

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

Ninety-Third Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1947

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

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

Prayer by the Rev. Forrest Higgins of Norridgewock.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Papers from the Senate Special Report

Report of the Committee on Welfare pursuant to Joint Order, S. P. 443. (S. P. 516) (L. D. 1405)

Came from the Senate read and ordered placed on file.

In the House, was read and ordered placed on file in concurrence.

Bill Substituted for Ought Not To Pass Report

Report of the Committee on Education reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Instruction in Scientific Alcohol Education in the Public Schools" (S. P. 343) (L. D. 976) as it is covered by existing legislation.

Came from the Senate with the Bill substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord.

Mr. LORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee, and in making that motion, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to state the reason that the committee's unanimous report was made.

We feel, in the first place, that this is cluttering up, as I might say, legislation in reference to what the State Department will do when we already have laws to cover this particular thing.

In the State law, under the duties of the towns, Number 3, it says "The school committee shall make provision for the instruction of all pupils in public schools supported by public money and under State control in physiology and hygiene with special reference to the effects of alcoholic drinks, stimulants and narcotics upon the human system."

So that it is already in effect insofar as the department thinks it can be done.

The bill creates a program where-by the Commissioner of Education

will have to set up a more definite study in this matter. Naturally it is not the purpose of the Committee on Education to attempt to do away with a proper approach to this subject in schools, but we do think that this particular bill will make a considerable amount of more work on the part of the Department of Education and will not accomplish the purpose any more than is being accomplished now.

Already the State Department has a bulletin in preparation that was brought to the attention of the committee that includes all of the teachings that this bill calls for, and we feel that this is only another way to create more work for the department, and we doubt very much that it will accomplish any more than is being done. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee.

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

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I cannot agree with the gentleman from Camden on this particular bill.

One of the things that I can offer to show you that it does produce results, if some effort is made, is an instance that happened in Aroostook County last winter. Inside of three weeks we had three deaths of youngsters who slid under cars. Those of you who have been in the county realize that snow is piled high by these plows and that an automobile driver or truck driver has little chance if a youngster happens to slide out in front of him. After these three deaths, they were asked to put on a safety campaign up there. The State Police did this job, and after that we had no accidents whatsoever. I feel that this is an example of what could happen if this bill went through, and that with a little instruction that we could possibly steer some of these youngsters right that without instruction might go wrong. I think this is a good bill and I think the examples are comparative, I hope that the motion of the gentleman does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Peirce.

Mr. PEIRCE: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Camden (Mr.

Lord), because with my experience on the Temperance Committee, I am convinced that more could be done in our educational system to prevent juvenile delinquency which is created by alcohol. The State of Maine is in the liquor business. It seems to me, therefore, that we have a double obligation to see to it that our young people are taught properly the effects of alcohol. I am not convinced that our present school system is doing that, therefore I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Camden (Mr. Lord) will not prevail.

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

Mr. **WILLIAMS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This Legislative Document 976 proposes more instruction on the use and effects of alcoholic beverages, this instruction to be made in schools. I think you and I must agree that there is no such instruction worthy of the name at the present time. The question is, whether such instruction would be beneficial. If it would, I think we should pass this bill. It has been admitted that there was not too much being done at the present time and it has been said that there was some material in preparation. If we vote against accepting this "Ought not to pass" report, and then substitute the bill for the report, in concurrence with the Senate, we will in effect have directed our School Department to proceed with this work of education.

Now I have heard the remarks of the gentleman from Presque Isle, and I have also noticed the headlines in our local papers. The young fellows in high school who are being brought in for driving under the influence of liquor are rapidly on the increase, and you see more and more cases of teen-ager intoxication, and I sincerely hope that this motion will not prevail, and I do believe we should pass this bill and that we should vote "no" on the motion.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Russell.

Mr. **RUSSELL**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very sorry that the Committee on Education in the city of Auburn is not attending to its duties. The duty of the Committee there is to see that the scientific results and effects of

alcohol and other narcotics on the human system is taught by the teachers in the public school. The passage of this law will not increase those duties in any way; will not increase the likelihood, I would say, of the towns that would enforce this law. We don't need the law; we need to live up to the law that is already on our statutes.

I hope that this discussion might lead to a better living under the laws we now have, but why add another that will not increase the responsibility of the school system of the State.

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

Mr. **BROGGI**: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Educational Committee, I most certainly am not opposed to scientific alcoholic education, but I want every member of this House to know that in the present State laws one week is set aside each year for scientific education. The gentleman from Gorham (Mr. Russell) has just said the various towns should live up to and practice this present law that is on our statutes. This legislation and discussion is absolutely not needed.

The **SPEAKER**: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord, that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. All those in favor of the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Reimbursing Towns for Tuition for Pupils Attending Secondary Schools" (S. P. 122) (L. D. 291) which was recommitted, reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 501) (L. D. 1369) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

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

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

Senate Amendment "A" to S. P. 501, L. D. 1369, Bill "An Act Relating to Reimbursing Towns for Tuition for Pupils Attending Secondary Schools."

Amend said Bill by striking out the 21st, 22nd and 23rd lines of that part designated "Sec. 99" and inserting in place thereof the following underlined words:

'Add the amounts paid for teachers' wages, fuel, janitor service, textbooks, supplies, ordinary minor repairs, premiums paid on insurance and 3% of the insured value of the school for depreciation; (2) from this amount subtract state and/or federal subsidy paid on teaching positions, courses, or per capita aid on account of this school;'

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Fire, Marine and Inland Marine Insurance Rate Regulation" (H. P. 64) (L. D. 49) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 9th as amended by House Amendment "A".

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

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Open Season for Scallops in Certain Waters" (H. P. 1550) (L. D. 1180) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 7th.

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

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-concurrent Matter

An Act Providing for the Perambulation of the Maine and New Hampshire Boundary Line (H. P. 850) (L. D. 506) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 12th and passed to be engrossed on February 27th.

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

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair notes in the balcony the presence of the Eighth Grade Class of East Boothbay, with John Barrows, Teacher, and on behalf of the members of the House, the Chair bids you welcome here this morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Garland, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I ask to present a resolution out of order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Garland, Mr. Campbell, presents a resolution and moves its adoption without reference to a committee. The Clerk will read the resolution.

Joint Resolution Relating to the Proposed Price to Producers Ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture for Class I Milk in The Greater Boston Milk Marketing Area and Other Federally Regulated Milk Markets in the Northeast.

Offered by Committee on Agriculture.

WHEREAS, the Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, U. S. Secretary of Agriculture, has ordered that the price for Class I milk payable to Boston producers for May and June 1947, shall be reduced 44 cents per hundredweight below the April price, and has ordered similar reductions in prices to be paid to producers supplying milk to other federally regulated markets of New England and New York; and

WHEREAS, producers supplying milk to Boston and other federal markets have already taken a reduction of 88 cents per hundredweight, or 2 cents per quart, in February and March; and a further reduction for May and June would mean a decline of 3 cents per quart in 4 months' time, which is entirely out of line with the trends of industrial earnings or of other commodity prices; and

WHEREAS, milk production costs have increased sharply from a year ago, as a result of an advance in feed prices of about 21 per cent; farm labor 19 per cent; and farm

machinery and supplies at least 25 per cent; and

WHEREAS, the order of the Secretary will result in returns to Boston producers of not more than \$3.50 per hundredweight in June, being a reduction of more than 60 cents below the return of \$4.17 for June last year, despite the sharp increases in milk production costs; and

WHEREAS, such action with respect to fluid milk prices will inevitably result in serious injury to dairy farmers of Maine, and indicates clearly that the Department of Agriculture has failed to understand or give adequate consideration to actual production conditions existing in this State, therefore be it

RESOLVED by the Senate and House of Representatives:

That we formally protest this action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture which will result in serious injury to dairy farmers of Maine; and that we respectfully request the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider and amend his order of April 9, 1947 in line with actual cost and production conditions, so as to maintain returns to producers for Class I milk at least at the April level, in the federal order markets of New England; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and to each member of the Maine delegation in Congress; and be it further

RESOLVED that this joint resolution be treated as a memorial to the members of the Maine congressional delegation to take affirmative action to advise the Secretary of Agriculture of the needs of the Maine dairy industry as expressed herein, H. P. 1692.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I wish to present this Resolution in behalf of the dairy farmers of the State of Maine: to protest to the Secretary of Agriculture against a proposed cut of 44c per hundred in the price of milk in the Boston market.

We have already taken two price reductions and, due to the increased costs of grain, farm implements, and labor over a year ago, we feel another reduction in price is unjust.

This Resolution is in line with one already adopted by the New

Hampshire and Vermont Legislatures and I feel that we, as citizens, should be vitally interested in our dairymen of this State.

I move the Resolution lie upon the table pending adoption, be ordered printed, and be assigned for Thursday morning.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Garland, Mr. Campbell, moves that the resolution lie on the table pending adoption, be ordered printed and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

Is this the pleasure of the House? The motion prevailed.

Orders Tabled

Mr. Rollins of Greenville presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the Research Committee be directed:

1. To investigate and study the advisability of the State of Maine developing hydro-electric power in cooperation with an adjoining state and an adjoining maritime province.

2. To investigate the availability of federal funds for the development, construction or expansion of hydro-electric power reservoirs, dams and generating plants within the State of Maine and the desirability and practicability of accepting such funds.

On motion by Mr. Peirce of Augusta, the Order was tabled for reproduction.

On motion by Mr. Burgess of Limestone, it was

ORDERED, that the Clerk of the House be directed to send flowers to Representative Dwight W. Dorsey of Fort Fairfield, and express to him the hopes of the members for a speedy recovery.

House Reports of Committees Divided Report Tabled

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Repeal the Charter of the Bay Point Village Corporation" (H. P. 1606) (L. D. 1272)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Blanchard of Aroostook
Baker of Kennebec
—of the Senate.

Weeks of So. Portland
Woodworth of Fairfield
Rankin of Bridgton
Atherton of Bangor
Snow of Auburn

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Batchelder of York
—of the Senate
Anderson of New Sweden
Payson of Union

—of the House
(On motion by Mr. Payson of Union, the two Reports, with accompanying papers, were tabled pending acceptance of either report)

Ought Not To Pass

Mr. Lacharite from the Committee on Aeronautics reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Registration of Dealers of New and Used Aircraft" (H. P. 1495) (L. D. 1115)

Report was read and accepted.

Tabled and Assigned

Miss Longstaff from the Committee on Public Health reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Nursing Attendant" (H. P. 1600) (L. D. 1268)

(On motion by Miss Longstaff of Crystal, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for Friday, April 18th)

Tabled

Mr. Daniels from the Committee on Public Utilities reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Define Common Carriers by Motor Vehicle Over Irregular Routes" (H. P. 1514) (L. D. 1137)

(On motion by Mr. Weeks of South Portland, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

Mr. Wight from the Committee on Public Utilities reported "Ought not to Pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Carrying of Passengers for Hire" (H. P. 263) (L. D. 180)

Report was read and accepted.

On motion by Miss Cormier of Rumford, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session, in order to permit smoking.

Ought to Pass In New Draft

Mr. Rollins from the Committee on Aeronautics on Bill "An Act to Provide Revenue for the Construction and Extension of Airports, and to Regulate and Control the Expenditures Thereof" (H. P. 1638) (L. D. 1326) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1690) (L. D. 1408) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted and the new draft, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules and tomorrow assigned.

Ought to Pass With Committee Amendment Tabled

Mr. Dean from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Bill "An Act relating to a State Police Barrack in the county of Cumberland" (H. P. 358) (L. D. 228) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted, and the Bill, having already been printed, was read twice under suspension of the rules.

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

Committee Amendment "A" to H. P. 358, L. D. 228, Bill "An Act relating to a State Police Barrack in the County of Cumberland."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the 1st sentence of section 2 thereof and inserting in place thereof the following: "There is hereby appropriated \$18,000 from the "Maine Post War Public Works Reserve" for the purchase of said land and the erection and equipping of said barrack."

On motion by Mr. Sweetser of Cumberland, tabled pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Allocation of Moneys by Governor and Council" (S. P. 247) (L. D. 710)

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I now move indefinite postponement of this bill. In support of that argument, I will read the bill.

