

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

SENATE

Thursday, May 8, 1947.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend T. O. Akeley of Gardiner.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

From the House:

The Committee on Legal Affairs to which was recommitted Bill "An Act Creating a School District for the Oakfield-Merrill-Smyrna-Dyer Brook Community," (H. P. 1627) (L. D. 1301) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendments "A" and "B".

Comes from the House, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendments "A" and "B".

In the Senate, the report was read and adopted and the bill was given its first reading; Committee Amendments A and B were read and adopted in concurrence and under suspension of the rules the bill was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Create the Ashland Area Community School District," (H. P. 1613) (L. D. 1279) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Comes from the House, the report read and adopted and the bill passed to be engrossed, as amended.

In the Senate, the report was read and adopted and the bill was given its first reading; committee Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence and under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The Majority of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Amending the Law Relating to the State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation," (H. P. 1461) (L. D. 1065) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Senators:

(Signed)

HOPKINS of Kennebec
HASKELL of Penobscot

Representatives:

BROWN of Unity
CHASE of Cape Elizabeth

LEAVITT of Old Town
BROWN of Woodland
MARSHALL of York
SHARPE of Anson
COLLINS of Caribou

Comes from the House, the report read and accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the Senate:

Mr. HOPKINS of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate, it is doubtless of passing interest that the Senators observe we have before us a bill in which we are in agreement, except one member who did not sign the report. It is of especial interest to me inasmuch as the bill was offered by the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, and it indicates we are not as far apart in our thinking as I thought we were. From this bill you will gather that the public has at least some interest in labor matters.

This bill before us provides for a revision of the laws affecting the Board of Arbitration and Conciliation. You will remember earlier in the week I gave you names of members of the Board and told you insofar as the Committee was able to discover, the Board has done no work in the past few years and there is no mention of them in the report of the Department of Labor.

This bill revises the law in regard to the Board of Arbitration and Conciliation, by giving the governor power to investigate after a declaration of public emergency, and that the Board shall make findings and the decisions of the Board are binding on the parties, within 90 days, provided the decisions are sustained by the Courts. By the way, I might say that the present provisions of the law is that the decisions of the Board are binding only if both parties request the Board to act. I presume that this is one reason it has not been used in recent years, but of course the main reason is because there has been no labor strife. After decision by the Board the Governor may direct the attorney general to issue a mandate and enforce the decision of the Board and the Court may make investigation and can sustain or set aside the findings of the Board.

I think this law is sufficient law and is desirable and definitely recognizes that public emergencies may exist as result of labor difficulties.

There is a right of appeal on the part of either party after ten day notice, in the court of competent jurisdiction, which is desirable.

Committee Amendment "A" is very minor in nature and changes just two words in order to clarify and strengthen the bill.

I move the adoption of the report, Mr. President.

The report of the committee was adopted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading. Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence, and under suspension of the rules the bill was given its second reading.

On motion by Mr. Spear of Cumberland, the bill as amended was laid upon the table pending passage to be engrossed.

Passed to be Enacted

Bill "An Act Relating to Baxter Park Road." (S. P. 494) (L. D. 1362)

Bill "An Act Relating to Neglected Children." (S. P. 541) (L. D. 1465)

Bill "An Act Relating to Old Age Assistance." (S. P. 542) (L. D. 1468)

Bill "An Act Relating to Adoption of Neglected Children." (S. P. 543) (L. D. 1457)

Bill "An Act Relating to Aid to Dependent Children." (S. P. 544) (L. D. 1466)

"Resolve, in Favor of L. Archer Weymouth of Clinton." (S. P. 177) (L. D. 524)

(On motion by Mr. Cleaves of Cumberland, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of Washington County." (S. P. 253) (L. D. 715)

(On motion by Mr. Cleaves of Cumberland, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of William Reardon, of Sullivan." (S. P. 329) (L. D. 974)

(On motion by Mr. Cleaves of Cumberland, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, Providing for Maintenance of a Road in the Town of Lamoine." (S. P. 341) (L. D. 962)

(On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec, tabled pending final passage.)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Lincoln-Chester Bridge District." (H. P. 499) (L. D. 354)

(On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

Bill "An Act Giving Commissioner of Agriculture Authority to Es-

tablish Quarantines." (H. P. 1365) (L. D. 987)

Bill "An Act Creating a Sewer District in the Town of Sanford." (H. P. 1653) (L. D. 1335)

Bill "An Act Relating to Tuition for Pupils from Towns Not Maintaining a Standard Secondary School." (H. P. 1651) (L. D. 1349)

(On motion by Mr. Savage of Somerset, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

Bill "An Act Relating to Maintenance of Bridges on State Aid and Third Class Roads." (H. P. 1746) (L. D. 1492)

Bill "An Act Relating to Service in Divorce Cases." (H. P. 1749)

(On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

"Resolve, in Favor of Roy R. Bell, of Thomaston." (H. P. 328) (L. D. 206)

(On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of Leola J. McCourt of Strong." (H. P. 417) (L. D. 247)

(On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of Mrs. Ralph Cooper, of Madison." (H. P. 586) (L. D. 359)

(On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of Stacyville Plantation." (H. P. 1018) (L. D. 650)

(On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve to reimburse the Town of Whiting for Transportation of State Children." (H. P. 1020) (L. D. 652)

(On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of Carrie M. Brawn, of Guilford." (H. P. 1053) (L. D. 692)

(On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of the Town of Woodstock." (H. P. 1148) (L. D. 764)

(On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, to Reimburse the Town of Strong for Fighting Fire in Salem Township." (H. P. 1155) (L. D. 1494)

(On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, to Compensate Town of Houlton for Assisting Kingman to Fight Fire." (H. P. 1270) (L. D. 1483)

(On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of Irving I. Bates, of Moro." (H. P. 1611) (L. D. 1277)

(On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, Providing for the Payment of Certain Damages caused by Wild Animals." (H. P. 1738) (L. D. 1476)

(On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, Providing for the Payment of Certain Pauper Claims" (H. P. 1741) (L. D. 1488)

(On motion by Mr. Savage of Somerset, tabled pending final passage.)

"Resolve, in Favor of Several Academies, Institutes and Seminaries." (H. P. 1747) (L. D. 1493)

(On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec, tabled pending final passage.)

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Batchelder of York, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Military Affairs Report "A", "Ought Not to Pass", Report "B", "Ought to Pass in New Draft" on Bill, An Act Providing for the Payment of a Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and to Provide for the Payment Thereof by Running Horse Racing and Dog Racing (H. P. 1578) (L. D. 1227) in a new draft under a new title of "An Act Providing for the Payment of a Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and to Provide for the Payment Thereof by Running Horse Racing (H. P. 1736) (L. D. 1478) tabled by that Senator on May 6th pending consideration of either report.

Mr. BATCHELDER of York: Mr. President, as you will recall we were called in special session last July in relation to veterans' legislation. At that time we were presented, I believe, with 26 different and various veterans' measures, some pertaining to cash bonuses, others pertaining to education and various others pertaining to the veterans. Now, as I understand it, in both the Republican convention and Democratic convention at that time

it was felt there should be some recognition given to our veterans and I believe it was a pledge made at that particular time, that we should take it into consideration. In the Republican convention I believe it was mentioned that our Governor had spoken in relation to that and that he was intending to call a special session of the legislature for the purpose of giving this matter consideration.

We later met in convention, and at that time, in joint convention, the Governor in his message said—and this is our executive head, speaking in relation to the cash bonus, and this is on page 12 of the Special Session of the Legislative Record of July 8, 1946: "On the other hand, there are obviously a large number of veterans who want cash. I have consistently said to the people of the State of Maine and to its veterans, that Maine would not fall behind the other States in evidencing its gratitude to its loyal sons and daughters who served so faithfully in World War II, and that once the veterans made clear the program they desired, the State of Maine would, within its financial limits, attempt to meet this program. I am convinced from my studies of the situation, from the reports that have come to me, and from my conversation with veterans, that they feel the State of Maine should in some tangible way show to each veteran its gratitude, and that the great majority of veterans believe this gratitude should be expressed in the form of a cash bonus. It is apparent that our veterans do not feel differently on this subject than those of neighboring states. The Legislatures of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont and Rhode Island have already voted each bonuses to their veterans, and it is well said that these veterans are no different than the veterans of our State. Maine paid bonuses to the veterans of World War I, and veterans of World War II are entitled to no less generous treatment.

"It is abundantly clear from the evidence that a cash bonus is the desire of many veterans, and I believe the time has come for us to recognize this desire and to fulfill it as best we can.

