bill is nothing like the bill he put in. They have changed on Committee Amendment "A", the motion to indefinitely postpone, for the simple reason that it is nothing like the bill as it was written and the intent of the bill is not in this at all. I hope you will go along with the indefinite postponement of this bill and all its accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Cox.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to point out a few things here under this business of including the value of commodities which are used and has been suggested by the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi, the difficulty of determining how much a farm household eats. Well, this does not include only food. Much of these produce, especially along the coast, have a parcel of woodland, and it is not too hard to look at a pile of wood in the dooryard that may have 10 cords of wood valued at $50 or $60 a cord and that this
family is consuming $500 or $600 worth of produce from the land in the form of fuel. Also, if they raise beef animals, it is very simple for them to bring a receipt from the slaughter house that killed this animal saying how large the animal was and so it is too hard to determine.

It is true that we have raised it from $1,000 to $2,000, but we have made it possible to include the produce that was consumed by the family. As for this making a lot of extra work for the assessors this is not necessarily so. The assessor is not required to go out and chase around looking for proof. The burden of proof is on the taxpayer to prove that he has produced this much on his land.

Personally, I might have preferred to have $1,000 to $1,500 worth of materials produced and consumed by the farm household, but in order for us to come up with a bill that we could get a number of signatures on, it seemed to be necessary for us to raise that amount to $2,000.

I still say that basically it is a good bill, because on these small subsistence farms, the largest amount of produce raised quite often is consumed, especially if it is woodland. I still stand by my previous remarks and my previous motion.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Orland, Mr. Churchill, moves that we its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed. The Chair will order a division. Those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes; those opposed will vote no.

A vote of the House was taken.

97 having voted in the affirmative and 17 in the negative, the motion did prevail.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Orland, Mr. Churchill, moves that we reconsider our action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed. All in favor will say yes; those opposed will say no.

A vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

(Off Record Remarks)

Divided Report
Majority Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-238) on Bill "An Act to Extend the Hours for Sale of Liquor During the Tourist Season" (H. P. 1358) (L. D. 1660).

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DRIGOTAS of Auburn
COX of Brewer
SUSI of Pittsfield
MORTON of Farmington
FINEMORE of Bridgwater
MULKERN of Portland
— of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mrs. Saunders of Bethel, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read once and assigned for second reading tomorrow.

Divided Report
Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-242) on Bill "An Act to Extend the Hours for Sale of Liquor During the Tourist Season" (H. P. 1358) (L. D. 1660).

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CARBONNEAU of Androscoggin
DANTON of York
— of the Senate.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Maxwell of Jay, the Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought to Pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for second reading tomorrow.

Divided Report

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. MERRILL of Cumberland — of the Senate.

Messrs. MAXWELL of Jay
DRIGOTAS of Auburn
FINEMORE of Bridgwater
SUSI of Pittsfield
MULKERN of Portland
COX of Brewer
TWITCHELL of Norway — of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on the same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WYMAN of Washington
JACKSON of Cumberland — of the Senate.

Messrs. IMMONE of West Paris
MORTON of Farmington
DAM of Skowhegan — of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Drigotas of Auburn, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and tomorrow assigned.

Divided Report

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. THOMAS of Kennebec
REEVES of Aroostook
JOHNSON of Aroostook — of the Senate.

Mrs. BOUDREAU of Portland
Mrs. CLARK of Freeport
Mrs. BYERS of Newcastle
Messrs. DeVANE of Ellsworth
PIERCE of Waterville
BOWIE of Gardiner
RIDEOUT of Mapleton
PEAKES of Dexter — of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought Not to Pass" on the same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HIGGINS of Scarborough
TIERNEY of Durham — of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mrs. Clark.

Mrs. CLARK: M. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I move that the House accept the Majority Report of the committee:"Ought not to pass.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Dam.

Mr. DAM: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and