"Sec. 24. Allocations by governor and council. The governor, with the advice and consent of the council, may allocate such sums as may

be appropriated for the contingent account by the legislature to meet any expense necessarily incurred under any requirement of law, or for the maintenance of government within the scope existing at the time of the previous session of the legislature or contemplated by laws enacted thereat, or to pay bills arising out of some emergency requiring an expenditure of money not provided by the legislature. The governor and council shall determine the necessity for such allocations, and all such allocations shall be supported by a statement of facts setting forth the necessity for the allocations."

This is only, members of this House, another move to delegate the powers of the Legislature. Here just this past week we had occasion,—our Appropriations Committee who, I think from appearances were doing a good job, cut an appropriation request of \$450,000 to \$225,000, and this Legislature supported it; and within a day or two after that the Governor and Council added an additional \$60,000 to that department. I believe that the Legislature was in session; I believe that the Legislature knew what they were doing, and I think from the report from our Health and Welfare Department that there is ample proof that the Legislature is working within its scope.

I hope that this bill is indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, that this matter be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with my colleague, Mr. Rollins on this bill nor the fact that the Governor and Council saw fit to go over the Legislature, the Appropriation Committee's head in providing money for the institutions, in view of the facts that we had given.

We were called before the Governor and Council and asked when we made this cut if we had in mind the \$150,000 which until two years ago had been considered as an institutional emergency fund and was two years ago combined with the contingent fund.

My argument to the Governor and Council at that time was that their

duty was administrative and they should be much closer to the institutions, where they met twice a month and we met twice a year, and if in their judgment they saw fit to allocate more money than we had, that was their privilege.

That is my story and I am going to stick to it. I still feel that was within their wisdom. There are times when contingencies arise which we could not foresee, and I have faith enough in the Governor and Council to feel that is one way that we can handle it.

In the case of disaster or anything else, there should be some set-up whereby these things could be taken care of; and I will say to you that the only way I can figure out is through the Governor and Council, because we cannot anticipate many things that do happen while we are not in session. So I therefore hope that the motion of the gentleman from Greenville does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, that the House indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act relating to Allocation of Moneys by Governor and Council." (S. P. 247) (L. D. 710)

All those in favor of indefinite postponement of this bill will please say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Fifty having voted in the affirmative and sixty-five in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon the bill was given its third reading, and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Passed to be Engrossed (Cont'd)

Bill "An Act to Increase the Working Capital of the State Liquor Commission" (S. P. 248) (L. D. 711)

Bill "An Act relating to Unorganized Townships Fund" (S. P. 398) (L. D. 1147)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Franco-American Loan Corporation of Lewiston" (S. P. 504) (L. D. 1384)

Resolve Authorizing the State Tax Assessor to Convey Certain Interest of the State in Lands in Somerset County to C. Max Hilton, of Greenville (S. P. 163) (L. D. 402)

Were reported by the Committee

on Bills in the Third Reading, Bills read the third time, Resolve read the second time, all passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act to Increase State Aid to Towns for the Support of Schools to Establish Minimum Salaries for Teachers" (S. P. 478) (L. D. 1336)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

Mr. Ellis of Castle Hill, offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

House Amendment "A" to S. P. 478, L. D. 1336, Bill "An Act to Increase State Aid to Towns for the Support of Schools to Establish minimum Salaries for Teachers."

Amend said Bill by striking out, in the 27th line of subsection II of that part designated "Sec. 201," the underlined figures "1,800" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures "1,700"

Further amend said Bill by striking out, in the 20th line of section 2 thereof, the underlined figures "1,800" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures "1,700"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Russell.

Mr. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives: I want to oppose the passage of that amendment to this bill. This bill, as you may know, originated in the Committee on Education after they had had a very full and complete hearing on the subject; after they had heard from people all over the State in relation to their interests and the bill was unanimously reported "Ought to pass". This amendment, as I understand it, tends to weaken that bill. Now, then, there has come down to us from that wise man of Israel a statement something like this, "There is that which withholdeth more than is needed and yet tendeth to poverty."

The State of Maine idea in her attitude towards education has been an exemplification of her truth of that proverb. We have had an unenviable reputation among our neighboring states and our fellow states all over the country, because of the Scotch attitude not to use a stronger term, that we have

maintained in relation to expenditures for education. We have tended to conduct our education on as cheap a basis as we could. The result is that, we have an unenviable reputation in relation to the level of our education. There are many ways in which the level of education may be measured but one level that has been stated and reported on very recently is this: The percentage of people in a given state in school subsequent to the secondary school—the country has been divided into the 48 States and the District of Columbia, making 49 units. How does Maine stand in the percentage of her young people attending school subsequent to the secondary school? Our motto says "We Lead". In that respect our motto doesn't tell the truth. We lead the wrong way. The State of Maine is Number 49 when we deal only with the white population of the several states. The 47th sister state and the District of Columbia have a larger percentage of their white population in schools beyond the high school than does the State of Maine. If we consider all the population, white, black, brown, red, yellow,—most of our states have some representatives of all those colors—Maine's position is a trifle better, Maine stands Number 45. Four states, largely made up of colored population, all south of the Mason-Dixon line, have a poorer record than Maine, a lower level of education than Maine, when all the population is considered. But, being number 45, is no great credit.

Now this Legislature, and the two preceding Legislatures, have been moving slowly towards lifting the level of education in Maine. This amendment tends to lessen the strength of this bill. Now, is it any advantage to a state to have a high level of education? The answer to that is "Yes". Not only a social advantage but a financial advantage. Let me compare two areas—one of them in the United States, the other of them on the continent of Asia. Let me take from the United States the State of California, which has for years had an enviable record because of her support and her position in educational matters. She has a high standard. For instance, more than 25 years ago the State of California made its minimum basis for the certification of her teachers for the certification of professional training

beyond the high school. At that time Maine required two years. Maine now requires but three years and yet, today, over half of the teachers in the elementary schools in Maine have less than three years of professional training. That is one evidence that California has been interested in education. California not only has required high qualifications for teaching but she has supported generously her teachers. Only just recently California has passed a new bill making the minimum pay of the certificated teachers of four years of training \$2400. This amendment tries to lower ours from \$1800 to \$1700, not in the right direction. But yet to show the standing of California in relation to the level of education many of the schools of California have for years been offering two years of college work, junior college work, at the expense of the taxpayer free to the boys and girls who have completed the secondary school course. Those are evidences of the high standards of California, the high level of education in California. Those of us who know about the southern portion of Asia, of which I am going to speak, recognize the fact that in India there are some people who have good education, but the rank and file of people in India are illiterate, giving to the country of India a very low level of education. Now, what effect does that have upon the prosperity of those two areas? The State of California has seven million population. The country of India has 390,000,000 population. Yet, the State of California, those seven million people, have a larger gross annual income than do the 390,000,000 population in India. A more than 50 to 1 odds in favor of the state that has maintained a high level of education. I wonder, then, why anybody should hesitate to take the step forward that we are taking in this State looking towards the lifting of our level of education. It will cost something, to be sure, but how much. We learned yesterday, from the gentleman from Monmouth (Mr. Marsans) that to pass this bill as approved by the committee would cost this year less than a million and a half; would cost next year only about two million. But two million dollars is no small sum. To me, who has been a teacher all my life, it is really a very large sum. But when you

think of two million dollars in relation to a state, what is it? It is about two dollars and a half apiece for us here in the State. I am wondering if we are going to be floored by paying two million dollars more for education when we can save two dollars and fifty cents each to do it?

A state that could spend last year \$27,000,000 for alcohol, which some people say does nobody any good,—and all of us know it does many people evil—to spend that, on the one hand, and then try to feebly weaken a bill for the benefit of the coming generation of young people by saving a few dollars—I cannot understand the wisdom of that. I do not believe this Legislature will want to pass that amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Castle Hill, Mr. Ellis.

Mr. ELLIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to surprise my friend from Gorham this morning. It is not my intention in any way, shape, or manner to hurt this school bill. This amendment is offered to bring out further discussion and perhaps a few suggestions to help solve a very serious problem that exists in our schools today. I hope that from these few notes and this can of mince meat perhaps I can explain why. I think, in the first place, we should take off our hats to this Educational Committee. It had faith enough to bring out the report that they have asking for such a small amount of money. We should pay special tribute to the gentleman who has just spoken to us. I understand that he taught many years ago for as little as four dollars a week. He has devoted his whole life to education and that's why I want this amendment this morning to bring out some of these things to us here to see why we need improvement in our schools. Still I must argue in support of the amendment to do my part. I wish to compliment the committee for their unselfishness in reporting out a bill that does not yet bring the teachers' salaries even up to those of common labor. I want to quote from a clipping written by Elsie Robinson. It says in her column, "Listen World"—"Our Cheapest Hired Hands," (which refers to teachers in our schools) "America is the richest nation on earth. Also

the strongest. Likewise it is our proud boast that our standard of living is the highest. Yet over large areas of this opulent land we pay our school teachers salaries which a scavenger would despise.

No citizen assumes a heavier responsibility than the average teacher. She is not only expected to instruct young America in the three R's but she supplies him with his general cultural and ethical background and interprets for him our whole democratic ideology — of which, incidentally, he hears very little in the average home. And a teacher can only do this after long and difficult years of training which frequently exhaust his or her cash and energy, in return for which he or she gets less than the most ignorant, untrained laborer.

In many of our rural districts the teacher is still 'farmed out' with a dingy room and haphazard food regarded as part of her compensation.

Highly trained men and women in our leading cities are being forced to abandon teaching or accept side occupations such as waitresses, carpenters, painters, baby sitters and barkeepers in order to support their families! Yet we cheerfully boast that we spend more money on education than any other country on earth. But it's show-off money. We employ leading educators. We subsidize outstanding athletes by methods of high class bribery. But when it comes to paying for brains we're a cheap bunch of pikers without decent regard for wisdom, and no concern whatever for the future of democracy."

Perhaps this bill should have been referred to the Salaries and Fees Committee as they are more liberal. Considering the bill that I tabled yesterday, which provided an increase of a thousand dollars a year for one person, while there are 6000 teachers in our public schools of Maine, \$12,000,000 would have been recommended for the next two years. That amount, which this bill calls for, is less than approximately one-fourth of that amount. We have just recently seen the ending of a horrible war; a war that cost the State of Maine approximately \$2,146,254,000 for the duration. And in addition to that, the country is paying about \$2,000,000,000 a year to mop up over there now, and we are to pay our proportionate part. We felt this was a good investment to

keep the enemy from landing on our shores but for education we are spending only \$10,458,310 per year; that's for 1946 in the State of Maine in our public schools. We could easily double this amount each year for more than a hundred years and still not spend an amount equal to the cost of the war. There is an enemy slowly creeping in that we should keep an eye on. I refer to ignorance and indifference concerning our public schools. Only this last fall one of our teachers up in Castle Hill had to sleep in the cloak room at the school building because she couldn't obtain a boarding place and besides, after fifteen years' experience, she took the school for less money than was being paid common laborers on a nearby farm.

Now we will get back to my amendment. I hope that before this bill finally leaves this room we will find money somewhere so we can report it out for a minimum of at least \$2,000 per year per teacher. However, for the present, and with what is before us, let's do our next best. This bill provides that \$1500 shall be paid as a minimum to certified teachers; \$1600 shall be paid to those who have completed three years beyond high school. It provides \$1800 shall be paid to those teachers who have had four years beyond the high school and the next step the minimum of \$2,000.

The suggestion in this amendment is that we pay \$1700 instead of \$1800 in the third bracket. This will not affect the money received from the State, as I understand it; rural towns or small communities will be getting their teachers from this group. They come to us without teaching experience. And then, after they have had a year's experience of teaching, we will be willing to give them \$2000 which is provided in the next bracket as suggested in the bill.

A few years ago, up in my town, we had several teachers that came from college in the State of Massachusetts. At that time, we were paying the maximum of \$648 per teacher. Those teachers came there and taught one year and went back to Massachusetts for \$1080 or \$1100, considering one year's experience was worth \$400. We should consider one year's experience worth as much.

If we don't, we are going to lose our teachers. I believe that in school or college the student is

dealing with possibilities. The year's experience will teach the effective young man or woman how to turn those possibilities into cash. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for the present, I hope my motion will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Broggi.

Mr. BROGGI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to subscribe to every word Mr. Russell has told us this morning. I don't think that it is generally known in this House that in our State of Maine we have 500 teachers who are teaching on sanctions or permits, which means in a great many cases these teachers have nothing but a high school education. To me this is a deplorable situation. I think the bill that has emanated from the Educational Committee relative to teachers' salaries is an honest one, a just one, one that we should defend, one that calls for no amendments. I feel I have a perfect right to speak on this matter because in my community, in which I am a public school official, we pay \$900 per teaching position more than the State average in Maine. We have the highest paid teachers in the State of Maine. We pay \$600 more than the national average. The average salary for teachers in my community is \$2600. I want every member of this House to know that we are proud of it. I believe that this bill which has come from the Educational Committee should pass without any amendments. I hope that the amendment is defeated.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monmouth Mr. Marsans.