"Despite the fact that some people think a cash bonus should not be paid, I believe it would be very unwise for the State of Maine, in

attempting to express its appreciation to its veterans, to say that they cannot have cash but must take insurance. Consequently, I recommend that those who do not wish to take advantage of the State's offer to make payments for insurance be given a \$100 cash bonus. In this way, we will be offering something very valuable and irreplaceable to those wise and patient enough to take advantage of the offer, but we will not be forcing it upon those who would rather have a \$100 cash bonus. After careful study, one hundred dollars, is, in my opinion, the limit to which the State can reasonably go in making cash payments to veterans, considering our financial situation and the desirability of carrying out a comprehensive veterans' program.

Now, with that in mind, this same question has appeared before this legislature. I believe this is probably where it should be rather than in special session due to the fact that we have to devote considerable time to the subject, although we did spend three weeks at that particular time, and I believe it was the opinion of a great many legislators that they should be paid a cash bonus. The question resolved itself into a question of how it could be paid.

I believe it is a recognized fact by all veterans that if we were to incur additional taxes, they would have to contribute a great deal, and that possibly they would rather forego the payment of a bonus unless it could be worked out some way that they would not have to contribute too much to it. At the time, many different methods of taxes were considered. We had before us sales tax, cigarette tax and various luxury taxes. It was said at the time that if we were to pass a cigarette tax much of it would fall on veterans who smoked a great deal and they would pay more than they would derive from the bonus.

As I see it, we are faced with the problem of getting money from additional taxes. As it seems now, we are going to have either a sales tax or cigarette tax and the veterans will pay something in those taxes but they will not get any bonus.

Under the bill which is before you, it calls for payment of a \$100 bonus along the line mentioned in the statement I just read. Being a

veteran of World War I, and having a son in World War II, I believe they should be entitled to the same recognition given to us immediately following World War I. I believe it is a recognized fact these boys who performed great service to their country and put in considerable time not only in this country but overseas, are owed a great deal by all of us. If we had lost this war we would have recognized this, and in the matter of taxes we would probably be contributing much more and the benefits we now enjoy would have been taken from us.

In the payment of the bonus this bill would take in the boys who served from December 8, 1941 to April 14, 1945, that being the time we made the fateful attack on Japan and up to the time the Japanese surrendered. It excepts the boys who served three months or less, as it was felt the boys who were in only three months had not been disturbed very much except possibly in business and on their jobs, and should therefore, probably not be considered.

The item of \$100, it may be said, would not go but a short way, but we cannot attempt to compensate the boys for what they have suffered and lost, due to the high wages being paid and loss of service being rendered. We recognize the fact the State of Maine should recognize the service rendered and I think it should be in accordance with what was done for the veterans of World War I. Now, it comes down to the point of finding some method of making the payment. I don't think we have the right solution for this, but it has been felt that the State of Maine is engaged in pari-mutuels, and some might say it affects the morals of our State, and I will say, as a matter of fact, that we have pari-mutuels at the present time and they are very beneficial to the fairs, and also we understand there are various running meets held not only during fair time but there are spring meets, and meets held immediately following the fairs. We have been asked here to grant a 45-day period of night racing. As I understand it, it doesn't come when the fairs are actually being run but would be granted to some individual or some particular fair so the State would benefit a little by them. Now, this calls for running races. I cannot see, if we are going to have horse racing, why it would be any

different if we had these running races. I believe a great many people prefer running races and cannot see why there should be discrimination between running races and harness races. I don't see any difference whether the jockey is running the horses on the horse's back or in a sulky behind the horse. It may be that the fairs believe that the granting of these particular races might injure them or do some harm to them.

As I understand it, the runners operate principally on a mile track. At the present time we have only one mile track in the State of Maine, and that is at Old Orchard. It might be contemplated possibly at the time of consideration of running races at the last legislature, that it would possibly involve the building of another mile race track in the State of Maine. At the present time a great many of our citizens of this State attend meets in adjoining States, Rockingham, Suffolk Downs and Narragansett, and a great deal of money is spent.

It may be said that there is not enough money to be derived but I will say if we consider the adjoining States, — for instance in Rockingham, a year ago, they were deriving revenue from racing there of approximately a million and three-quarters, and it was suggested that they were planning to raise the revenue $\frac{1}{2}$ cent so it would be equal to a quarter of a million dollars more money.

It was said and estimated that the State of Maine would be in a position to receive approximately half a million dollars from this source of revenue. I believe it is a very conservative figure and if we were allowed to have running races here in Maine, that amount of money could be raised from that particular source. At Old Orchard at the present time, which is a great summer resort, they would probably be attended by approximately 50,000 people. Our automobile number plates carry the word "Vacationland" and I believe we should allow the people who come here summers to have the right to attend running races if they wish.

Now, this bill calls for a payment over a period of 24 years. It was felt that with a conservative figure of half a million dollars, it would be a very easy matter to pay off \$400,000 each year on the bonds

besides taking care of interest. I might say the bond issue would be in an amount aggregating \$10,000,000. There are about 94,000 veterans of which 4,000 paid the supreme sacrifice and it was recognized that the wives or relatives of these boys should receive the benefits from the payment of the bonus.

If you will refer to page 6 of the bill you will see the word "dog races." It was deleted from the original bill and is a misprint in the bill before us.

Now, I do not know whether this is the proper method of providing the bonus for veterans, but in this particular method they would not be called upon for the payment of much of this bonus as they would if certain taxes were imposed. We have pari-mutuels at the present time and so it is not opening up a new field, such as dog racing would, and I see no reason why we should not, at least, give it some consideration, and I move for acceptance of the Committee "B" report.

Mr. DUBE of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I fought for three years in training and in combat and was released from service a year ago and I never dreamed that I would be here today speaking to you and asking a little bit of something for the veterans in the State of Maine.

Yesterday we found a copy of Life Magazine on our desks which pointed out the evils of horse races and gambling. I am sure many of you have not turned to page 89 but if anybody here has that magazine I wish he would look at it. If you have not, I will read a couple of articles which may take five minutes, and I hope you will bear with me. It is entitled "On the Death of an Angel":

The morning sun shone warmly as the long column moved down the road from Exeter, England. We were on a 14-mile training hike, and all of us were saving our breath for the finish. All wore combat fatigues, helmet and full field packs. The green English countryside made me want to drop out of ranks and stretch on the grass for a nap. I had position of rear guard, and several doctors and nurses whom I had never seen before walked ahead of me. I looked at them wonderingly, for if I had been in their place I certainly would have stayed at home. My legs seemed to be dis-

connected and moved by their own volition. I shifted my pack and wished I were anywhere but here. A calf bawled in a field and I thought of home. The peace of the countryside made the war distant and unreal. "Damn the war," I muttered.

Suddenly I heard the whistling rush of a fast plane in the sky behind me. I yelled and dove for a ditch. The clatter of machine guns tore the peaceful air. As suddenly as they had come, the planes were gone, leaving a blank silence. Then groans and cries of "Medic! Medic!" started, and I knew someone had been hit. I crawled out of the ditch and checked to see if any of the nurses were hit. They were all on their feet and seemed all right. This must have been the first time for the big brunette, for she stood staring into the field, her fumbling hands brushing the dirt from her fatigues in an aimless sort of way. A little blonde, as beautiful as spring, had dropped on her knees beside a wounded doctor and was administering first aid. She took off her helmet and shook her head, letting her hair fall on her shoulders. The blond hair seemed to make a halo around her head. I watched her for a few seconds, thinking of a picture I had seen of angels. The other nurses were all taking care of wounded men except the brunette, who stood beside me quietly crying.

The officers started to blow whistles and shout, "Fall in." As the column formed, shouts arose in the front, and I looked ahead. The three Jerries in their ME-109s were not satisfied and were coming back for more sport. White parachutes carrying their load of death blossomed over the head of the column and I knew we were really in for it. I had been through this particular kind of hell before. I shoved the brunette nurse into the ditch and leaped in after her. "Keep your goddamn head down," I screamed at her. The explosions were deafening, and I could hear pieces of metal whistle by overhead.

The noise faded away until all was still. I looked up cautiously, afraid Jerry might come back to machine-gun what was left. No, he wouldn't bother us again. The three Jerries were high-tailing it home with a squadron of Spitfires after them.

"Are you hurt?" I asked the nurse beside me. No answer. She was

out cold. I checked, but she had not received a scratch.

I came out of the ditch to get a medic, but stopped in horror. The lovely little blonde was lying on the road beside the decapitated and mutilated form of the doctor she had been attending. Both her legs were blown completely off, one lying about 5 feet from her, the other gone. A medic was trying to put tourniquets on the ragged, bleeding stumps. I stood frozen, watching the tourniquets slip off because the stumps were too short and slippery with blood. Each time a tourniquet would slip off, the red blood would gush out, deepening the puddle she was lying in. She was fully conscious, trying to smile and say something. Every time she did, she would blow out little bubbles of blood.

A doctor walked up and put his arm on the medic's shoulder. "You can stop now, son." He shook his head. The numbness left me. I began throwing up. I staggered blindly over to a tree and sat down, crying and vomiting.

