

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-Fifth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1951

**DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

HOUSE

Friday, March 30, 1951

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. C. C. Sargent of Bath.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Papers From the Senate

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act relating to Complainant and Witness Fees and Costs of Police Officers and Constables" (S. P. 522) (L. D. 1250)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Towns and Counties.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Towns and Counties in concurrence.

Senate Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of Mrs. Belva Leach of Penobscot (S. P. 477) reporting leave to withdraw.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Claims reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of Morton Furber of Melrose, Massachusetts (S. P. 371)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve in favor of Vincent Hincks of Orrington (S. P. 470)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve in favor of Perley E. Brooks, of Bangor (S. P. 299)

Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Liquor Licenses in Unorganized Territory" (S. P. 415) (L. D. 974)

Report of the Committee on Natural Resources reporting same on Bill "An Act Creating Utilization of Wood Waste and Development of New Products" (S. P. 26) (L. D. 913)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Inheritance Tax" (S. P. 218) (L. D. 468)

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House, Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the Bill read twice and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act relating to Distribution of Antitoxins in Emergencies" (S. P. 413) (L. D. 978) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 418, L. D. 978, Bill "An Act Relating to Distribution of Antitoxins in Emergencies."

Amend said Bill by striking out, in the 4th line from the end, the underlined word "prepare" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word "procure"

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill was assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass with Senate Amendment "A"

Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Penalties for Violations of Liquor Laws by Unlicensed Persons" (S. P. 381) (L. D. 907)

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the

Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

In the House, Report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill had its two several readings.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 381, L. D. 907, Bill "An Act Relating to Penalties for Violations of Liquor Laws by Unlicensed Persons."

Amend said Bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

"R. S., c. 57, §66, amended. The 2nd paragraph of section 66 of chapter 57 of the revised statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

'Whoever, being licensed to sell liquor, by himself, his clerk, servant or agent sells any liquor in this state, in violation of law, shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$100, nor more than \$500, and costs, and in addition thereto by imprisonment for not less than 2 months, nor more than 6 months, and in default of payment of fine and costs, by imprisonment for not less than 2 months, nor more than 6 months, additional, and on each subsequent conviction he shall be punished by a fine of \$500 and costs and in addition thereto by imprisonment for 6 months, and in default of payment of fine and costs, by imprisonment for 6 months additional. Any person or his clerk, agent or servant who sells liquor within the state without a license shall be punished for the 1st offense by a fine of not less than \$300 and costs, nor more than \$500 and costs, which fine and costs shall not be suspended, and an additional penalty of not more than 30 days in jail at the discretion of the court; and for a 2nd offense by a fine of not less than \$500 and costs, nor more than \$1,000 and costs, which fine and costs shall not be suspended, and an additional penalty of not more than 60 days in jail at the discretion of the court; and for all subsequent offenses a fine of not less than \$1,000 and costs and 60 days in jail, which fine and costs and jail sentence shall not be suspended, and an additional penal-

ty of 4 months in jail at the discretion of the court. Any Clerk, servant, agent or other person in the employment or on the premises of another, who violates or in any manner aids or assists in violating any provision of law relating to intoxicating liquors, is equally guilty with the principal and shall suffer like penalties.'

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Bill was assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Senate Report Recommended

Report of the Committee on Public Utilities reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Private Carriers in Operating Motor Trucks for Hire" (S. P. 441) (L. D. 1004)

Came from the Senate recommended to the Committee on Public Utilities.

In the House, the Report with accompanying papers was recommended to the Committee on Public Utilities in concurrence.

Senate Report Indefinitely Postponed

Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Sale of Malt Liquor in Non-Returnable Bottles" (S. P. 119) (L. D. 208)

Came from the Senate with the Report and Bill indefinitely postponed.

In the House, the report with accompanying papers was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Uniforms of Deputy Sheriffs" (H. P. 440) (L. D. 258) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on February 15.

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

In the House:

The SPEAKER: What is the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, with respect to this non-concurrent matter and similarly with respect to other non-concurrent matters excepting Item 14, I hope that if there is to be debate on any of these matters, that the sponsors of the bills will consent to table them and carry them over until next week. If it is simply a matter of concurrence with the Senate, the House may as well go along.

The SPEAKER: What is the pleasure of the House?