Mr. MARSANS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Castle Hill, Mr. Ellis.

I would like to point out that this amendment would only affect 340 teachers of the total of four-year teachers that we now have in the State of Maine, and the bulk of these teachers are in your high schools. I would like to point this out so the small towns will not feel that they will have a chance for much saving by lowering these teachers. You yourselves know how many teachers of the four-year class you have in your own place. There are only three hundred and forty in the entire state.

What we are asked to do here in this amendment is to lower this an

extra one hundred dollars. Now you are killing the incentive of the teachers in the second and third year group, those who have had an amount of training over and beyond the high school. It costs them quite a bit to go to summer school for extra training; they have to do it for two or three summers at least, and if we are only going to raise their salaries one hundred dollars they see no incentive for it. You realize that these teachers who have gone through college have gone through quite a considerable amount of expense to get their degree.

As has been pointed out, the average of the teachers, even at the eighteen hundred dollars, is below the common workingman's average. Keep in mind that the average person in the United States only has nine years of school. In other words, they are a freshman in high school on the average. Here is a group of teachers who have had seven years beyond that, three years more of high school, four years more of college, and you are trying to lower them still lower than the average working man's salary.

My colleague, the gentleman from Sanford, has pointed out that we now have approximately 500 teachers teaching under sanctions and permits. That amount will be nearer 700 teachers this coming year, 700 teachers who have had no professional training beyond the high school, possibly a little less than one year in some cases. Those are the people to whom you are entrusting our children, our children and the State's children. We want to do all we possibly can to have properly trained teachers in our schools, and an amendment of this sort is going to definitely take a slap at your high school teachers and also a slap at those who have seen fit to go through and get their college degree in order to prepare themselves more fully for their teaching job ahead. It is merely a matter of only 340 of them. The amount saved would be very little to the town. It would mean a lot to the teachers below that group as an incentive for them to look forward to. It cannot be for monetary reasons that the gentleman from Castle Hill is putting this amendment in, because that town fares quite well under this bill. They have been doing a good job there, and their teachers are sufficiently up in salary so that it will only cost them

\$264 to meet the minimum as prescribed in this bill. The State is giving them \$1972 to help them do that, so they come out on the long end and gain \$1708 over and above what it is going to cost them to raise their teachers.

I think it is something that we should consider very carefully if we are trying to do anything at all for our teachers and especially trying to get our teachers to build up their educational background so that we can have a type of teacher that we must have to train our youngsters in the American way of life.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all sympathize with the teachers and want to do as much as we can to help them, but if this is one of those bills which has to pass without amendment, I think the House is entitled to more information than some of us seem to have.

I should like to know how much of this three and a half million dollars which we propose to raise is actually going, assuredly going, to teachers and, having the answer to that question, I may want to ask another.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Castle Hill, Mr. Ellis.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Lord.

Mr. LORD: Mr. Speaker, I was waiting for somebody to rise to attempt to answer the questions from the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth. I will attempt to do it, reluctantly, because I believe that the bill does not make it compulsory that the money shall be given to teachers. It is possible, as I understand it, for the school boards to use that money for other purposes. But, from my information, from what has been done throughout the State under the other law passed two years ago, the great majority of the towns have used the money for teachers. And I think it is the purpose, I know that it is the purpose—of the Legislature, if the bill is passed, that the money shall be used for teachers' wages.

Now you will understand, I am sure, that if that particular money is raised and used for teachers, the appropriation from the towns can be cut. Meaning, then, that the

towns can save money, tax money, because of less appropriation. I don't know how we could frame a bill that would make it compulsory on the part of the towns to use all of the money for increased teachers' wages. But it is a tendency in the right direction and I think that most of the towns in the State of Maine are in a position, today, to do that very thing from the reports that we have received from town meetings this last March. It shows a tendency on the part of the people of the State to increase teachers' wages. But to answer the question directly, it would seem to me that there is no way that we can possibly frame a bill that would make it absolutely necessary for all this money to be used for teachers and prohibit the towns from reducing their appropriations.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monmouth, Mr. Marsans.

Mr. MARSANS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can give the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth (Mr. Chase) a more concise answer in actual dollars and cents. The cost to make salaries of the current teachers agree with the minimum as established in the bill would be \$731,217.00. The funds that would then be available to towns for salary increases for teachers beyond the basic minimum would be \$890,048.00. That \$890,048.00 could be used for additional help to teachers and some of it would have to be used, because if you make a minimum salary for a two year, or a three year teacher, at a certain amount, then the towns would have to take into consideration these teachers who have that amount of training but who had been in the town and have had experience for four, five, or ten years. So they will have to use some of those extra funds to give those particular teachers an amount over and above the minimum.

I think that, perhaps, answers to some extent the question. We realize, however, that this bill is not purely a teachers' salary bill but is an increase in State aid to towns for their school program.

The bulk of it will perhaps go to the teachers, but the towns will be able to have an additional amount available to help in their general school picture, but, apparently, the major part of it is definitely destined for the teachers and the ad-

ditional amounts that the towns will get will be used in readjusting the teachers' salaries based on their experience and the number of years they have been in the town. Those are the figures as near as I can get them for you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the two gentlemen for their answers. We have been talking here this winter in connection with this and other matters upon relieving cities and towns, and I take it that this measure, if passed, is one way in which cities and towns would be relieved, and that the money which they get which is beyond the gentlemen's estimate of what they would have to pay for teachers, is a form of relief to the cities and towns, and I take it from his figures that a little more than half of this money which we raise under this bill can be construed as general relief to the cities and towns.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Elliott.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I asked this question last night of the Commissioner of Education. He immediately referred me to Section 206 of the School Laws of the State. I am very sorry that we haven't a copy of the School Laws here that I know of in the House. This money is allocated to the towns, as I understand it, on the school tax rate of the several towns. That school tax rate is made up of money that is appropriated for all school purposes, I think, excepting repairs of school buildings. Section 206 says that this money which is paid back to the towns would have to be expended by the school committee for anything pertaining to the schools, excepting the repairs of school buildings. In other words, it has to go back for the same purpose for which the school tax rate is raised. It can be used for conveyance, supplies, books, and teachers' salaries, but not for the general funds of the town.

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

Mr. BROGGI: Mr. Speaker, I should like to have one more chance to answer the question of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase. More than half the money would be used for salaries, because

assume a situation where this bill calls for an \$1800 minimum to college graduates. Assume in a system where a man comes in to teach who just got out of college. Being a college graduate, he is entitled to the minimum; also assume that in that system college graduates of several years' teaching experience, of varying experience of teaching, it is obvious that the school committees of the town will have to remunerate the persons with experience more than they will the new man coming in that meets the requisite for four years' degree. Consequently, much of the fund will be used to take over this minimum for the teachers who have experience beyond the basic requirements.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monticello, Mr. Day.

Mr. DAY: Mr. Speaker: We are here this year, trying to do a little economizing, and it looks as though in our relief, our welfare department that we find that we are spending a lot of money. It is interesting to me to compare our education expenditures. We are way down to the bottom. Our relief load is way up compared to other States, and it looks to me that if we raise more money to get a better class of teachers in schools that is one of the ways that we can relieve our relief burden. And I will cite you one thing, just for illustration: In a certain community, a college, they sent a group out to make a study of the pupils in that section and they came back with the report — 25, I believe, was the number — that the way they were headed then, they would wind up in State Prison. Over a period of years afterwards, they sent out another class of students to look up those boys and out of that group they found there were two that had been mixed up with the law, and they wanted to find out why this was and they found that a certain teacher went into that community and she worked with those students. Now, it looks to me as though if we have a better class of teachers we will have a better class of citizenship in our State and I think perhaps we will see our relief burden lowered, and I hope that the amendment does not pass.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is upon the adoption of House Amendment "A."

All those in favor of the adoption of House Amendment "A" will say aye; those opposed, no.

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

Thereupon the bill was given its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended in concurrence.

Passed to be Engrossed (Cont'd) Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Town of Norridgewock School District" (H. P. 615) (L. D. 380)

Bill "An Act relating to Board of Boiler Rules" (H. P. 1400) (L. D. 1017)

Resolve to Provide Funds for Clam Cleansing Research (H. P. 1620) (L. D. 1292)

Resolve Providing for Construction of Homes for Physicians at the Augusta State Hospital (S. P. 271) (L. D. 814)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bills read the third time, Resolves read the second time, all passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

Passed to be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act to Create the Augusta Parking District (S. P. 203) (L. D. 594)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 130 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 relating to Membership of Maine State Office Building Authority (H. P. 621) (L. D. 382)

An Act to Amend the Charter of the Ogunquit Village Corporation (H. P. 1286) (L. D. 941)

An Act to Incorporate the Saco Sewerage District (H. P. 1313) (L. D. 950)

An Act Creating the Bridgton Utilities District (H. P. 1669) (L. D. 1373)

An Act relating to the Digging of Clams in Southwest Harbor (H. P. 1670) (L. D. 1374)

An Act relating to the Digging of Clams in Lamoine (H. P. 1671) (L. D. 1375)

Finally Passed

Resolve in favor of the town of Baileyville (H. P. 1557) (L. D. 1379)

Resolve in favor of the town of Trenton (H. P. 1558) (L. D. 1380)

Resolve Reallocating Road Resolve Money Previously Allocated to Road in Bucksport (H. P. 1658) (L. D. 1381)

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

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair lays before the House the first Special Order for Wednesday, "House Report "Ought to pass in a New Draft and New Title of Bill "An Act Providing Additional Highway Funds." (H. P. 1678) (L. D. 1394) of the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Reducing Real Estate Taxes and Providing Additional Highway Funds." (H. P. 634) (L. D. 414) by unanimous consent made a special order on April 14th by the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, the pending question being acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Because of the major importance of the bill now under consideration, it will take a few minutes longer than I would myself like to stand on my feet and address you, so I ask your indulgence, and I promise you that I will not bore you to the extent of the colored parson who preached in his church on a certain Sunday, preaching on and on and on, until his congregation began to leave. As they were leaving someone passing by walked in, and he stayed and he stayed, and, finally, losing his patience, he interrupted the reverend, and he said, "Parson, how long have you been preaching?" And the parson said, "Brother, nine years." And he said, "Brother, by God, I will stay with you because you cannot last much longer." (Laughter)

The need for additional revenue to the Highway Department is

primarily based on two factors: First, the kind of highway program the people of Maine wish, and, secondly: Do you wish to own it when it is done or do you wish to continue on a debt?

In other words, in deciding this measure this morning, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you are deciding the type of program your highway department will have for the next biennium, and you are deciding whether or not you wish to pay for it or pass it along to future generations to pay for.

The program which I will attempt to outline to this House is one which I believe would pass the closest scrutiny of any business man or banker and would pass the scrutiny of the major oil companies or even the Master of the State Grange as a business proposition.

In outlining it, I say to you that I firmly believe that the practice or the application of business principles as a Legislator is exactly the same as you and I would attempt to abide by back home in our own little business.

Therefore, let me call your attention to the sheet which has been placed upon your desks relative to the bonded indebtedness of the State. I have asked the Highway Department to go back just a few years beyond the present status of the indebtedness so that you may follow the general trend. If you will look opposite the year 1947 you will see that we now owe \$1,724,000 plus the interest, or, in other words, with our present debt structure, our bonded debt as a first mortgage on the revenue of the Highway Department is over \$2,000,000.

There has been much discussion, and it is authentic, that the federal government, since the end of the war, has stepped up the allocations to the many states of the Union and to the State of Maine way in excess of any pre-war allocation of funds; so that we now find ourselves in a position of either matching those federal funds for our federal aid system of highways or losing it. As I say, there are two ways of matching it, one by debt and the other by paying a tax and owning it at the end of the biennium.

If we were to go back into the history of our bonded indebtedness, we would find that not many years ago the State of Maine's bonded indebtedness ran much higher than

that, but, with the exception of a few years, we have continued to reduce it.

The matter of the so called reissue of bonds has been decided once and for all by the ruling of the Supreme Court, for which I personally am glad; and, because of that ruling, it has ended a practice which I believe should have been ended, but it has also brought us face to face with a situation which we must decide.