The ambulances came and picked up the wounded and the dead. We reformed our ranks and marched home.

To my dying day I shall have nightmares of that blond little angel of mercy, lying in a pool of her own blood and trying to smile.

There is another short article that I would like to read to the members of the Senate:

When does sanity end and madness begin? On many a hot morning on Guadalcanal, my fellow marines and I questioned our sanity as we looked out upon the corpses of the enemy. Why did we extract such extreme delight in firing a burst of machine-gun fire into already dead Japanese? Their bodies sprawled, their lifeless eyes staring into nothingness, their sagging jaws open, gold teeth gleaming in the sun, their sardonic grinning mouths—these sights somehow impelled us to fire volley after volley. As the bodies jerked and quivered, we would laugh gleefully and hysterically. Only when the bullets tore open the corpses, emitting a stench that stung our nostrils and turned our stomachs, did we snap back to sanity, turning our backs now on the dead enemy, disgusted with our behavior. Why did we do this? What subconscious motive prompted our action? Were we "cracking up"? Was this the outpouring of hatred, ac-

cumulated in three previous campaigns? Even yet I do not know. Like my fellow marines, I still wonder what thin line, if any, divides sanity from madness.

Gentlemen, I went to war in the southern Pacific over a year. I am here today but really I don't know why. I can assure you whatever little you can do for the veterans of our State, which many other States are doing right now for their veterans, will be greatly appreciated. The State of Maine gave a \$100 bonus to the World War I veterans. If a \$100 bonus were to be given to the World War II veterans I can assure you that little bit would be appreciated although it would buy about \$25 worth of the materials it would have bought at the time we left for service.

You have seen maps and pictures of what we did. After we had gone everyone said, "Let the boys come home. When they come, we will ask them what they want and give it to them." I will say that I have been fighting ever since I entered the legislature to do something for the veterans and I sincerely believe the bill before you on which there is no form of taxation, would be about the best ways and means of raising money to help out the veterans which I feel did so much for all of us here. I think and I hope sincerely that most of you will go along with me on the bonus. I have tried to be fair and square with you people here and I hope you will be with me.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate, for reasons only too well known to the most of you I am rather reluctant to speak on this measure. The reasons that I elaborated upon last summer—last haying time—are still true today. At this time I ask: "Is this a bonus bill or is it a pony bill?" I say again: "If this bill is passed either as a bonus bill or as a pony bill, or both, it must go to the people by referendum." Less than eight months ago the people of Maine, including ninety odd thousand veterans opposed a much less objectionable measure by a two to one vote. Is that not enough? Do we need to go all through another such feeble gesture?

I said last summer and I say again today that we can never pay the veterans the debt that we owe

them. A small cash bonus is not the answer. Every benefit that is of permanent value to help the veteran help himself is most worthy and I am whole-heartedly for it.

Now, if this is a pony bill, then it is another matter. Two years ago I voted for the pony racing bill. I don't believe in pari-mutuel betting. I think it has done more to hurt the State of Maine and the State of Maine agricultural fairs than any other one thing. Nevertheless we have it, the majority seem to want it, people like to bet and it is legal to do so. So if it is all right for the harness horses, then as far as I am concerned, it is all right for the pony horses.

I say again, if we can do anything of permanent value to help the veteran to help himself, I am for it. If we can build up some sort of reserve in the years to come—and I think the time is coming when the veterans, the same as many other citizens, are going to be more in need—then let us be prepared to do something for the veteran when that time comes. If this pony bill is the answer, all right; let us enact the pony bill and make some sort of proviso in it that the money realized will pile up in a "Veterans' Bonus Fund." If there are \$400,000 a year in as the proponents estimate let it pile up. When the pile is big enough I think the time will have come when the veterans will really appreciate a bonus. Then we can disburse this money to every veteran, free and clear, with no strings or restrictions on it, with no taxes to pay and no bonds to pay off.

Let us not get the cart before the horse; let us have the horse out in front, bringing in these dollars. It would save a bond issue, something we know the people will not support, and the veteran himself will not support it. So if we have harness racing and that is all right, let us have pony racing and build up this reserve and get this \$400,000 or more a year. Over a ten year period that would amount to four or five million dollars, perhaps more. If it increases as fast as they say, in ten years we will have a substantial sum to give to the veteran with no strings on it.

I am not in favor of the present measure. I will, however, support a pony bill with those provisions.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I arise to my feet at this time because when I come to vote on this particular measure I want my good friend, Senator Roger Dube, to know the reason why I vote as I do.

I don't suppose there is anything that could be done in this world to compensate for the horrible experience of the little blonde angel for whom there is no further help and for the boys who had to watch that, but I do not conceive it to be true that the payment of a \$100 bonus apiece to all the veterans in the State of Maine would be any sort of compensation for a thing like that at all.

My thoughts on the general subject of a bonus are a matter of record. I tried to point out last summer during the months between the confused session that we had and the election, why I thought a bonus at this time was unsound.

I stated that the State was faced with a financial picture that made any thought of putting the State into debt to pay a bonus would be entirely unthinkable. Since that time your State Budget Committee has met and pointed out the fact that they believe there would be a deficit of around six million dollars without the State of Maine spending a single cent for any new appropriation. That meant it would be necessary to hold the line at the level we were holding it.

Since that time we have come to Augusta. We have been here for the longest session on record. We have talked in both branches of this legislature and tried to point out the financial problem that the State of Maine faces. As I understand it, the original budget deficit, by paring down on requests for appropriations, has been due down to some \$3,000,000, and new matters that seem, at least, to be necessary, have been suggested that would make an additional \$6,000,000 per year. Those new requests are to my mind requests that should not be ignored.

We know that for the benefit of veterans back here in Maine now there is need for compensation in the field of education, so that the educational system in our State, the teachers that teach our children will be good teachers, and good teachers for the children of the veterans as they come along. We know

there is a program at the University of Maine to permit veterans, themselves, to take advantage of the educational provisions of the G I Bill of Rights. We know that although Senator Dube and some 80,000 others were away it didn't cost the State anything for the National Guard, but now that the boys have returned, we will have to pay for that.

Now, in the face of all these needs, what has this legislature done? To this date it has refused and rejected every tax measure that has been suggested except a tax measure on cigarettes, to increase a tax that is already high.

I was talking yesterday down at the Augusta House with a returned veteran of this last war who is serving in this legislature and he served in the southern Pacific. I believe he fully understands the problem. I said to him, "If we could get together in this legislature and enact a sound tax program so that over the years a sufficient amount could be taken from that income to retire bonds I would be in favor of a bonus of \$100 apiece, but I felt it would not in any way repay one of the veterans for the sacrifice he made or that any of the veterans made for their country and state, but simply as a token of our appreciation.

These tax bills have been rejected. There are those in both branches of the legislature who say it would provide too much revenue. We need only nine million dollars and these tax measures would provide ten million.

If this legislature had the courage to face that problem and enact a sound tax program from which we could take money each year and retire the bonds necessary to pay the bonus I would go along with it gladly.

A suggestion was made in a joking fashion when I was talking with a friend over the telephone — he said, "What have you done in Augusta about this financial problem?" I said, "Apparently nothing." He asked, "What are you going to do?" I said, "That I do not know." He said, "I have a suggestion. Why don't you write the names of the officials of State government on slips of paper and put them in a hat. Have someone draw out half of them and cut off the appropriation for that half, and then let the legislature go home." It was a joking suggestion, but fellow members, if

we don't do something we might as well do that.

I would not have very much to say on this measure that is hooked onto the bonus bill to pay it back. It is true the State of Maine has gone into pari-mutuel betting and harness racing but from all I can gather, harness racing and pony racing are entirely different.

The article which was read in Life Magazine was dealing with pony racing. Editorials have been written and published in this State that if we had pony racing in the various towns and cities it would bring undesirable people from outside the State that we do not want. I am against pony racing and do not want it and will vote against it.

I say again, if the legislature had the courage to enact a vigorous tax program to meet the crying needs of this State and provide bonds that we can retire, I would go along with that.

The only justification for my remarks is because I want my good friend, Senator Dube, when I get up to vote on this measure, to know why I so vote.

Mr. DUBE of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I agree with Senator Barnes that it would be much nicer if we could find other ways and means to finance such a bonus. Other means have been tried but we have not decided what kind of taxation the State will take up to pay all the extra expenses that we here have voted on to take care of roads and the care of institutions and all the other expenses.

Now, then, I have this Life Magazine which came in handy. On page 36 it shows a beautiful island which used to be a city but it shows what can be done in a few short moments before they blew it up. It could have happened to the State of Maine if the veterans had not gone over there to fight for their nation. It seems to me we have three or four undeclared wars going on such as Greece, Palestine and China, and many other places. You might have to call on those boys in a few short years and ask them to give service to the State. I feel sure many of them feel that they have been forgotten by the State. I know the federal government has provided many special privileges for certain veterans but they are not taking care of all the veterans, and what the federal government is doing for the State

of Maine they are doing all over the nation.