Ladies and Gentlemen: if you will turn to this sheet which has been put out by the Committee on Ways and Bridges—and if any of you have lost your sheets the page boys have a few extra ones which they will supply you.

I want to compliment at this time the Committee on Ways and Bridges for the very efficient manner in which they have set up a proposed highway program for the next biennium. I do not need to go into figures because you will have them on the sheet before you. I only wish to point out that at the foot of the page, under the item "Deficit", which refers to the federal allocation of funds to the State, that I am now informed by the Highway Department that those allocations have been set ahead one year, so that instead of the figures \$3,968,000 and so forth for each of the next two years you have \$1,468,000 for the first year and \$3,968,000 for the second year, making a total of federal funds available for federal aid construction of \$5,436,000, which, as we know, must be matched dollar for dollar.

Ladies and Gentlemen, that kind of a program, if we match it—and I feel certain that we will—will give the State of Maine during the next two years ten millions of dollars of federal aid construction, and I submit to you that a ten million dollar construction program for the next two years is a good program.

The other items which the Committee on Ways and Bridges has set up are, in their wisdom and judgment necessary if we are to preserve and rebuild those parts of our highway roads throughout the State which have worn out to a point where maintenance has reached such a high cost that it is cheaper to reconstruct.

The item of snow removal, that part of snow removal which is borne by the State, requires an increased appropriation over the last bien-

nium for this reason: that the last Legislature appropriated \$1,200,000 but the expense to the State has now slightly exceeded \$1,700,000.

We could go down through that whole list, and we would find every item of it absolutely necessary if we are going to maintain that type of highway program which in my opinion the people of the State of Maine are desirous of having.

Regardless of what the opposition says—and I congratulate every one of them for the clean fight which they put on here; they are now better friends of mine than when I first met them—but regardless of what they say, I believe that the people of Maine want a road program which is constructive and which is advanced. They do not want our roads to go back. And I also believe that they are willing to pay for it, and that they do not want us to finance a road program for the next two years with debt. That I assure you, would be contrary to the first fundamental, basic principle of good business which each one of us applies in our own little business if we are to succeed.

I want to address my next very brief remark to those friends of mine who belong to the minority party. I hope—and I assure you that they, when the vote is taken, will vote with us, and that we will have a unanimous vote on this program which I believe and I know you will believe, if you analyze it, to be sound, to be constructive, to be paid for at the end of the next biennium, so that we will own it. I hope that group in our House will go along and help us establish a sound program for the next two years.

Someone might argue that because of the new cars and what not that revenue will increase in the State Highway Department. That, I believe is true. But let me point out to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that every time the receipts of the Highway Department increase it represents wear and travel upon the roads. There will never be any profit from that source, there will never be any profit to the Department from increased revenue, because the more we travel the more the roads need to be repaired and kept in driving condition.

I want to call your attention briefly to the fact that this, I believe, is the first time in the history

of the Maine Legislature when it has had an opportunity to vote for a tax bill, collected at a State level, from which some part is allocated directly back to every community in the State to assist them in their own local problems.

I want to point out to you Ladies and Gentlemen that this type of allocation may not meet with the approval of every person, but I believe that it is a definite step in the right direction, and that before the session is over, should you agree to accept the committee report and proceed with it, that if there are any better ideas I am sure that the Legislature wants to hear them.

We have been here for several months, figuring to ourselves and collectively just how we could most wisely handle such affairs as this and others, but yet I believe that there is not one man or lady within the sound of my voice who has forgotten for one minute the need back home. Every municipality in the State of Maine, because it has only one method, one type of taxation, is in exactly the same position or even worse than is the State as a whole.

So I submit to you, Members, that you give serious consideration to the first tax bill of all time in the State of Maine which is directed at a pay-as-you-go plan in the State's handling of the highways, and yet turns back to the communities of Maine one million dollars to assist them in their own local problems.

I want to call your attention just briefly to one other item on this sheet which the Committee on Ways and Bridges has presented to you, and that is what we know as the "Cross Bill"—they have another title for it here—where they have set up \$520,000 for each of the next two years. That too is a step in the right direction and is needed by every community, and new revenue is needed to carry out the program that the committee has wisely prepared for us.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, in summary of my argument before the Committee on Taxation, which has deliberated all winter on the various gas tax matters and the need of the Highway Department, and has, as you know presented to you unanimously this particular bill—in summarizing the argument, let me state to you: If you wish to

have funds not only to keep the roads barely passable, but, as I stated, to rebuild those sections where maintenance costs have gone so high that construction would be cheaper—if you want a ten million dollar construction program during the next biennium, one-half from the federal government and one-half from the State of Maine, and if you want that paid for, then the passage of this measure is necessary in order to finance it.

Mr. Speaker, I move you the acceptance of the committee report, and when the vote is taken I would ask for a division.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In behalf of the minority, I wish to thank the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, for his recognition of the minority.

Until the need is shown of the necessity of additional taxation, I believe we should stand pat and vote against any and all taxes or additional taxes before this House—and certainly those tax programs that do not allow the citizens of Maine to have a voice in the matter.

This bill, in my opinion, is sugar-coated-pill legislation. Looking at this morning's paper, the official paper of the Legislature, the Kennebec Journal, I find the following:

"Inability of Administration Cited in Welfare Department Probe. The Legislature was told Tuesday that the State Health and Welfare Department was wasting large sums through inefficient administration, and a report of two investigations submitted by Senator Leon Williams, Chairman of the Legislative Welfare Committee."

There it is! Let us start cutting the cloth, and then we will vote for taxation.

This bill was amended to pick up strength and for no other reason. It might be well, before we tax, to start looking around somewhere else. There it is right there: mismanagement and lack of judgment, to the tune of a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Now this idea of delving into this fund in anticipation of taxes is going to boomerang some day, because this tax set-up in Maine now is certainly not such that it could stand in any way, shape or manner any disruption.

I want to vote on this. I want to be heard. I want the people that sent me up here to know that I am going to be heard; I want the taxpayers of Maine to know that I am voting. I hope that the motion of the gentleman does not prevail, and, when the vote is taken, I ask for a yea and nay vote.

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

Mr. MUSKIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to oppose the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, because I honestly differ with him on his theories in regard to payment for new road construction.

If, years ago, the State of Maine, had made up its mind that forever after it would pay for its roads as it went along, we might well then have said it would have been a sound policy. Looking at this sheet with regard to retirement of the highway bond issues, we find that today we are paying close to \$2,000,000 a year for roads that were built years ago, and for roads that we are today enjoying.

The theory was that future taxpayers would pay for their share in roads built by today's taxpayers. And so, it seems to me, that once we have embarked upon that theory of highway financing, we should today say as to roads we build today which will be enjoyed by future taxpayers, they likewise would pay their share of the freight.

It seems to me that this type of financing is sound for all capital construction. When our towns build the schools, there is never an attempt to pay for those schools out of current revenue, because it is impossible. It must be amortized; it must be paid for, not only by this generation of taxpayers, but future generations of taxpayers who can also enjoy those schools and who should pay for them, and it is because of my very sincere belief in that theory of financing, that I feel myself compelled to oppose the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the acceptance of the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee. The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, has asked for the yeas and nays. Under the Constitution the yeas and nays will be ordered only on the request of one-fifth of the members present. All

those in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and remain standing until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Thirty - seven having voted in the affirmative and thirty-seven being more than one-fifth of the members present, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Elliott.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: I wish to state in the first place that I am one of those despised Grangers that have been mentioned so many times on the front page of newspapers in recent weeks, and I can say that as a Granger and as a representative of several Granges, that they are not all opposed to new taxation for the improvement of our roads.

As you know, there was a letter mailed out, signed by me as a member of the Taxation Committee, and as a member of the Grange, for different granges throughout the State, and I received a lot of replies and compliments from those Granges who are entirely back of this program to increase our gas tax. I am not speaking as any official of the Grange—only just as one member, but I assure you that we have much of the rural population in the State who are in favor of having our roads maintained and improved, and I, for one, believe that we should pay for it as we go, and not increase the bonded indebtedness of the State, therefore I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, prevails.

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

Mr. LEGARD: Mr. Speaker, In rising in opposition to the passage of this bill, I would like to read one of the editorials appearing in one of our papers recently. It says: "The Maine Legislature" and I quote, "has been discussing and proposing to increase the present State gasoline tax by two cents per gallon, thereby hitting not only our motorists but the thousands of drivers, and their families, who come here every year to enjoy the pleasures of 'Vacationland.' Should this action be taken, there is no mistaking the damage it would do our Summer tourist travel and how

quickly the press and Publicity Bureaus of neighboring states would pick it up and use it to their advantage."

This threat is well set forth in an article in the Portland Press Herald on Sunday, April 6th, when it stated: "Out-of-state vacationists may well be warned of the two-cent per gallon gasoline tax imposed by the State of Maine. The legislative taxation committee assumedly will report this favorably."

As I see it, we have spent a considerable sum of money to attract tourists from out-of-state, and now we are about to erect a barrier, a price barrier, to keep them out. Only recently in the State of Massachusetts they had a bill in to increase the tax from three to six cents. That bill, members, was killed. There was also a bill in the State of Montana to increase the tax from five to six cents, and that bill was also killed.

In North Dakota they attempted to increase it from four to four and a half cents, and that bill was indefinitely postponed. Wyoming attempted to raise a cent on their gasoline tax, and that also was killed. I believe that our present average tax rate on gasoline in the United States is four cents and a small fraction. I feel that we are in line, and in keeping with the other states. I also feel that it will work a hardship in the rural areas because more than fifty percent of the Maine communities are dependent upon trucks for all the necessities of life. In fact, I believe we have 1,880 communities, and out of that number 1,175 are not on any railroad line. If the added tax rate is put on, it must be reflected in the cost of transportation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that we have under discussion a very important piece of legislation and must request the members, as well as our guests, to be as quiet as possible while this matter is being debated.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Collins.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It would seem to me that if we are going along with the program that I think most of us want, good roads, or at least maintenance of roads in good shape, we have to raise the money to maintain and build those new roads. It seems to me that it is a very logical step that

we pay for them as much as possible on a "pay-as-you-go" basis. I believe the two cents additional tax is a fair tax — the people who use the roads help pay for them. I am in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chelsea, Mr. Harris.

Mr. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill. I think it is a fair tax. We have a good many taxes, like the automobile tax, where a man pays as much if he runs his car one thousand miles over the road as the man does who uses the road for twenty-five thousand miles.

Now I believe that not only do we want roads but we are going to need some jobs of road-building. Already we have right in this section a textile mill closed in Winthrop, a shoe factory closed in Hallowell, one of our Gardiner shoe shops operating four days a week. Now the handwriting on the wall, in my opinion, is that we have a slight recession coming on here, and I can see no object in hiring money when we can pay as we go along. I think the person who uses the road — and this money is all to be used on the roads — I think the person using the road should be the one to pay for it, and I am in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who are not in favor of increasing the gasoline tax, but we are confronted with this situation, as I understand it. We need money for the roads. There is some talk and possibility that the matter of a bond issue may be presented to us. I am inclined to think that it would be wise for us to keep this matter alive long enough to see what is going to happen. I do not want the tax, but I do not want this Legislature to put itself in a position that we cannot have the tax if we find that it is going to be absolutely necessary. Therefore, although I am against the tax I am going to vote in favor of the bill at this time.

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

Mr. BURTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature: I do not think any of us need to fear that the two-cent additional tax

that will be put on gasoline will have any deterring effect in regard to people driving three or four hundred miles on their way to Maine. I think that they will continue on and enjoy the beauties of our State. Therefore, I am very hopeful that this bill will receive passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wilton, Mr. Morison.

Mr. MORISON: Mr. Speaker, I find that the members of this Legislature are much like everyone else. There is no one that likes a tax that hits themselves, and this one hits us all. If we could find a method by which we could raise money from a tax which would hit the other fellow and not us, it would be a good one. This one comes nearer doing that than any tax measure that I know of, for it not only taxes ourselves who use the roads but it does get some measure of assistance from those who come in from out of state and also use our roads to enjoy the State of Maine. I think it is a good tax; I think it is a good bill; I think it is the fairest tax that we could have; I believe that it is necessary.

The Taxation Committee has discussed this bill for weeks, and they finally, after it had been revamped somewhat, have agreed unanimously on it, and I hope that this House will support the committee in the passage of it.

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

Mr. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I suppose you know that I come from York county. I suppose of all the counties in the state York county is the one that will be hit hardest, and naturally I would be desirous of voting against this bill. The only reason I can have for voting for this bill is the final reason for the increased cost. The way I worked it out for myself is this: that the money today is not worth the money back along. Many of you have heard of the inflation where costs have gone up thirty per cent. If you take thirty per cent of twelve million dollars, which is approximately the total here, you will get \$3,600,000. That I consider added expense from any figures in the past, and you know that the Attorney General has ruled that we cannot issue bonds. And the total of that makes about \$3,300,000; and you add them together and you get \$6,700,000 which

I can legitimately say was added expense over the past. Such being the case, I considered the State's benefit over and above the York County matter. I am going to vote for the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Castle Hill, Mr. Ellis.

Mr. ELLIS: A few weeks ago when I was in Aroostook County I asked my constituents in the several towns, if they were in favor of this increase in gas tax. They said, "Buddy, go to it; we want the roads." And after I came back I received a letter from the Granges saying that they too as a body were in favor of this measure. Last week I wanted to satisfy myself further than that. I was down in the southern part of the State; I got down into Kittery Saturday morning shortly after daylight, and I spent the day Saturday over in New Hampshire, and Sunday I spent part of the day in New Hampshire and then I came back up to my friend's county.

My friends, and members of this Legislature: people down there are not opposed to the gas tax as much as we think. More than that, they are looking forward to the day when they can chip in an extra dollar and ride over the turnpike.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this motion prevails.

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

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, when you come into the State of Maine you only have to close your eyes before you know you are in the State. I think it is time that we did something to our highways. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Boothbay Harbor, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, as I read this bill, it contains an emergency clause. Now, under certain circumstances, I might vote for a gasoline tax of two cents, but, as the thing stands, I am unable to vote for this bill at the present time, and I sympathize with my friend from Portland, Mr. McGauffin. I do not think that this bill ought to be disposed of arbitrarily because we may need it later when we have looked over the

whole, entire tax situation. But I am in this situation: I am unable to vote for this bill at this time, the object of it being to deprive the people of this State of the right to vote on it at some later time if they so desire. I am not in a position to go back and tell my people that I voted for the purpose of depriving them of the right to vote later on a referendum if they see fit. Therefore, at the present time I am obliged to vote against the pending question.

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

Mr. SLEEPER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Since apparently the vote is going to be yea and nay, I shall vote nay, and I want to give my reasons. My reasons are still the same. I still feel that if the State of Maine, the Highway Commission, are able to afford to grant these out-of-state trucks free registration, I still say that they can build their own roads. I do not intend to pay an additional two cents on any gas tax to provide a roadbed for these out-of-state trucks. That is personal; that is prejudice. And I have several other good and sufficient reasons for voting "No."

I have not had one single constituent — and I still say I come from a town of 9,000 people—who favors this bill. I have had several dozens, hundreds, who were opposed to the bill.

Why do we need to raise this additional two-cent gas tax? I cannot understand. No one knows why. In the headlines last week the paper said that our registration figures had reached an all-time high of five million dollars. The gas taxes of the past two months are reaching astronomical figures, and I say that there will still be plenty of money available for what little work should be done at this time.

The proponents of the measure said that we must match federal funds. What are federal funds? They are your funds. Every dollar that comes from Washington—in the Democratic days we had to send down \$1.30 to get back a dollar (Laughter)—under Senator Taft and others we only have to send down \$1.29; but we still have to send down more than one dollar to get a dollar back. Those federal funds will come and keep on com-

ing, so we need not be in a hurry to match those federal funds.

I do not really think that the concensus of opinion of this Legislature is that we must put on this additional gas tax. No one really favors it. We have been log-rolled into it, feeling that this is a program that must go on.

Above all this, however, the most important thing in my mind is—I am prejudiced, I admit, I do not want to pay the extra two cents; I do not think there is any need of paying the extra two cents, there is no reason, no justification for it—but at this particular time is this the wisest time to embark on a great highway construction project?

I will guarantee today that two years from today you can build four miles of road for what it will cost to build two miles in this present biennium. I would say that now is the time to retrench, save our money, and then when you can get labor at a reasonable figure, when you can buy materials and machinery to build roads at a somewhat reasonable figure, then build our roads, but do not embark upon a great project now. There is a very great recession coming, undoubtedly, and when it comes and when you need the labor, do your construction then, but do not be bamboozled into voting for any highway additional tax at this time.

Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken, I will vote "No."

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to this motion, for the simple reason that I do not feel that we should vote this bill and cut off the people from having their say whether they want to pay additional tax or not. I thoroughly endorse the arguments of my friend from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, and before me here I have a resolution from which I will read the final clause of same.

"Therefore, be it resolved, that the Wilson Valley Number 415 Grange go on record as opposed to any increase in the State tax on gasoline, and so notify our Representatives in the State Legislature.

(Signed)

LESTER W. NOEL, Master
SUMNER L. HART, Secretary

I hope that the motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. SHARPE: Mr. Speaker and Members: I rise in opposition to this bill. About half of the people—I guess about half of the people in my district are farmers, and they earn their living mostly with trucks, and if the Legislature has seen fit to make it possible for the trucking companies not to pay anywhere near their proportionate part, I am not going to be a party to the taxing of our farmers to help build the roadbeds for these trucks.

I want to endorse what the gentleman from Rockland (Mr. Sleeper) has just said.

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am in the same boat as is my good friend, Judge McGlauffin, from Portland. I am going to vote "yes". I don't believe in the bill but I am going to vote "yes".

There is one thing I don't believe in. I believe the cities and towns should have relief from some other tax measure besides the gasoline measure. I believe the gasoline money should go on the highways—not for the cities and towns to use for some other purpose.

There are other tax measures, I understand, coming along, where the cities and towns should have some relief but not through the gasoline tax.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a member of the second largest Grange in the State and they have taken a vote against this tax measure, and they asked me to represent them so I shall have to go on record against this vote.

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

Mr. FOWLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I was elected to this House at the special session last January I made a promise, that any tax measure which came before this body, of which I am happily pleased to be a member of such body, that I would try to canvass and get the majority

opinion of people in this district, and this city of Augusta.

I will say that I live here on the hill overlooking this State House and in the past week there have been eleven people come to my house personally, in opposition to this bill; not a one in favor of it. The only ones in favor of it that I could find seemed to be here in the State House. Therefore, in justice to the people who elected me from the city of Augusta, I feel it my duty to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. BICKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have to rise in opposition to this bill. I am in the same position that some of the other Members are in—I, too, belong to the sixth largest Grange in the State of Maine, representing three hundred and fifty members or more. I, too, have been approached by quite a few people in my city who say a lot in favor of this bill. Now I think that we are not making enough in my judgment, of the increased amount of revenue that is going to come into the State through registration of new automobiles and also the increase in consumption of gasoline. That is not going to be any small penny at all. As I said, in the next two years thousands upon thousands of our present old automobiles are going to be changed to new ones, and instead of a tax of perhaps ten or a dozen dollars, that is going to be double, and we are going to get a large number of new cars.

There is one other point: I happen to live in the industrial cities of Lewiston and Auburn, and there are thousands of our working people who live outside in the country, and there are more homes going up in the country districts than there have been for many years. They have to commute back and forth over the highway, and their tax bill, whether it is two cents more or less, has to be taken into consideration in the expense of their living.

To the Representatives in this House it probably would not make much difference whether or not you paid a few dollars more for gasoline, but please remember that many people who have to figure on dollars and even cents, and it is going to hit the low-income person to quite a large degree.

Now there is going to be, of course, in this Legislature, large

sums of money required for new taxes in the different matters, and I am wondering just how far the people can stand these extra taxes.

I have owned an automobile this makes the thirty-seventh year. I have driven over all kinds of roads, and it is a very surprising thing to me, and a wonder to me, to realize the increase in good roads that has come about during that time. It is most marvelous. We never would have thought that this immense amount of money which has been paid out on good roads in the State of Maine could ever stand. And consequently, I am not opposed to good roads, and if I could vote on this bill personally, I would vote in favor of it, but I have to say that I have to vote for the people whom I represent, and I firmly believe that the people whom I represent are not in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I think there are a good many arguments in the House. I come from a city of about six thousand people and none of them have written me about this bill. The only ones that have bothered me for about an hour and a half have been the oil men, who have come in and wanted me to vote "No". I am voting "Yes" on this bill regardless of the oil men.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lovell, Mr. McKeen.

Mr. McKEEN: Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill on the ground that it is going to hurt the gas dealers up on the border. Where I come from we can almost spit across the border there. You can own a gas tank there in the town of Fryeburg, and still live within the village. I am not opposing this bill simply because I belong to the Grange, because I don't believe as a whole that the Grange has anything to do with it. Our Pomona went on record as favoring this bill.

This bill reminds me somewhat of an instance that happened up in our town about probably a year ago. An old fellow planted his garden up there. The woodchucks bothered him. He had a neighbor who had three boys, and he told the boys that he would give them twenty-five cents apiece for every woodchuck they would catch. The next morning a young boy came in with a wood-

chuck and the man earmarked him and paid the boy a quarter. The boy went off with the woodchuck. It being the last week in July, the next morning they didn't catch any woodchucks, but they thought they weren't going to get as much as they thought they would, perhaps, for the Fourth, so the other boy came back with the woodchuck. The man kind of grinned and he gave the boy a quarter and the boy went home. They didn't catch any woodchucks the next night. The next day the older boy fetched back a woodchuck, and the old gentleman kind of smiled and he gave him a quarter. And then he turned around and he says, "Boys, before you come back again I want you to bring a new woodchuck. I have paid for this three times."

Now when the first gas tax was put on gas we were told that a two-cent gas tax and registration fees would take care of the bond issue. We found out through administration that two provisions took about half of this amount of money and we were only getting about half of the money that we expected to get. So in a few years they came back and tacked on another two cents. And then what happened? Along came the New Deal and the war, and the government wanted some money, and knowing well how easy it was to get it, they found out through Maine how easy it was to collect this tax, so they tacked on a cent and a half more. Now we haven't money enough and we are coming back and asking the taxpayers for two cents more.

When you buy a car today you pay \$100 to \$125 in tax; when you get it home you buy your registration and driver's license, insurance, and then you go back to your tax assessor and you are going to pay somewhere from nineteen to twenty-five dollars more for excise tax on that car. And then you think you are already to ride. No; you have to have ten gallons of gasoline. You have to pay two cents more. There is sixty cents more tax that you pay. If you put any oil in, you are going to pay a tax on that. It is going to cost you thirty-five to forty cents for every eighty miles that you drive that car as long as you live.

Now it seems to me that it is about time for this body of people, if they want more money, to bring

in a new wood chuck. I hope that this bill does not go through.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Leavitt.

Mr. LEAVITT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to this bill for two reasons, especially two reasons. Perhaps there is no man in this House, or woman, who drives in the course of a month over our State roads any more than I do in my work.

However, the fact that I would have to pay two cents out of my mileage fees does not sway my opinion against this bill. My opinion has been in opposition to the bill, due to the fact that my constituents in my area have written me and called me all in opposition to the bill.

Now it might be said that when we are sent down here that we should have in our own minds the right to bring out all opinions as to what should be done representing the people; but I think on a measure as important as this that the people should have a chance to express their own opinion as to whether they should pay taxes or not for this particular bill. So as the bill stands today, as it is in this form, I am opposed to it on that ground and I must vote "No."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Naples, Mr. Bove.

Mr. BOVE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the 93rd House of Representatives: As long as I am going to vote "Yes" on this particular bill, I wish to state my reasons.

It is true that when I first came here this winter and this bill was introduced I certainly was opposed then, but today I have changed. If I may, please, I will tell you my reasons.

I am a great believer in paying my bills in currency and not in apologies. I believe if I am going to use the roads of our State that I should pay my proportional part of the cost. We need the money, and we have been told that this money is going to get us good roads.

What is two cents additional on a gallon of gas? What would you say, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you had to pay \$1.40 for a gallon of gas, or \$1.30 for a gallon of gas? What would you say then?

Ladies and Gentlemen, if I may tell you, please: On the 9th day of

January, 1930 I happened to be in that beautiful city of Naples, Italy, and I felt that I wanted to drive, and it was one of the most beautiful drives in the world from Naples to Capri. I had to pay \$1.20—it was not for a gallon, it was for a liter, which was equivalent to five quarts. I did not care; I was only too glad to pay that sum of money. For what? Because it was a recreation, and I wanted to observe the beautiful country, and I was willing to pay it.