Right now the State of Maine has spent thousands of dollars—to be exact, they spent \$35,666 at the last special session to see what they could decide on a veterans' bonus. Here today it is ready to be passed within a few short seconds. If it is not approved, as I look upon our possible future governor, he might have to take up the matter in two years from now all over again, and we might possibly have to have a special session.

I feel sure, gentlemen, if you can compensate for the raises of wages and all the expenses which the State in undertaking for which we need nine million dollars for this biennium, I feel that we could pass this bill which would provide the bonus and which would not create any hardship on us here today.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President, last summer, as everybody knows, I was opposed to the bonus. I was opposed to the bill we presented to the people. I felt the whole thing was confusing. For some reason or other I had doubt whether the people of this State could ferret out just what was in that bill and what it meant. This bill here, regardless of whether you like horse racing or pony racing, or how you feel, it is clear cut and I am perfectly willing to trust to the people at this time to decide, and I think it should go along to the people for them to vote on it.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I too, was one of those who opposed the so-called bonus measure last summer because to me that bill was a measure to ask the veterans to pay the State a bonus for the privilege of coming home. I fought against the bill and was glad to see it was beaten three to one, as I predicted in this room at special session that it would be. I don't like the present bill. I don't think the amount is large enough. If a \$100 bonus was fair for the veterans of the first World War, then certainly from my viewpoint a \$100 bonus at this time is a very small offer because you and I know that since the first World War, which has been 25 years, the cost of living has gone up at least 200%. In all fairness, I think a bonus should be about two or three hundred dollars. Nevertheless, I still think that a bonus should be

paid. Apparently this is the only measure out of the four or five that appeared before the legislature that has a chance of passage, and I shall vote in favor of this bill because it will not tax directly the veteran. I realize probably the veteran will gamble on these horses but he will not be forced to do so in any way, shape or manner, and it will be his own choice if he does.

Now, I have heard a lot about the moral issue of running horses. I am not a race track enthusiast in any way, shape or manner. I guess probably in my whole lifetime I have seen but 15 or 20 horse races, but in my humble way I cannot see any difference between horses running when the man is sitting on top of the horse or behind the horse in a sulky. It is still a horse race to me. Where they can differentiate between the two on moral turpitude or attitude I cannot see. I wish someone who knows would show me the difference in right or wrong between horses racing and ponies racing.

Talking about the moral issue, this State is already in the booze business. If we were not in the booze business we would be a lot worse off today than we are in facing a financial problem. Now a lot of people worry in this State about prohibition. I have no worries about prohibition as long as the State of Maine can depend upon selling the amount of liquor necessary to finance old age assistance and aid to dependent children. Whether we have running horses or harness races make no difference to me. It is still gambling and I maintain it would be no worse under running horses than it is now under harness races. Let's not be blind to this thing. Money is being bet on the running horses now through bookies who get the benefit of the profit and our veterans are deprived of a bonus.

I, for one, will vote in favor of this measure because while I believe it is really too small an offer, at least it is a gesture of gratitude to our veterans who have fought and died for us in the last war, and I think before we have another war we better pay this bonus or we will have two bonuses to pay.

Mr. President, I hope the motion of Senator Batchelder will prevail.

Mr. DENNY of Lincoln: Mr. President and members of the Sen-

ate, I know we all agree with at least the first part of the talk which the Senator from York, Senator Batchelder gave. I know we all want to do everything we can for the veterans and we are all very reluctant, when we feel it is necessary to oppose a bill, to publicly stand up and say "no". I have always opposed, or at least up to date I have opposed a bonus on the grounds that I did not like the way in which it would have to be paid. I felt too much of the burden would fall upon the veteran. I still think it is true and sound. We have something like 90,000 veterans and it takes very little figuring to realize these 90,000 veterans will be taxpayers and the people who will run and be responsible for the State of Maine in the very near future. I do not think we should burden them.

This bill, I think is unsound and it has for me the same objection as the other tax measure which was attached to the other bonus bill which the people and veterans discarded. When we try to pass a bonus at referendum with pony racing in the State of Maine I believe we are all wrong. When a population as great as that of greater Boston can go and pay a dollar for a round trip ticket to Rockingham, stay for the races and go back at night, we are going to find it quite different in getting any comparative crowd to a pony racing meet in the State of Maine. We just have not got the people to bring in \$400,000 a year and we might as well recognize it now as any time and if we cannot bring in money enough to pay a ten million dollar bond issue in the 25 years which I believe the bill calls for, certainly at least part of this burden of paying the bond issue and interest is going to fall back on the 90,000 veterans who are going to be the State of Maine of the future. For those reasons I hope the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Batchelder, does not prevail.

Mr. DUBE: Mr. President, I will agree with Senator Denny that some of you here are reluctant to pass this measure but I will tell you this much, sirs, if the veterans — if many of them had been reluctant when the time came for them to join the armed forces to help save our country, or while in battle were reluctant to go ahead and do what they thought was right, I

guarantee we might not be here today. I recall one little incident in which I was reluctant too. It was before Japan agreed to end the war and I was flying a large transport with 36 paratroopers depending upon me and my fellow men to fly them to Okinawa in which we were grouping thousands of airplanes ready to fly into Japan whether the Japanese accepted our proposals or not after we dropped our second atomic bomb. I hit the tail end of the hurricane or cyclone we were having. I was reluctant to go on or head into the sea, but we had to come through. I felt we must come through, and we did come through. The airplane was a C-47 like Governor Hildreth was given, and their wings were cracked but they were all glad to be alive at this particular time. I was really reluctant on this but I had to go along. So why don't we try it on this?

Mr. WELCH: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I am a little mite reminded this morning of one time when we had a hearing before the Ways and Bridges Committee in this Senate chamber on some road resolves. As you know, some members would have in two or three resolves. One fellow came before us and addressed us and said, "Gentlemen, this is the worst piece of road in the State of Maine." He gave reasons to back up his statement. The next article on our calendar was another resolve of his and he said, "Gentlemen, this piece of road is worse than the one I just spoke of."

I didn't like the bill we had the other day and I spoke against it, on night racing. They said it would give us a little more revenue. I don't like this one. I went on record in the special session and will again today, to do everything I can for the veterans. We have voted large sums for education for them in the University of Maine and we have voted sums in other cases, and I hope I will not fail at any time to vote for money which will provide for facilities for education for our veterans whether it be in one school or another; if it is for veterans, I am for it but I am not for this running races bill to provide money for as small a bonus as this is. I did vote last summer for a bonus, a measure whereby everybody would have contributed

to the payment of that bonus. It has been mentioned here that the cigarette tax of last year would have placed an undue burden on the veterans. Have we any reason to believe that this measure would not be paid in large part by the veterans? It may not, but we have no assurance it will not, and I hope the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Batchelder, does not prevail.

Mr. DUNBAR of Washington: Mr. President and members of the Senate, during my three terms in this Senate I don't believe I have ever voted against any measure that carried a referendum to the cities of the State where such a referendum was attached to any bill. This measure carries a referendum to the people of the State of Maine to pass upon this issue and we will have an opportunity to find out whether or not the people of the State of Maine, first, believe in a bonus and second, find whether or not a bonus should be financed by running horses. I am willing to trust the people who sent me to this legislature in my county, and if the people of the State of Maine vote "No" on this proposition I will abide by their will. I will gladly do so but I am not going to vote today or any other time in this legislature while I am a member of it, against referring a matter to the people if such an amendment is attached to the bill. I believe we can trust the people of this State to decide in this matter in the proper and the right way.

Without going into other phases of the thing, either from the standpoint of giving a bonus to the veterans or how it should be financed, it has been very well and ably covered by those who have spoken here this morning both for and against the proposition and I want to go on record that I still trust the people of the State of Maine and shall be glad to support the motion of Senator Batchelder and when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Batchelder, to adopt Committee Report "B", "Ought to Pass".

A division of the Senate was had.

Ten having voted in the affirmative and eighteen opposed, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the "Ought not to

pass" report of the Committee was adopted.

**From the House
(Out of Order)**

Resolve in Favor of Anson Academy (H. P. 1055) (L. D. 1503)

Comes from the House the bill substituted for the report and passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate:

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President I move that the bill be substituted for the report. This is an academy which they are trying to rebuild at a cost of \$100,000. It serves a considerable number of veterans attending this school. The local community has contributed to a large extent and I think it is only fair that the bill be carried to the same point where other similar legislation is now carried.