Now on February 1st., this same year, a month later, in the beautiful city of Paris, I paid \$1.30 in American money for a liter of gasoline.

Now, Members, if we do desire good roads and if we do feel as though we must use our good roads, it is up to us to do it, and I am willing to pay my proportional part of this. Therefore, I am going to vote "Yes" on this bill.

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you.

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

Mr. BICKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is just one little item that I would like to present. I asked a number of the members here in this House how much the government tax was on our roads, and I am sorry to say that only two or three out of ten could actually tell. They apparently did not know. Perhaps you know now and perhaps you do not know how much it is, but it is one and a half cents a gallon.

Now when you buy ten gallons of gas it is not forty cents, but you pay fifty-five cents at the present time, or five and a half cents a gallon. Now if you stop at a gas station and buy ten gallons of gas under this new regulation, you have to remember that seventy-five cents of it is going for gasoline tax. It seems to me that is a pretty high rate of taxation. Just think it over.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House? I represent nine towns in the northern part of Waldo County. In those nine towns there are five Granges. Four of those Granges I have heard nothing from either one way or the other in regard to this gas tax. The other Grange has notified me

that they have gone on record as favoring the gas tax. I myself operate four trucks and two automobiles, and I assure the members of this House that I use them and drive a considerable number of miles a year. I shall vote "Yes" on this tax, because I believe in a pay-as-you-go program.

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

Mr. JUDKINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because the people I represent do not want to pay this gasoline tax; therefore I shall vote "No."

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Boothbay Harbor, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, I find that I misunderstood the situation. The emergency of course does not apply at the present time. Therefore when a vote is taken I shall vote to keep this bill alive. I shall vote "Yes."

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, that the House accept the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee. More than one-fifth of the members present having indicated their consent, the yeas and nays are in order.

The House will be in order. While the Clerk is calling the roll, the House and guests will please be as quiet as possible.

The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, that the House accept the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee will vote "Yes," and those who are not in favor of the acceptance of the report will vote "No." The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Allen, Ames, Anderson, Atherton, Bell, Berryman, Boulier, Bove, Bowker, Brewer, Broggi, Brown, Milford; Brown, Unity; Brown, Wayne; Burgess, Burton, Byron, Campbell, Carville, Chase, Cape Elizabeth; Christensen, Collins, Cousins, Day, Dicker, Dufour, Elliott, Ellis, Emerson, Finnegan, Gallant, Gray, Hall, Hammond, Harris, Haskell, Hayward, House, Jennings, Johnston, Jordan, Saco; Loughton, Lee, Lombard, Longstaff, MacPherson, Marsans, McClure, McGlauffin, McGown, Meloon, Mills,

Morison, Nichols, Palmer, Palmeter, Patterson, Payson, Peirce, Perkins, Prout, Rich, Robbins, Ross, Russell, Sargent, Savage, Smith, Exeter; Stearns, Sterling, Stetson, Sweetser, Tabb, Thompson, Torrey, Turner, Webber, Wight, Williams, Auburn; Woodbury.

NAY—Adams, Benn, Berry, Bickford, Bird, Brown, Baileyville; Cado-rette, Carey, Chase, Limington; Clements, Cole, Cormier, Curtis, Daniels, Dean, DeSanctis, Dostie, Lewiston; Dostie, Winslow; Doucette, Fitch, Foley, Fowler, Fuller, Buckfield; Fuller, Hallowell; Hanson, Hatch, Heanssler, Hobbs, Holt, Jalbert, Jordan, South Portland; Judkins, Kelly, Kent, Labbe, Lacharite, Leavitt, Legard, Lessard, Lord, Malenfant, Marshall, Martin, McKeen, Moreau, Moulton, Muskie, Nadeau, Plummer, Poulin, Randall, Rankin, Rollins, Seeger, Sharpe, Sleeper, Smart, Smith, Westbrook; Snow, St. Pierre, Thomas, Tremblay, Violette, Weeks, Williams, Topsham; Woodworth.

ABSENT—Dorsey, Silsby.

Yes 80, No 66, Absent 2.

The **SPEAKER**: Eighty having voted in the affirmative and sixty-six having voted in the negative, two being absent, the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee has been accepted.

This being a printed bill, is it the pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended and the bill be given its first and second reading at this time?

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its two several readings and was tomorrow assigned for third reading.

On motion by Mr. Mills of Farmington, the House recessed until 4:00 P. M.

After Recess — 4:00 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Privileges of Club Liquor Licenses" (S. P. 411) (L. D. 1159) (In the Senate, passed to be Engrossed) tabled on April 10th by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams, pending third reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to call your attention briefly to this Bill "An Act Relating to Privileges of Club Liquor Licenses". The law, as it now reads, is as follows: "Any club maintaining a public dining-room and catering either privately or for functions to a group not members of the club, and also any club with diningrooms letting rooms to non-members, must pay the same fee as required by a hotel located in the same municipality." Now, at the present time, the Liquor Commission has a ruling that a club that is not licensed under the same provision and pays the same fee as a hotel can not let premises for other functions. That is they can not let the premises where a public dance hall will be run.

Now this particular bill adds the following: "Provided that any club having rooms on two floors shall have the privilege of renting rooms for private or public functions on the floor where no liquor is sold or served, and provided, further, that while any such rooms are so rented liquor shall be served only to club members and not to guests."

We have in the State of Maine twenty-one liquor inspectors. We have numerous clubs throughout the State. These clubs have been granted the privilege of serving alcoholic beverages to members upon the payment of a smaller fee than private enterprises conducting similar sales of alcoholic beverages. Now, this Bill would allow a club, providing it has two floors, in the clubrooms, the privilege of selling alcoholic beverages while such public functions were conducted on the other floors. I should like to point out what might happen and the difficulties from the enforcement angle. We should bear in mind that we have twenty-one inspectors. In the ordinary building where there are two floors, you would come into your entryway and, if your alcoholic liquors were sold on the first floor, that would be in rooms adjoining. Next, you would proceed up the stairs to the other rooms that were let for public functions. I don't know how any enforcement officer could police such a situation. If there are three or four couples standing around or sitting around in the clubrooms, how is he to know that they are not attending the public function and stopped down-

stairs? I do not believe, and I am sure that you do not, that he can go in there and inquire from the various individuals as to whether or not they were club members. He would probably be thrown out if he did. There is another bill still pending and held by the committee which would allow letting rooms provided the sales of liquor were entirely suspended which I will not attempt, in any way, to discuss at this time, but I just want to call your attention to the difficulties of enforcement and also to point out that other clubs might have one floor only with much larger premises with a chance, perhaps, to close the doors between and lock them or shut the doors and they would be excluded when some clubs having two floors could let a part of their premises and operate as a club under the club license. This would be true even though, as I said, they were letting their hall regularly for public functions.

Because of the fact that this seems to create a situation that would be very difficult to enforce, I now move indefinite postponement of the bill.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams, that this matter be indefinitely postponed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of this committee who reported this bill out "Ought to pass" unanimously, I might say that the committee felt that inasmuch as these dances were to be held in a hall leased by another group other than that of the club, the doors of the room where they sell liquor are not accessible to anybody attending that particular dance or entertainment. Consequently, we reported the bill unanimously "Ought to pass", and I hope that the motion of my good friend from Auburn, (Mr. Williams) does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams, that the House indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act Relating to Privileges of Club Liquor Licenses". All those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: Seventy-six having voted in the affirmative and twenty-four in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, "Resolve, in Favor of an Investigation of Hydro-Electric Power Development." (H. P. 1577) (L. D. 1222). Tabled on April 11th by the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Byron, pending passage to be engrossed.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Since the order which I presented this morning deals with this subject and it is now tabled pending reproduction, I move that this item be retabled and specially assigned for Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, moves that this matter be laid on the table pending passage to be engrossed and be specially assigned for Tuesday, April 22nd. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the matter was so tabled, and so assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter, "Memorial to Congress in Favor of Changing the Method of Determining the Pollution of Clam Flats." (H. P. 1687) (L. D. 1393) tabled on April 11th by the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Emerson, pending the motion by that gentleman that the Memorial be adopted without reference to a committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Emerson.

On motion by Mr. Emerson, the House voted that the Memorial be adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, Senate Report "Ought to pass in a New Draft" under a new title of Bill "An Act Relating to Local Option Provisions" (S. P. 503) (L. D. 1382) of the Committee on Temperance on Bill "An Act Relating to Local Option Provisions Concerning Malt Liquor." (S. P. 352) (L. D. 984) tabled on April 14th by the gentle-

man from Augusta, Mr. Peirce, pending acceptance of report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Peirce, the House voted to accept the "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee.

Thereupon, the bill having already been printed, was given its two several readings under suspension of the rules, and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, "Resolve, Providing for an Additional State Pension for George H. Babb, of Augusta." (H. P. 1449) (L. D. 1322) (In the Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence) tabled on April 14th by the gentleman from Boothbay Harbor, Mr. Perkins, pending consideration; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Perkins, the House voted to recede from its former action.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, I now move indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "A," and my reason for doing so is this: This is a Resolve in favor of George H. Babb, of Augusta, for an additional pension of \$10 a week.

Now, I am not opposed to this pension, but the Amendment which I asked to be indefinitely postponed says that the money is to be paid out of the Pension Accumulation Fund. That is a fund to which he did not contribute—and it is that Bill that I referred to a few days ago, and it is breaking down that Bill.

I move that the amendment be indefinitely postponed, and perhaps later we may have a Committee of Conference and work out a method whereby Mr. Babb can obtain a pension from some other source.

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

Mr. PEIRCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As sponsor of this bill I would like to state that I am in accord with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Boothbay Harbor, Mr. Perkins.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed?

The motion prevailed, and Senate

Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, the resolve was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter, "Committee Amendment "A" to "Resolve in Favor of the University of Maine for General Operations" (H. P. 79) (L. D. 67) tabled on April 14 by the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Collins, pending adoption; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As has just been stated this Bill came out of the Appropriations Committee with a report "Ought to Pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

The Amendment which has come out of the Appropriation Committee in regard to funds for general operations of the University of Maine on the Orono Campus cuts exactly in half the amount called for in the original bill. The bill asked that in order to provide funds additional to the regular one mill tax, the sum of \$350,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, be appropriated, and a like amount also be provided for the next fiscal year. The Amendment, if adopted, would cut this back to \$175,000 for each of the two fiscal years. In my opinion, this reduction is not justified and, if adopted, would certainly make it impossible to carry out the program that is so badly needed at the University of Maine and which, I believe, the citizens of Maine are demanding.

I have a great deal of respect for the judgment of the Appropriations Committee, but in this instance, I feel that they did not fully take into account all the factors involved. In the first place, we must all realize that the University of Maine has increased its enrollment from about 2100 students in 1941 to about 4000 at the end of 1946. Of this number, 2800 are veterans, about 800 being on the Brunswick campus. It is planned to move the 800 from Brunswick to Orono next fall when the new dormitories are completed. This will mean however that new veterans just returning to college or enrolling for the first time, together with some of the freshman boys in civilian life, will again have to be housed at Brunswick. There simply won't be enough

room on the Orono Campus to house everybody. Thus, it is readily seen that if the Brunswick operation continues, the demands upon the University of Maine on the Orono Campus have increased tremendously. The two operations tie in together. If we wish to help out the Veteran, as I believe we all do, then, funds must be provided that will allow the University to do it. As you probably realize the House has already passed the resolve appropriating money for Brunswick which was an indication that in this branch, at least, we were united in our determination to help the Veteran. This resolve, the Brunswick resolve, is now tabled in the other branch of the Legislature. If the Brunswick measure finally passes, then I say the amount called for in this bill, namely the \$350,000 per year for the next two years, is the additional amount required at Orono. Of course, all of these revenue bills will be of no avail unless we pass a major tax measure.

In talking from the Veteran angle, it is interesting to note how the Veteran has performed from the academic viewpoint. From figures released by Dr. Hauck on the standing of veterans for the fall semester of 1946-47, the men Veterans at Orono received higher rank than the non-veterans. On the basis of a marking system of which 4.00 is the highest grade obtainable, the average grades showed that the Veteran in Orono, the Veteran man, received an average of 2.406 against a non-veteran average of 2.20 and in the case of the women, the Veteran woman, the average was a little higher, 2.553. In that instance the non-veteran women had 2.556. There was three thousandths of a point difference between the two. I just mentioned this to show that the Veterans are really doing all right scholastically. An average of 3 points or better, which means that they were on the Dean's List. That is the result obtained by 397 Veterans at the Orono Campus and 141 Veterans at the Brunswick Campus. I think these figures are significant to show that the Veteran is truly appreciative of his opportunity under the G. I. Bill and that he is taking his education seriously.

Nearly two years ago, the Governor called a committee of educators together to determine the best way of handling the problem

of Veterans' education under the G. I. Bill. It is my understanding that the four colleges in the State were represented on this committee. And after careful consideration it was decided that the University of Maine would be able to serve more Veterans than any of the other colleges of the State and that the principal drive in this regard was to accentuate the program through the University of Maine. The Board of Trustees of the University, and I would like, at this time, to assure you that I am not a member of the Board of Trustees, under the splendid leadership of Dr. Hauck have attempted to do this job, and I know that you will agree with me that they have bent every effort to do the best job possible. When you see the results of this effort, as some of us have at first hand, you realize the magnitude of their job. In doing this job the University had to do things which in normal times they might have hesitated to do. They have had to use up the reserve funds of the University to carry on. So that now, when they seek additional funds, they have no reserves to fall back upon.

You will remember that at the Special Session last July the University asked for \$2,000,000 for building 3 new permanent dormitories. At that session only \$1,000,000 was appropriated and the University was authorized to borrow another million dollars if required. The Trustees have had to borrow this money and during the first year of the loan, at least, there will be no income to help pay it back. The payment of this loan alone will be an additional burden on the students of the University and will have to be repaid from the profits on board and room.

I think it may have been the thought of some of the Appropriations Committee that the additional sums necessary might be raised in other ways. In fact, I have heard it stated that possibly by increasing the tuition the balance could be made up. However, I believe that this is a fallacy to a very considerable degree. Even if the tuition were raised, there still is the very definite need of the \$350,000. You will remember, therefore, that the cost of board and room has been materially advanced to meet present high costs. This, in itself, is a direct burden on the students. In

addition to this, the tuition has already been increased by the Board of Trustees by \$25 per year for students within the State and by \$50 for students outside the State and those attending the University under the G. I. Bill.

In considering tuition, it should be borne in mind that the University is a State institution and that the tuition in Maine is as high, or higher, than in most land grant colleges.

No. I don't think that the increased tuition is the answer to the problem, though it might help to some extent but at the same time might prevent many worthy boys and girls from receiving a higher education. The tuition angle, I think, can largely be disregarded as it will not meet the needs of the University.

The only way to let the University carry on its comprehensive program is to grant them money enough to do the job. I believe that the \$350,000 per year is the minimum amount.

For these reasons, therefore, I believe the amendment would cripple the institution and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that Committee Amendment A to Legislative Document No. 67 be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. WIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to oppose my colleague from Caribou, Mr. Collins, but I will have to do it in this instance. I have been advised that I should not, because the University of Maine is in Penobscot County, and we should not oppose any appropriation for Penobscot County.

Now, the cost of each student, as near as can be figured out at the present time at the University of Maine—I think a fair figure would be \$460 per year. The tuition of residents is \$175 per year. It seems as if these resident students might pay one-half of the cost of that tuition, which would be \$230 per year or \$55 more than at present. We have, I believe, some 2,000 G. I.'s who would pay more, I believe if the State charged more for tuition and that would be paid for by the United States Government. So that this \$175,000 would be largely overcome by that increase in tuition which, I believe, should take place. \$225 for tuition is not out of line with other

colleges—Bates is \$350; Colby, \$350; Brown is \$450; Middlebury, \$400; Northeastern, \$350; Tufts \$400; Union, \$400; Wesleyan, \$450, and Williams, \$450. We would still be well below the cost of tuition in those various colleges.

The G. I.'s at the present time, I believe, pay \$300; the government, I believe, would pay more if we charged more, and therefore it would largely be taken care of by the United States Government. Now there are some hardship cases, no doubt, in the University of Maine. I know of quite a few, but where students have a will there is a way of getting through that college. I know of three girls from one small town in this State, sisters, their mother a school teacher, and two of those girls have already graduated from the University of Maine. They did it on a shoestring. They got a lot out of that more so, probably than a great many of those students who have rich fathers and rich mothers. I have, at the present time, a young man working for me in my establishment; he works part time, five days a week; he earns about \$15 a week during that time. He has nine brothers and sisters and his mother is now teaching school in the State of Maine and she is healthy and happy and that boy is going to that college on very, very limited means but I think he is going to get a lot out of that college.

The Appropriations Committee, I believe, is to be congratulated this year. It has been a tough job. Everybody wants to cut down the expenditures of the State and they have had to stand up before these various demands for large sums of money. They have made a report in this case after investigating and hearing the proponents of that measure and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Amendment will have adoption.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Brewer.

Mr. BREWER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It might be interesting to members who have not worked on the Appropriations Committee to understand how some of the reports reach you. In the first place, we decided that we would consider the various bills involving some of the money from a monetary point of view. Then we considered the fact of whether we might get

new revenue because they involved new revenue. And then, further in the process, we decided we would forget the dollar sign hanging in front of us, and the fact that new revenue was needed, and that we would go on the merits of the case. Apparently my feeling now is that this Bill must have been sent out while we had the dollar sign before us. I say this to you because, as a member of the University of Maine Committee, I spent one evening and the next day looking over the University of Maine. I believe sincerely that we are committed to carry on the program that we, you might as well say, have talked the University of Maine into establishing on their grounds.

Now why do I say this sort of thing? A year ago, before our Special Session, the Governor and Council took money out of the contingent fund and encouraged the Trustees of the University of Maine to absorb every veteran that they could possibly take care of. You may say why didn't they do it at the other colleges, Bates and Colby? Because the University of Maine happens to draw not only Federal funds but also State funds and is known as a land grant college. The reason these universities are known as land grant colleges is because of the fact that some of our forefathers decided that there were many boys and girls who could not pay the cost of private schools and by a little subsidization, so to speak, could be encouraged and could have their college education, which they could not have if they paid the fees asked in the private schools. The University of Maine started out and went as far as they could. In the Special Session we came down here and gave them various sums of money and felt that was the thing to do. As Mr. Collins has told you we have already passed money to take care of the Brunswick end. Now what you have done, you have talked the University of Maine and its Trustees into doubling their membership there. I would say to you that if this thing had not occurred, with the reserves the University had built up, and going along as they were, they wouldn't need very much money today. But you have talked them into doubling their attendance and if you make this cut at this time, you are saying to them that we're all done with the Veterans' program. I say to

you that we have talked them into doubling their attendance. They are asking half as much again as they ordinarily would have asked. They do have a one mill tax on the State valuation. They are asking for half of that because they have doubled their enrollment. I feel that if we walk out—I am not speaking for the Appropriations Committee, I am speaking as an individual—I feel that if we walk out from under the Trustees and the men that did the job that they have done, that it isn't very good policy and I wouldn't be too proud of it and I don't think that any member of this Legislature would. I am willing to stay with the University and go all out until such a time that we feel that we have given the Veterans their chance to get the education that they need. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Caribou (Mr. Collins) prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say as a member of the University of Maine Committee for four terms that I agree with everything that Mr. Collins has said and everything that Mr. Brewer has said, and I sincerely hope that the motion prevails.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to go on record as doing everything I can for the Veterans to get them an education. I also have a slight feeling for some students who would like to get a high school education in this State. We have had plenty of bills before the Appropriations Committee asking for money to help launch bills maintaining high schools. One in particular is the town of Van Buren, which has a tax rate, if I recall correctly, of \$100 and they have borrowed what money they can borrow. They still lack about \$60,000 to get any kind of high school at all. Another one is the Town of Freedom, which just lost its only high school they had, the Academy, by fire, on February 15th. They furnish a high school for four towns in that vicinity. At the present time they have no place to go at all. I would like to see this go through to take care of some of these schools and that is the reason I signed the report as I did.

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

Mr. LEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to endorse everything that Mr. Collins and Mr. Brewer have said in this matter. We have had various measures in the Special Session and this Session for the help of Veterans. We have not done very much. I think that the least we can do is to follow through on what we have done for the University of Maine.

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

Mr. FINNEGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am very sympathetic with the University of Maine and its program; I think we all are. But I am inclined to go along with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wight, and Mr. Brown, that we can not concentrate all our affection on one spot, and that we have a big problem here to consider. It is with great reluctance that I, as a member of the Appropriations Committee have had to file "ought not to pass" some of these programs that call for aid for secondary schools. Mr. Brown has mentioned Van Buren, Bridgton Academy and Monmouth. We have about five or six hundred thousand dollars worth of proposed urgent construction required, and I think we have to use a little bit of judgment about it. I can appreciate the loyalty of the gentlemen. I certainly do not want to go against my good friend, Mr. Brewer, who I have fought side by side with on a great many of these matters.

This was a unanimous report. I have seen nothing in the situation that has changed it very much. We have considered all these things, we have fought them out thoroughly, and I believe that if the Trustees do a little something to increase their tuition, it will accomplish the purpose.

It is not easy, but it is not easy for these other people to go entirely without funds. I don't think that a \$75 increase, or \$50, as Mr. Wight said is going to prevent any boy who is really entitled to an education from going forward. This is not entirely a G. I. school. Let us not be deluded about that either. We have a G. I. program but there are students in great numbers who are not classified as G. I.'s. I hope that the Bill as recommended will have passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I have been a Trustee of the University since 1929 and, for the entire period since, a member of its Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees. I believe I am familiar with the financial history of the University. I went on the Board at the same time that the mill tax was adopted which put the University of Maine onto a permanent basis, giving us a certain sum which the Trustees were to allocate for all of the purposes of the University. Having been put on that basis in 1929 until war came in 1941 we paid off a substantial debt which existed when the mill tax was passed and traced back to World War I. We built Merrill Hall, we built Oak Hall, we built Coburn Hall, we have reconstructed several of the buildings, we have built wings on the Arts and Science Building, we have built the Chemistry Building, we have built Estabrook Hall, in part by Federal Grant, and in part by money which we borrowed or which had been saved; we built several buildings for the College of Agriculture, and we built over the heating plant. And we never asked the State for a cent for any of those purposes until we came up into this period of emergency. In 1945 we had substantial reserves — \$600,000 to \$700,000 which we had saved during that period to be devoted to a construction program. The war ended and the program of Veterans' education came, we had to spend about half the money for temporary facilities for Veterans and about the other half went into the heating plant and to complete the Library which we had to complete in order to provide emergency classroom facilities.

Having done all that, having taken steps at our own risk to expand the enrollment about 50%, we were asked by the State to do more. We had exhausted our own resources. The Governor and Council gave us \$150,000 to open Brunswick. The Special Session of the Legislature to carry us over the emergency gave us \$250,000 which has been spent. We asked for \$2,000,000 to build three dormitories which are going to cost \$2,000,000, we now believe. Two of them are now far on the road to completion.

The Legislature gave us a million dollars. We borrowed the other million dollars on the credit of the University through Legislative consent. That's a loan which we have to pay off.

Now, we have undertaken other commitments, with the authorization, if this Legislature grants it, to expand Brunswick, which will give us a student enrollment of about 4800 as compared to a capacity, what we deem to be our capacity pre-war, of 2100 students at Orono. We asked the Special Session to give us \$400,000 to add to funds which we now have in reserve which are specially segregated for a Plant, Science, and Engineering building. The Legislature approved the request but it included it along with the bond issue bonus measure which was referred to the people and we did not get the \$400,000; so that for our classroom facilities, today, we're thrown back on our own resources. We're desperate for more classroom facilities, and we must build those buildings as soon as we can. Even if we do have, as has been suggested here, even if we should somewhat increase our income, by \$100,000 to \$125,000 a year by increasing tuition, that does not scratch the facilities for taking care of the needs of the University in order to provide facilities for the students which we are committed to take.

In 1929, when the mill tax started, we were getting \$759,000 a year. We have never got as much as that since; we're under that now under the regular mill tax appropriation. All of these things which I have told you about that have been done in construction and in building up the University have been done out of that mill tax fund. If you compare the record at the University with the record of any other department of the State Government, I think you will agree that it shows prudent management. Now, as I say, I am familiar with these figures. The Trustees, in the time I have been on the Board, have always come to the Legislature for exactly what they expected to get. They have never padded their estimates and they are not doing so now. We are asking for the minimum amount with which we believe we can get along. It is not a trading proposition; there is no room for it in pruning, there is nothing allowed in it for a cushion

or surplus, or construction. I should like to assure you on the basis of that record, with the unanimous assurance of the Board of Trustees for this request, that we need every cent of the money which we are requesting.