Thereupon, the bill was substituted for the report and under suspension of the rules was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Resolve in Favor of E. E. Webber of Rockland (L. D. 1504)

Comes from the House the report read and adopted and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, the report was read and adopted and under suspension of the rules, the resolve was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

An Act Relating to the Construction, Installation, Repair, Use, Operation and Inspection of Elevators, Dumb-Waiters and Escalators (L. D. 1501)

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this new draft, 1501 is a revision of L. D. 1054, to change from the Department of Labor and Industry the administration of the elevator provisions. To cite briefly the reasons for the original bill, we had a very unfortunate accident in Piscataquis County and the bill as originally submitted to the legislature was an effort to set up a commission to study the elevator rules and regulations and set up some sound rules and regulations and then have the Department of Labor and Industry responsible for the inspection of the original installation and annual inspection of the elevators. The bill provided a mod-

est fee system and undoubtedly was good legislation.

The committee reported a new draft which retains the same substantial provisions of the original bill but transfers the administration from the Department of Labor and Industry to the Insurance Department. Now, it is true the Arson Division of the Insurance Department do have fire inspectors but some of us think that the responsibility for elevator inspection should be in the Department of Labor and Industry for these reasons—the Labor Department is responsible for boiler inspections and it so happens the boiler inspector in the State is an elevator man, trained and experienced in the operation and installation of elevators. It is also true he is eminently qualified to conduct examinations and issue licenses and certificates to others so that they may do the inspecting. If it is set up in the Insurance Department it means training new State personnel. It means transferring to a department a function that has been carried on for many years by the Department of Labor and Industry. I am willing to concede the Department of Labor and Industry needs additional funds with which to do a more complete job of elevator inspection and if the Senate accepts the motion to substitute the original bill for the committee new draft, I will offer an amendment to L. D. 1054 that will put into that bill the same revenue provisions that had been added to the new draft, providing an inspection fee for new installations and annual inspection fees for elevator inspections.

I certainly believe the place for this function in the State is in the Department of Labor where these same functions are being carried out in industrial and commercial buildings. To set up another department and create another board and another group of inspectors in a department where I think that type of work is foreign to the normal functions, I think is unnecessary and expensive.

I move, if it is in order to do so, the substitution of the original bill for the Committee's New Draft report.

Mr. BATCHELDER of York: Mr. President, I might say this bill was before us for consideration as result of the accident spoken of here. Before the committee appeared the

Insurance Commissioner and at that time we had someone appear from the Labor Department. We were given to understand that they had only one man in the Department of Labor making investigations at that particular time. We realized a great many mills as well as hotels have elevators which require inspection and in a great many cases they are covered by insurance and often times are inspected by insurance companies. We felt it was more in line with the duties of the Insurance Department due to the fact it ties in with insurance. Another thing, it was called to our attention that the Insurance Department has eight or nine field men covering various parts of the State for fire inspections and they could, with very little training, take on this additional work and could give this service without great additional expense which would be necessary in the Department of Labor, to put on additional men which they should have to inspect elevators throughout the State. Another thing, it was called to our attention and information was given by the Department of Labor that there was nothing at fault with the elevator involved in the accident mentioned, but later information showed that there was. It seemed to the committee that due to the scarcity of people able to do the work they didn't have sufficient crew to take care of the State. I believe the change is a change for the best and that this should be changed to the Department of Insurance. I hope the motion of Senator Haskell does not prevail.

Mr. HASKELL: My concept of this change is not that it will add a single employee to the Department of Labor. It will make one person in the Department of Labor responsible for licensing elevator inspectors, and to be licensed as an elevator inspector an individual must pass a test and have qualifications set up by that supervisor, but in practical operation the people who are going to be licensed to do inspection work are elevator installation and maintenance men. As you know, one large elevator company does all or substantially all of the maintenance of most of the elevators in the State. There are two or three minor companies that do that. It will be the function of this one individual in the Department of Labor to properly satisfy him-

self that those persons are qualified as elevator inspectors. Having satisfied himself as to their qualifications, those persons without cost to the State are going to do inspection work for the State.

Now, on the other hand, if you seek to put this into the Insurance Department, you are going to have the problem of training some fire insurance men in the art of elevator inspection work. I have no quarrel with the desirability of training fire insurance men in the art of inspecting elevators but I cannot believe they will have the same qualifications as the men who are installing and maintaining these same elevators. To me, those are the persons best qualified to do the job. If you go back to the original bill it is the system you will have. You will have a fee system whereby the elevator owner pays a fee to the general funds. The other bill provides the dollars shall go to the Insurance Department and not the general fund. I believe the Labor Department working with licensed elevator inspectors is the efficient way of doing the job.

Mr. SPEAR of Cumberland: Mr. President, I didn't know until a short time ago about this matter. I concur thoroughly with Senator Haskell in his explanation and as to where this administration should be, I think it should be in the Labor Department where it belongs and I am somewhat suspicious of this move as it seems to me it is an attempt in the Insurance Department by a person or persons to dish out jobs and decide who they will dish them out to.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, to substitute the original bill for the "Ought to pass in second new draft" report of the committee.

A viva voce vote being had, the motion prevailed, and the bill was given its first reading.

Mr. Haskell presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

The Secretary read Senate Amendment "A":

Senate Amendment "A" to H. P. 1442, L. D. 1054, Bill "An Act Relating to the Construction, Installation, Repair, Use, Operation and Inspection of Elevators, Dumb-Waiters and Escalators."

Amend said Bill by adding at the end of that part designated "Sec. 36-G" thereof the following underlined paragraph:

'General layout plans of each new elevator, dumb-waiter, or escalator shall be submitted to and approved by the supervising inspector before the construction of same may be started. Fees for examination of plans shall be \$1 per \$1,000 of the valuation of quipment, provided, however, the minimum fee shall be not less than \$5 and the maximum fee shall be not more than \$25. Fees for annual inspection shall be \$5. All fees collected under the provisions of sections 36-A to 36-I, inclusive, shall be credited to the general fund.'

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted, and under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

**Emergency Measure
(Out of Order)**

An Act Providing Revenue for the Highway Fund (H. P. 1735) (L. D. 1500)

Which bill being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative vote of 27 members of the Senate and 3 opposed was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Bishop of Sagadahoc, the Senate voted to take from the table, Bill, An Act Relating to the Salaries of the Officers of the Legislature (H. P. 1723) (L. D. 1451) tabled by that Senator on May 2nd pending passage to be enacted.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, I move this bill be re-committed to the Committee on Salaries and Fees. I now yield to the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook; Mr. President and members of the Senate, you will recall a week or so ago we received a resolve to change the Constitution relative to expenses of members of the legislature. Since that time several serious objections have arisen to that measure and it is thought for the purpose of making a change in the statute rather than the Constitution, something might be worked out under this bill and that is the reason for the motion to recommit it.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Bishop, to recommit the bill to the Committee on Salaries and Fees.

The motion prevailed, and on motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook, the bill was sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec, all matters acted upon in the Senate were sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec

Recessed until three o'clock, EST.

After Recess

Senate called to order by the President.

From the House, out of order and under suspension of the rules:

Bill "An Act Relating to Increasing the Maximum Payment in Old Age Assistance." (S. P. 487) (L. D. 1355)

(In Senate on May 7, 1947, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A", "B" and "C".

Comes from the House, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "C" in non-concurrence.

In the Senate:

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I move we insist on our former action and request a committee of conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot: Mr. President, I move we recede and concur.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Williams moves the Senate recede from its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A", "B" and "C" and concur with the House in the passage of the bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "C".

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I arise to oppose the motion of my colleague, Senator Williams. Senate Amendment "B" to this bill is the amendment we debated at some length in the Senate several days ago and is the amendment which, I think, says that we spent a substantial amount of money in investigating recipients in

the various categories in the Health and Welfare Department and when we received the report we found they had determined there were many relatives of the recipients, who, in the opinion of those making the report, ought to be supporting those recipients. Based on mathematical calculations it was thought two to four million dollars could be saved. There is either truth in that, or there isn't. Apparently there is some sound thought that there is truth because if you will examine your tentative budget submissions of the Appropriations Committee you will find the appropriations for each and every one of the categories are very substantially reduced. Now, to justify that reduction you have no other choice than to make those reductions over in the Health and Welfare Department and if you don't make them you are going to have 5,000 people standing in line over there in the next two years. The only way you are going to make those reductions is to find if the conclusions in the report are correct. Senate Amendment "B" seeks to do that. It provides that the recipients shall file evidence of their financial responsibility and it seeks to have their relatives file evidence of financial responsibility.

Now, if it is a good amendment to provide that the applicants must go through that procedure,—if it is sound and right, certainly it is reasonable to check the people who the committee says are taking dollars from the State without any reason. If you are willing to let the applications pile up there without that restriction, fine. But so long as you seek to prove the recipients are taking dollars that should not be taken, let's be consistent and let's insist this year and next year we satisfy ourselves that those recipients are eligible. Let's check the financial ability of their relatives this year and next year. Let's be consistent. Let's not make two classes out of the recipients over there, those who got under the wire and those who didn't; otherwise those who got in under the wire are scot free from filing this data, and those who come in later must come under those stringent regulations. If it is good for those 5000 who are going to have to stand in line the next two years, it is certainly good for the 15,000 who are

in. I certainly hope the motion does not prevail.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot: Mr. President and Senators, as Chairman of the committee who believe very strongly that Senate Amendment "B" is not necessary, I think I might say a few words to defend that point. There are three amendments added to this particular bill, as you well know, as my fellow senator from Penobscot and I debated this question here. Senate Amendment "A" took out the provision regarding ability to work, which the Committee on Welfare was willing to go along with. Senate Amendment "B," as Senator Haskell told you, gave the same standing to recipients of aid as the bill asks of applicants. Now, it has been a policy of the department for a long time to make occasional changes in applications, and when they change the applications they do not go back and ask everyone who is then receiving aid to make out the then present application. They go on the one that came in in the first place. It is what we are asking the department to do today.

I will admit our committee has been investigating this department and I think we brought out some facts which are the same as Senator Haskell has told you, but it is not the object of our committee to persecute the Health and Welfare Department. It is not the object of our committee to place on that department a tremendous job, a job they are not being appropriated enough money to carry out, before January 1, 1948.

Under the present law on the statute books, if it is sufficiently carried out, all recipients should be investigated and if there are relatives who should support them, it will be brought out. If the department has lived up to this law in the past, they have that data at the present time in their files. I don't know whether it is so or not, but I understand the Governor and Council have taken steps to see that those who make investigations in the department see it is brought about.

The committee was asked by the department not to put in this amendment because it was to involve a lot of work, I think. I think of the 15,000 recipients, regardless of the charges made against them, we know that thousands and thousands of those recipients have no relatives to help them and have no

assets themselves. It would make unnecessary work and probably would involve a hundred thousand statements being filed and it is something that under proper administration would be covered; and this act, in itself, would mean a revision of the applications which would sort out some of the facts at the time and our investigation shows it is easy to file applications without any pertinent facts being given as to the financial condition of the applicant, and consequently a lot of people are putting in applications and taking a chance that they may receive old age assistance. With those arguments, I hope we may recede and concur with the House and do away with Senate Amendment "B".

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I am not sure we are too far apart on this thing. The facts have been recited to you time and again that we may save some money down in that department. Let's look at the figures in old age assistance, and it is that category we are talking about. The department asks \$6,335,000 for the biennium. The Budget Committee recommended \$5,600,000 for the biennium. The disclosures of the Welfare Committee cut \$300,000 from the Budget Committee recommendations, cutting them down to \$5,300,000—but I ask this question, where are the dollars coming from? I argue in making the cut, the Appropriations Committee assumed that report was correct and that there were many applicants and many recipients who ought to be denied. You cannot cut a dime from the applicants. You have got to cut from the recipients.

It amazes me that this same committee which took pride in finding these facts out, say to you now, "Let's not try to find out facts. It will make work in the Welfare Department. Let's not try to find the money they have cut from the department's request." If the money is there and what they say is true, let's go and find it so we will have the dollars to give the worthy applicants the sums they are entitled to. They say that many worthy applicants are being denied because of the misuse of funds over there in the department. The Committee now comes and says, "Let's not confuse the department by making the recipients file statements." It is not consistent. It is inconsistent to make the new applicants file state-

ments but not require those who are already in, to file.

Mr. DUNBAR of Washington: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I wonder if you would be willing to bear with me a few minutes while I tell you a true story. It is the reason I voted for Senate Amendment "B" the other day, and why I'd like to see for a time at least, at least two years, that Senate Amendment "B" be complied with.

Down in my county during the last two years a woman from Pennsylvania who claimed to be the niece of the decedent, a woman from the town of Steuben, came to my office in regard to taking out administration of her sister's estate, and I said, "Did she leave any estate?" She said, "Yes. When I was home for the funeral I discovered in her strong box five bank books". She had them with her. Four of the bank books were payable to her. They were all on New York banks and one was a joint account descending to her husband. The decedent, it is true, was not receiving old age assistance, but her husband was, and up to that time he had been the recipient of between eight and nine hundred dollars of old age assistance, and those bank books, Senators, including the joint account totaled over \$30,000.

I was appointed administrator of the estate and I took the matter up with the legal department of Old Age Assistance as I believed they ought to collect that money, but their position was that they could not collect it until, at least, the husband had died. I said to him, "Where is the doctrine of fraud that has been practiced here upon the State of Maine? Why don't you go to the husband and tell him that there will be some action unless he authorizes the administrator of the estate to pay back that money?" He did, and I received authorization for the money to be paid back and that money went back to the Department to help some worthy person that really needed assistance.

It is true it is perhaps one isolated case, but I don't know how many there are there in the department, and I am not blaming the department or the field worker for making that error because they were people apparently living in very poor circumstances and must have represented to the department or to the

field worker that they really needed assistance. But it is a true story and it has happened within the last two years and you will find the record of the case in the Probate Court for Washington County.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Williams, that the Senate recede from its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed and further recede from its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendment "B", and concur with the House in the passage of the bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "C".

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I hope we do not recede and concur in this matter. I think Senate Amendment "B" is a good amendment. I talked for it the other day and I still think it is good. The only objection I have heard is that it will add to the administrative costs of the Department of Health and Welfare. It has been pointed out here that we may save anywhere from one to four million dollars. I think perhaps four million is optimistic, but I think perhaps the one million dollars is there. I'd like to ask Senator Williams if he could give some idea of what the additional administrative cost would be to carry out the provisions of Senate Amendment "B"?

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. President and Senators, I believe I was asked what the administrative cost would be in carrying this out. The Appropriations Committee has given the Department a certain amount of money—my colleague may have the figures before him for the administration of the Department. I believe the Welfare Committee has recommended, if I have the figures correct, \$1,090,000 for administration. Of that amount, they will no doubt spend all of it. Now, if this law is put into effect, I don't know what it will cost to administer it, but if these sworn statements have to be taken in and all this has to be done before January 1, 1948, it will take quite a lot of time. I think it could be better spent under the present statutes in finding out about recipients and re-investigating recipients, and if their files are anywhere near complete today, they might have some idea as to those people.

I think the statement of Senator

Dunbar of his experience is very fine and that is what is needed. If we had had these applications in this form, this wife would have had to make out a sworn statement. It is exactly what we wished to get at from this particular bill.

It is just an administrative idea. We are not too anxious about it. If the Senate wants it, all right—if they want to burden the department, I want to call to your attention that the Welfare Department didn't make up that budget and some of the members didn't agree with the figures in the budget for the coming year.

Mr. LEAVITT: Mr. President, from the remarks of Senator Williams, it would seem the cost would not be increased, but only the work and perhaps instead of writing up two reports, they can use their time in finding out what the return will be on the questionnaires. I think it would be a good idea to have them return those questionnaires and find how many are receiving this money that they do not deserve.

I have had at least three cases given to me which do not parallel exactly what Senator Dunbar said, but in substance they were the same thing, and I know at least two lawyers who will return money to the department here because they found it had been illegally collected. I hope Senate Amendment "B" remains on the bill.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, the other day I supported Senate Amendment "B". I think it is a good amendment. However, I am a little bit confused right now as to what I should do. I believe it is a case where a committee of conference is requested, Senate Amendment "B" having been indefinitely postponed in the other branch. I am afraid if we insist on Senate Amendment "B" we may get a conference report "unable to agree" and lose the whole bill. I think the bill is a good bill and if we cannot get the whole loaf let's get half a loaf. Therefore, I am going to vote with Senator Williams.

Mr. WELCH of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I just want to state that I was opposed to this amendment when it was introduced, and I am still opposed to it. I feel that the situation can be handled under the present laws which we have. As far as the original bill goes, I am in favor of that, and with Senate Amendment

"A". But I believe Senate amendment "B" is unnecessary. Therefore, I hope the motion of Senator Williams will prevail.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate in regard to the question raised by the Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes, I don't think this Senate needs to feel that anybody who might be appointed on a committee of conference from the Senate and who then would represent the opinion of the Senate, would throw up this bill by failing to come out in agreement. I think it is a good amendment. I think it ought to be on there and the bill, I think, is a good bill.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Williams, that the Senate recede from its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed and further recede from its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendment "B", and concur with the House in the passage of the bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" and Senate Amendment "C".

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

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Senate voted to insist and request a committee of conference. The President appointed as members of such committee on the part of the Senate, the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell; the Senator from Washington, Senator Dunbar; and the Senator for Cumberland, Senator Leavitt.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to the Construction, Installation, Repair, Use, Operation and Inspection of Elevators, Dumb-Waiters and Escalators." (H. P. 1754) (L. D. 1501)

(In the Senate, on May 8, 1947, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.)