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

Mr. PEIRCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The prospect of an increased tuition at the University is rather alarming. There are a great many sons and daughters of Maine citizens, who attend the University of Maine, who could not afford to attend any other educational institution. It is either the University of Maine or nothing to a great many of them. There has already been an increase of tuition. I'm afraid that a further increase might preclude a great many deserving students from an opportunity to obtain higher education. Therefore, I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone the Committee Amendment will prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Collins, that the House indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A" to "Resolve in Favor of the University of Maine for General Operations."

All those in favor of indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A" will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: Eighty-one having voted in the affirmative and twenty-one having voted in the negative, Committee Amendment "A" is indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon the Resolve was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the seventh tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Veterans' Permit to Hunt and Fish Free." (S. P. 178) (L. D. 523) (In the Senate passed to be engrossed) tabled on April 15th by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Robbins, pending third reading.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins.

Mr. COUSINS: Mr. Speaker and

Members of the House: Mr. Robbins, the gentleman from Houlton, tabled this measure, yesterday, on my request as I could not be here yesterday afternoon. This is a piece of legislation that I have missed completely. Until a few days ago I did not realize that there was such a thing. This would change the law which the Legislature enacted during the War whereby Veterans receive permits to hunt and fish free. The wording of the law then was that they would receive this permit for two years from the date of discharge or the end of the War, whichever was later. They now seek to strike out "or the end of the War or whichever is later."

I could not understand why anybody would want to do this. It was one of the few things that they did give the Veterans; one of the few things that most of the Veterans took advantage of; one of the few things that really didn't cost too much, actually, when you come right down in dollars and cents.

They say, "we need the money in the Fish and Game Department, we are in a bad way." Yet I find that they are also going to try to increase the price of these licenses for hunting and fishing during this session. I can't go along with them on this measure; it doesn't seem right. It seems to me that they are definitely going back on their word that they gave to the Veterans that they would have a free hunting and fishing permit for two years from the date of their discharge or the end of the War, whichever is later. Now they don't like it. I am not going to say much more. Mr. Speaker, I move indefinite postponement of the bill.

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

Mr. MUSKIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As Mr. Cousins was speaking, I pulled out a hunting and fishing permit that I was given on my discharge from the Army last December. I read it, and, true enough, it says: "This permit expires two years after the official end of the War."

As I remember the proclamation of the President of the United States of last January, the War ended then, which would have meant that this would be good until 1949. If this Bill is passed, I assume that this will expire next November. To me, that means little or nothing.

I enjoy hunting and fishing in the State of Maine sufficiently to pay my share of the freight; but I am thinking about those thousands of Veterans who have come back and who have been given nothing to speak of by the State of Maine as yet.

Last summer you spoke of giving them a token of your gratitude. This is a slight token, but it is an invitation to them to enjoy again those beauties of nature and the facilities of nature which they missed so much while they were away. I think it is little enough for us to do for them, not to take back this slight token which we have already given them. For that reason, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousin, will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Byron.

Mr. BYRON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When this bill was passed, it was certainly the intent of the Legislature to give the Veteran a two year free hunting and fishing permit. I just can't understand the attitude of the two previous speakers that nothing is being done for the Veterans. We have just killed an amendment here for the University of Maine cutting their appropriation in half and I think the Veterans are going to get something from that. If I recall correctly, Mr. Muskie, during the Special Session when they were asking for the bonus, said "Do not give us anything that we have to help pay for."

Well, now, if this Bill is indefinitely postponed, we surely will have to make up the deficit somewhere. Everybody will have to pay for that. Mr. Speaker, this Bill, if it is indefinitely postponed, will cost the Fish and Game Department somewhere between \$130,000 and \$140,000 annually. I hope the motion by the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: For the first time I would like to speak briefly in favor of my good friend from Fort Kent, or rather for the motion which he has made. Assuming the figure which has been quoted as to loss of revenue to the Fish and

Game Department is correct — and I have no doubt but what it is — to me it is not a matter of dollars; it is a matter of keeping faith with whatever promise was made to the Veterans. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Fort Kent (Mr. Cousins) does prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins, that the House indefinitely postpone Bill "An Act Relating to Veterans' Permit to Hunt and Fish Free."

All those in favor of indefinite postponement will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the house the eighth tabled and today assigned matter Bill "An Act Providing for Giving Complimentary Hunting and Fishing Licenses by Governor to Congressional Medal of Honor Holders." (H. P. 1667) (L. D. 1372) (In the House, passage to be engrossed reconsidered) tabled on April 15th by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Robbins, pending passage to be engrossed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Cousins.

Mr. Cousins presented House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1667, L. D. 1372, Bill "An Act Providing for Giving Complimentary Hunting and Fishing Licenses by Governor to Congressional Medal of Honor Holders."

Amend said Bill by striking out the underlined sentence at the end of said Bill and inserting in place thereof the following underlined sentence:

"The governor may grant two year complimentary hunting and fishing licenses to holders of the congressional medal of honor, upon their application therefor."

House Amendment "A" was adopted and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the ninth tabled

and today assigned matter, House Majority Report "Ought not to pass" and House Minority Report "Ought to pass in a New Draft" (H. P. 1681) (L. D. 1392) of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Relating to Conveyance of Elementary School Pupils." (H. P. 337) (L. D. 210) tabled April 15th, by the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Broggi, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BROGGI: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill is a permissive bill giving local school authorities the privilege, if in their discretion they deem it wise to do so, of picking up private school students. I feel that it is a good bill. This morning, on the floor of this House, I said that my town had the highest paid teachers in Maine. It is a true statement. The reason we are able to pay high teachers' salaries in our community, the reason we have made so much advancement in public school education, is due to the fact that nearly four out of seven students in my community attend public school. Three students out of seven attend private schools and by that reason save my community an awful lot of money. To be more specific, our public school educational cost in my community is approximately \$264,000 annually. On the basis of the fact that there are three-quarters as many private school students as public school students, my community has an annual saving of approximately \$200,000. Now, I think that it is prudent business, good sound business, for us, the public school authorities of my community and other communities who have the same situation, to extend the courtesy to these private schools of merely carrying their children to school. It is the only request that has ever been made to me during my tenure of office as a public school official by these private schools and, in my opinion, it is an honest request. As I said before, I think it is consistent with good, sound, prudent business to grant this request. This is not my Bill but I am very much in favor of this Bill. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move that the minority report of the Committee be accepted and when the vote is taken I request a division.

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

Mr. McGLAUFNIN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word in favor of this Bill. I notice, in the Constitution of Maine, it provides in Article I, Section 1: "All men are born equally free and independent," and in Section 3 of our Constitution, Article I, it says: "All men have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences."

Now we have a provision that children in our State shall attend school, but if they attend our schools in private or parochial schools, equally proficient, they may do so. Now, as I understand this proposition, this would enable the buses, on their regular routes, to take Catholic children on those buses to their destination without putting those buses to any inconvenience whatsoever. It looks to me perfectly reasonable, perfectly sound. Why should we have religious prejudices that would cut out such a simple request? I want to take just a moment to tell you how far prejudice, religious prejudice, goes when there is no occasion for it whatsoever.

Some years ago, when the Ku Klux Klan was flourishing in this State, a friend of mine came to me, and he said, "Do you know that one of these Catholics would cut your throat just as quick as a wink?" I said, "My friend, you are awfully ignorant. I have a camp up in the White Mountains where my nearest and only neighbor is a Catholic, and I have been hunting with him and fishing with him. I have eaten with him and I have slept with him, and if I should get lost in the mountains of New Hampshire — and there is plenty of opportunity to do so — there is not a man in this world who would put himself out so much to help find me as that fellow that you said would cut my throat. I would trust him with my life, any where, any time."

I merely mention that case. I thank God for the Catholic Church. Some of the best men I have ever known were Catholic priests. Now let us not be so narrow that we can not take these children along on our buses when it does not cost us a cent. Let us pass this Bill.

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

Mr. McCLURE: Mr. Speaker, I

favor this Bill also as a real Christian bill. In time of war, we made no exceptions when we transported our grown-up children. Why should we make that exception before they have reached maturity? We speak of tolerance. Let us live it. The best way to begin is to accept the minority report and vote "Ought to pass" here today.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Naples, Mr. Bove.

Mr. BOVE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature: I am very much in favor of this Bill and the reasons that I am in favor of it are because I am thoroughly familiar with the same situation regarding schools in the different small towns. Having been connected with the Board of Education in my town for so many years, I wish to say that in my opinion this a good legislative bill, and, therefore, I sincerely urge that the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Broggi, to accept the minority report will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Boothbay Harbor, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to say a word on this Bill that I have read it carefully and I see nothing harmful in it. It simply permits the Superintending School Committee to permit any child of school age to ride on any bus which travels on established school bus routes. I want to be a good neighbor, and, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think I will go along with my good friend from Sanford, Mr. Broggi.

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

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor of this bill. In my town there is a parochial school which accommodates between 250 and 275 pupils; a small percentage of these pupils are transported in the public school buses. A short time ago a new member was elected to our School Board. Somebody asked him if it was all right to transport parochial school children on public school buses. He said he did not know. He wrote a letter to the Commissioner's office, Commissioner of Education, and they said they had no ruling on it but they did have a letter which was the

opinion of the City Solicitor in one of our cities in which the solicitor had ruled that the law did not permit the transportation of such pupils, and he went further to say that neither did the law deny it.

You will notice the difference between the two points is this: I have a car. Nobody can claim the right to ride in my car if I don't want to let them. On the other hand, I can invite anybody to ride in my car that I want to. Now, for a great many years, in my town and other towns which have the same trouble, it has been the custom, and I am very happy to say it has been the custom in my town, to pick up those children and transport them to school. Every kindness and consideration which we ought to show to small children is represented by that act. Now, I do not believe that the people in my town and the people of the other towns which have the same trouble feel any more kindly or considerate to children than we do. There are many towns and cities of Maine which do not have this problem. In those that do, they all feel alike, and they do transport the children.

Now, the problem is not to change any existing situation as a matter of fact; the thing to do is to make the law agree with the established fact. This proposed bill simply puts in words that which is being done already. And if the people of Maine do feel kindly disposed towards these children and if they do not believe in government by indirection, let us put the law on the books where it belongs. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Sanford will prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Broggi, that the House accept the minority "Ought to pass in New Draft" report of the committee, and the same gentleman has requested a division. All those in favor of acceptance of the minority "Ought to pass in New Draft" report will please rise and remain standing until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and six having voted in the affirmative and one in the negative, the motion prevailed.

This being a printed bill, under

suspension of the rules, it was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

On motion by Mr. Ellis, of Castle Hill, the House voted to take from the table the ninth tabled and unassigned matter "An Act Relating to Registration of Motor Vehicles." (S. P. 130) (L. D. 283) Tabled on April 15 by that gentleman pending passage to be enacted.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Castle Hill, Mr. Ellis.

Mr. ELLIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action whereby we accepted the "Ought not to pass" report on Item 2 on today's calendar, L. D. 976.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Castle Hill, Mr. Ellis, moves that the House reconsider its action taken earlier in today's session whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Relating to Instruction in Scientific Alcohol Education in the Public Schools" (S. P. No. 343) (L. D. No. 976). Is this the pleasure of the House?

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Castle Hill, Mr. Ellis, that the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee will please say aye; those opposed no.

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

On motion by the gentleman from Baileyville, Mr. Brown, the House voted to take from the table the sixth tabled and unassigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation on "Resolve Authorizing the State Tax Assessor to Convey Certain Interest of the State in a Building on Land in Washington County to Fred O. Foster, of Forest City" (H. P. 1217) (L. D. 856) tabled on April 15th by that gentleman pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted.

On motion by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wight, the House voted

to take from the table the seventh tabled and unassigned matter, House Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation on "Resolve Authorizing the Maine State Park Commission to Convey a Lot of Land Situated in Bangor to William Carmalt, of Bangor" (H. P. 957) (L. D. 559) tabled on April 15th by that gentleman pending acceptance of report; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the "Ought

not to pass" report of the committee was accepted.

The SPEAKER: If there is no further business to come before the House, the Clerk will read the notices.

On motion by Mr. Woodbury, of New Gloucester,

Adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.