Comes from the House, that body having insisted on its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, and now asks for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate:

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Senate voted to insist and join in a committee of conference. The President appointed as conferees on the part of the

Senate, the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell; the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Spear; and the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick.

Senate Committee Reports

Mr. Morrill from the Committee on University of Maine on Bill "An Act Relating to Trustees of the University of Maine," (S. P. 466) (L. D. 1311) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

Which report was read and adopted.

Mr. Barnes from the Committee on Salaries and Fees to which was recommitted Bill "An Act Relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees," (S. P. 299) (L. D. 794) reported the same in a second new draft (S. P. 552) (L. D. 1502) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

Which report was read and adopted, the bill read once and a motion by Mr. Bishop of Sagadahoc, tabled pending assignment for second reading.

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table, Bill, An Act Relating to Control of Tuberculosis (S. P. 59) (L. D. 1437) tabled by that Senator on May 7th pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be enacted.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair has in his possession a telegram from Honorable William T. Smith, which he will request the Secretary to read.

The Secretary read the following telegram:

"Thomaston, Maine, May 8, 1947. Chester T. Winslow, Secretary of the Maine State Senate, State House, Augusta, Maine. To the Honorable Senate. Had hoped to return to the Senate before adjournment but find I shall be unable to do so. Therefore I take this opportunity to thank you all for the much appreciated visits, flowers, telephone messages, letters and cards during my illness. With kindest regards and best wishes. Senator William T. Smith."

Mr. Denny of Lincoln was grant-

ed unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. DENNY: Mr. President and members of the Senate, as there have been no bills which have come as far, at least, as the Senate, having to do with the Bangs disease program, and as many of the Senators are not interested in livestock and probably have not kept in touch with the Bangs disease program, and as many of you have probably been asked questions about it and have heard many wild stories, some with foundation and some probably without foundation, it seemed that before this session adjourned it might be well to make an effort to bring some of the Senators up to date on the program.

I have no doubt you have often voted on this Bangs disease program in a way that was described the other day as just holding your nose and voting, not knowing exactly what the program was. So I think a little explanation might be in line.

First, to review the financial history of it. Back in 1941 the legislature authorized a bond issue of \$450,000 which it was hoped at the time and expected at the time would be the one and only large appropriation necessary for the eradication of Bangs disease. However, in 1945, the last legislative session, another \$400,000 was appropriated. The reason for this was during the war the lack of federal veterinarians delayed the progress of the plan and it was impossible to cover the State as was anticipated originally. This legislative session was asked, or rather the Appropriations Committee was asked for \$40,000 for the first year of the biennium and \$100,000 for the second year. They granted \$40,000 for the first year and cut the second year to \$50,000. So in two years there is a total appropriation of \$90,000.

Now, if you have referred to the Appropriations Committee report you will find it calls for \$100,000 for the first year and \$120,000 the second year, with a title attached to it, "For the Eradication of Bangs Disease." Just a little note about this: Before we had the Bangs disease problem, we had the tuberculosis problem in cattle which in many ways was similar to the Bangs disease program and was handled in cooperation with the federal government, similar to the

way the Bangs disease program is handled. Due to lack of veterinarians during the war, the federal government was unable to send them to the State to do the necessary testing.

Up to 1941 most of the herds were tested at least once in three years and tuberculosis was kept under control and something like 12 head in the State was the total number of reactors found, requiring very little money for indemnity, which came out of the money appropriated for the program called "Eradication of Bangs disease." However, because of lack of facilities to check the herds during the war, it was found tuberculosis was getting a start again and instead of an average of something less than 12 cases in a year up until the present moment in 1947, 100 cases or more have already been found. This is going to require, of course, considerable more money, so the Appropriations Committee was asked for \$60,000 for the first year of the biennium and \$60,000 for the second year for indemnity on tubercular cattle. It is the reason you will note in the report that the amount has been increased from \$40,000 the first year to \$60,000, and from \$60,000 to \$120,000 the second year.

Now, to go back to Bangs disease again, back in 1940 before the program was inaugurated a committee got together, a group of men, mostly livestock breeders in the State, representing each of the well known breeds in the State and included on the committee were representatives from the Department of Agriculture and from the University of Maine and from the Experiment Station, from farms, livestock farms in general, who did not have pure herds, and also several representatives from the State Veterinarians' Association. These people got together to try to determine some way to control Bangs disease in cattle in the State. As result of this committee getting together, the program which we have, almost in its entirety, was proposed to the legislature and has been followed since then. Briefly, it is a program of testing and slaughtering. It means testing of herds and slaughtering infected animals, and there was also a provision in there for those who wanted to vaccinate calves. It was believed it was a program of interest and value to

the State, the livestock breeders and consumers of milk.

There was set up three classifications of herds. The first classification was where a herd was tested and infected animals were taken out and slaughtered, leaving a clean herd, not vaccinated. The second classification or "B" herd is one in which calves four to eight months of age were vaccinated in the hope they would be immune from disease and the herd could be continued as a clean, vaccinated herd. The third classification is classification "C" which was used and is used in other States for herds in which the State and the veterinarians found a large percentage of recurring animals in such proportion it would probably bankrupt the farmer or put him out of business if the animals were slaughtered. In that case a provision is made for the farmer to keep the herd. The State would not pay indemnity on recurring cattle. The cattle in that herd would be quarantined and could be sold only for slaughter. In that way it was hoped to control it. There are many herds in the State in that classification. It is believed all those herds are harmless in spreading disease.

Another feature of the plan I should have mentioned before was that instead of doing what was called "spot testing" as was carried on before in the program, testing here and there all over the State, the State was divided into areas where entire counties were taken and every cow on every farm on every road was tested, and then they would move on, and the general plan was to go back and retest between 60 and 90 days and go on to another county and clean it up and come down the State, with the hope of cleaning up the entire State.

Lack of funds was, of course, a serious difficulty. The plan in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Agriculture provided that the United States Department of Agriculture would supply the veterinarians needed for testing. The department would supply the laboratory and some of the facilities and the United States Department of Agriculture would supply the technicians. The State would participate fifty-fifty with the federal government in indemnities paid for losses to reactors. There were times during

the war when instead of having seven, eight or nine federal veterinarians in the State it got down, I believe, as low as one veterinarian, so you could see that progress was pretty slow and a good many herds were not retested when they should be. As a matter of fact, it was only possible to go back and test again and retest the reacting herds rather than all the herds.

Another reason it is hard to get veterinarians is because it is a difficult and rather nasty job to do this testing. To those of you who have never seen it done, it is necessary for the farmer or someone on the farm—very often requiring two men—one man to hold the animal's head and the veterinarian gets under the neck of the cow and he has a test tube in which there is a cork and inserted in the cork is a large hypodermic needle. The veterinarian pushes up under the neck of the cow and enlarges the jugular vein and jabs the needle into the jugular vein and collects blood. The test tube is cooled and sent to the laboratory here in Augusta for testing.

One point may have given rise to some wild stories you have heard—you may have heard the test is not accurate and some animals have not reacted, but they had the disease and didn't show reaction to the disease. I can tell you very frankly because it is on good authority, and recognized authority, that if an animal has Bangs disease his or her blood will react to the test. However, one cause for some of these stories is that it is still a question of how long it takes after exposure for an animal to become contaminated enough with the disease to show blood reaction. It might be three or four days or might be three or four months. So there is a possibility of leaving an animal in the herd that is a reactor.

Undulant fever is a disease human beings get from using milk from cattle which have Bangs disease. There are currently between thirty and forty cases of undulant fever recorded in the Health Department of this State. This, however, is very low because although doctors are supposedly required to report cases of undulant fever they admittedly do not. I know of two cases of undulant fever near where I live which have never been reported at any time to the State department. Undulant fever is a serious disease. I doubt if anyone in this room doesn't

know of someone who has had it and been pretty badly inflicted with it. On good authority we are told that the four most serious diseases in human beings are gonorrhoea, syphilis, tuberculosis and undulant fever, and it is because of that that State and federal appropriations are justified for eradication of this disease. It is certainly a public health program.

Other stories you might hear is that the farmer is getting something out of this. I can assure you in the average case—there may be irregularities and some cases may be exaggerated—but the farmer cannot possibly with the indemnity and salvage he gets from an animal, replace the animal. It is estimated it is about one third the cost of the animal.

Just to give you an idea of the magnitude of the job—there are 128,000 cows in the State of Maine. Now in the year 1941 if all the 128,000 cows could have been tested at one time it would have been fine but it took two or three years to get all the cows tested and you perhaps realize the 128,000 cows in 1941 are not the same 128,000 cows we have on our farms at the present time. There is a tremendous turnover and the cows are now 90 percent different cattle.

The Department of Animal Industry have records at the present time, up to date, of 37,000 herds with each animal that has been tested in each of the herds and can check those animals. A herd, of course consists of from one cow to three or four hundred. There are sometimes four or five thousand samples sent to the laboratory every week.

There have been some leaks in the program. There is no question about it. One of the worst is the practice of unscrupulous cattle dealers—and when I say unscrupulous cattle dealers I think you must remember the older cattle dealers of today are the horse traders of yesterday. I think they have a pretty good reputation. There are many of them who are just as straight as any other type of business man but there are still many tricky, unscrupulous cattle dealers who have Bangs disease cattle and spread it over the State. There is hardly a day but what letters come to the Department, complaining that some farmer has taken a cow from some dealer and the dealer

has said it is clean, and then finding when tested that it reacts—the damage is done and it is too late. Speaking of being too late, it is something like the story of the bee who was gathering honey from a clover blossom. A cow was grazing nearby and chewed off the clover blossom and it made the bee pretty mad and on the way to the cow's stomach he decided he would sting the cow, but it was warm and comfortable there so the bee went to sleep—took a little doze. When he woke up the cow had gone.

Farmers aren't all sympathetic, of course, to this test. There are a good many objections to it just as there were to the tuberculosis tests. In many cases farmers drove the veterinarians from their farms when they came to test for tuberculosis, so we get some wild stories on that score too.

I think the proof of success or failure of this program today is the fact we have nine counties today in which there is less than one percent reactors in those counties in less than five percent of the herds, and when this plan was started some of the counties in the State showed reactions of over seven percent.

The work is being carried on now. There are more veterinarians in the State. I believe there are five at the present time and every indication that a good many can be kept in the service of the State.

The point I want to bring out more than anything is that this program in which we have practically one million dollars invested should not be stopped and interfered with any more than is absolutely necessary. I think the best argument in support of that is the experience we are having today in the lack of systematic or continuous testing for tuberculosis when in the past several years we had an average of twelve reactors or less and so far in four months this year we have over a hundred. Probably it is due to lack of systematic testing. I know it is going to be impossible for anyone to say when the livestock industry of the Department of Agriculture of the State is going to stop asking for money for the eradication of Bangs disease. We cannot stop with that and cannot stop with the tuberculosis testing.

That, I think, covers and brings up to date the Bangs disease program pretty well. In closing, I want

to say in the words of Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, Harry Truman and Robert Cleaves, "You'll never miss the milk till the cow goes dry."

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook

Recessed until seven-thirty o'clock, Eastern Standard Time.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

From the House (Out of Order)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the legislature on bill, An Act Relating to Tax on Cigarettes (H. P. 635) (L. D. 415) reported that the Senate recede from its action whereby it passed the bill to be engrossed and further recede from its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendments A and B to House Amendment A and concur with the House in the adoption of House Amendment A to House Amendment A and the passage of the bill to be engrossed.

Which report was read and adopted in concurrence.

From the House (Out of Order)

Bill, An Act Relating to Width of Trucks Hauling Forest Products (S. P. 551) (L. D. 1499)

(In the Senate previously passed to be engrossed.)

Now comes from the House, having been passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment B in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, the Senate voted to recede from its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, House Amendment B was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, I arise to make inquiry as to the action which I think the Senate just took. We are at some disadvantage in not having calendars. Did we adopt the conference committee report on Legislative Document 1498, An Act Relating to a Tax on Cigarettes?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state the Senate adopted the conference committee report on L. D. 415, An Act Relating to Tax on Cigarettes. The Chair will state for the information of the Senator that the Chair understands that 1498 is now in substance in the form of an amendment to L. D. 415.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook, the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby it adopted the conference committee report on Legislative Document 415.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I express my apologies for not recognizing that bill when it appeared. I support the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes, because I am thoroughly convinced of the inadequacy of the cigarette tax to solve the problem faced by this legislature. You have in your books Legislative Document 1475 which is the preliminary appropriation bill. That bill, I submit to you, is cut to the bone—the basic appropriations with which the State is operating. You have taken from many departments dollars set up on a budget that cuts seven million dollars from the requests of those departments, and even with the dollars you have in that budget you are still two million dollars short of the dollars necessary to run the basic services of this State. You are two million dollars short because they are omitted and correctly omitted from the document.

You have estimated income of a million dollars more than the basic bill provides for but in this Senate you have had evidence from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs that income from liquor revenue is overstated by at least a million dollars, so on that bill alone the general fund is \$2,000,000 short. Now, what have we got beyond that? Assume for a moment that you are willing to accept the substantial cuts that have had to be made by the Committee on Appropriations; assume you are willing to make appropriations which will form a line of 5,000 in the Health and Welfare Department; assume we are proud of it and willing to do that — what else do we face? Piled up on the Senate table are \$10,000,000 worth of appropriation bills. Some of them are going to be sluiced and probably should be sluiced, but many are sound appropriation measures the

people of the State want. Who has the courage to stand up and cut the teachers' bill? If you pass it, it is \$3,000,000. Added to the basic deficiency, it is \$5,000,000. Who has the courage to say we want to cut down the appropriation at Brunswick? Who wants to cut Orono? It is another million dollars. Who wants to leave the legislature without appropriating \$900,000 to take care of the contingency fund? The surplus is nearly gone and you need an appropriation. Who is going to leave the legislature without appropriating the money, \$400,000 the Recess Committee tells us it decided was a fair and equitable basis for our State pension plan. Assume you cut out all of them — you need \$90,000 to run this legislature — cut out University of Maine Building program, cut out A. D. C. — cut them all and you are still \$7,000,000 behind.

Here in this legislature tonight we vote for a two cent cigarette tax, thinking we are doing the thing the people sent us here to do, and solving the problems of the State. I am willing to vote for a tax on cigarettes and cigars and tobacco, but when you vote for it don't think for one moment you are solving the financial affairs of this State or this legislature. If it is all you are going to pass, you might as well go out of here and come back in special session and pass a basic tax measure to take care of the financial needs of the State.

You can add up those bills two or three times and you will still be lacking the dollars to run this State. The two cent cigarette tax is not the answer. If we should pass this back to the House where these revenue measures should properly originate, fine; but in passing it back I think the Senate should understand it isn't solving the problems of the State of Maine. I certainly hope the motion to reconsider prevails.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that the Senate has reconsidered its vote whereby it adopted the report of the Conference committee. The question before the Senate is on the adoption of the Conference Committee report.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. CROSS of Kennebec: Mr. President, I do not intend to argue the merits of this cigarette tax because I don't think there are too

many things to say about it except it does produce some new revenue. Only a short few hours ago Senator Haskell in conjunction with myself spoke to keep the tax alive and send it back to the house of its origin for further action. I will say that even if this solves only part of our problem we should keep this tax alive by acceptance of this conference committee report, and send it back to the House for what action they see fit to take.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate, we have heard a vast list of figures and I don't question the exactness of any one of them. If we pass this, as has been suggested, there will still be \$7,000,000 needed. In a statement in this Senate yesterday morning it was stated that if we passed a major tax bill we would still be \$2,000,000 short. This bill will provide that revenue and just because we cannot have everything we want, we say we don't want anything. That isn't reasonable or good judgment. We all grow from infancy. This bill has some merit — perhaps not all it ought to have. My original idea was that it would be a stop-gap and bridge over and take care of some of the major problems that face us, and I think one of the major problems is minimum salaries for teachers. Without recognizing that, and if we get pig-headed and kill all these bills if we cannot have everything we want, we will be back where we started from. The future success and prosperity of the State depends upon our youth. The prosperity of our State and community depends on how well we train the youngsters to take the place we have so badly jumbled over the years.

I believe this bill has merit. I believe we ought to accept this conference committee report and let it go back to the House to be discussed on the merits and demerits. If we need more we are still in a position to enact more. I don't think we ought to get in a panic because when you do that you accomplish nothing. I believe we ought to adopt this report. It is a start and once we see the thing growing, the folks who are opposed to something else may begin to change their thinking a little bit and may wish to compromise a little bit, and if we keep our heads then I think this legislature can adjourn

with what we need, and with a good record. Let's not be pigheaded.

Mr. BARNES: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I quite agree with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Cross, and if necessary to keep this bill, which I believe is totally inadequate, alive, I shall vote for it, but I hope it won't get a majority of more than one.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state for the information of the Senate that the question before the Senate is one of concurrence or non-concurrence with the House, the House having originally passed this bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A." The Senate at a later date passed it to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" and by Senate Amendments "A" and "B" thereto; following which a committee of conference was suggested and joined in by the House. The conference committee now reports that the

Senate recede from its action whereby it passed the bill to be engrossed and further recede from its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendments "A" and "B" to House Amendment "A" and concur with the House in the adoption of House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" and the passage of the bill to be engrossed as amended. The Chair will further state that adoption of the conference committee report simply places the two branches in agreement as to the form of the bill but does not pass the bill. The question before the Senate is adoption of the conference committee report.

A viva voce vote being had, the conference committee report was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Cross of Kennebec

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock, Daylight Saving Time.