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action of February 15th whereby it passed the bill to be engrossed.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 440, L. D. 258, Bill "An Act Relating to Uniforms of Deputy Sheriffs."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of said Bill after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof of the following:

"R. S., c. 79, §167, amended. The last sentence of section 167 of chapter 79 of the revised statutes is hereby repealed and the following enacted in place thereof:

'Upon approval of the county commissioners, uniforms required by this section, but not exceeding 2 for any 1 county, shall be furnished by the county.'"

Senate Amendment "A" was adopted and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Inspection of Children's Homes" (H. P. 1142) (L. D. 674) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on March 15th.

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

In the House: On motion of Mrs. Fay of Portland, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it passed this Bill to be engrossed on March 15th.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1142, L. D. 674, Bill "An Act Re-

lating to Inspection of Children's Homes."

Amend said Bill by striking out everything after the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

"R. S., c. 22, §243, amended. The 3rd sentence of section 243 of chapter 22 of the revised statutes, as enacted by chapter 177 of the public laws of 1947, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Said written statement [to] shall be furnished annually thereafter, in those cases where the home is licensed to board more than 2 children."

Senate Amendment "A" was then adopted and the Bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Resolve for the Laying of the County Taxes for the Years Nineteen Hundred Fifty-one and Nineteen Hundred Fifty-two (H. P. 1659) (L. D. 1228) which was finally passed in the House on March 28th, and passed to be engrossed on March 22nd.

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

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am about to move for the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "A", for these reasons: This amendment refers only to Androscoggin County and we had our several meetings, in fact we had our dealings with our Commissioners, and the delegation arrived at the figure that we presented.

The author of this amendment was at the meeting of the Committee on County Estimates, and there was no objection made, therefore I move for the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, moves that the House insist upon its former action. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and, on further motion of the same gentleman, the Resolve was ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Fishing and Hunting Licenses for Residents" H. P. 523) (L. D. 285) and Minority Report reporting "Ought not to pass" on which the House accepted the Majority Report of the Committee on March 22nd, and passed the Bill to be engrossed on March 23rd.

Came from the Senate with Minority Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Bearce of Caribou, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Minority Report.

On motion of Mrs. Daggett of Ashland, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session, in order to permit smoking.

Non-Concurrent Matter Tabled

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of the Town of New Sharon for School Building (H. P. 109) (L. D. 83) and Minority Report reporting "Ought to pass" on which the House accepted the Majority Report of the Committee on March 2nd.

Came from the Senate with the Minority Report accepted in non-concurrence and the Resolve passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell.

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that this item be laid on the table until some matters of more general interest are disposed of in the House.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman care to assign a definite date?

Mr. CASWELL: Just as soon as it is feasible, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell, moves that this matter lie on the table pending consideration. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the two Reports with accompanying papers were tabled pending consideration.

Bills and Resolves Requiring Reference

The following Bills, transmitted by the Director of Legislative Research pursuant to Joint Orders, were received and, upon recommendation of the Committee on Reference of Bills, were referred to the following Committees:

Taxation

Bill "An Act for the Assessment of a State Tax for the Year Nineteen Hundred Fifty-One and for the Year Nineteen Hundred Fifty-Two" (H. P. 1675) (Presented by Mr. Rollins of Greenville)
(Ordered Printed)

Bill "An Act relating to Tax of Intangibles by Authority of Article XXXVI of the Constitution of Maine" (H. P. 1676) (Presented by same gentleman)
(1000 Copies Ordered Printed)

Mr. ROLLINS of Greenville: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ROLLINS: In order to facilitate the action of the House and to have these bills advertised for hearing next week, I move that both items be sent forthwith to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will defer his motion until the bills are referred. Is it the pleasure of the House that Bill "An Act for the Assessment of a State Tax for the Year Nineteen Hundred Fifty-One and for the Year Nineteen Hundred Fifty-Two" (H. P. 1675) and Bill "An Act relating to Tax of Intangibles by Authority of Article XXXVI of the Constitution of Maine" (H. P. 1676) be referred to the Committee on Taxation, the first bill ordered printed, and one thousand copies of the last bill, Item 2, printed, and sent up for concurrence?

The motion prevailed.

On further motion of Mr. Rollins, the two bills were ordered sent forthwith to the Senate.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PLUMMER: To make an inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may make his inquiry.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, on Item 14, Resolve for the Laying of the County Taxes for the Years Nineteen Hundred Fifty-one and Nineteen Hundred Fifty-two (H. P. 1659) (L. D. 1228), could that be sent to the Senate immediately?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, moves that this item be sent forthwith to the Senate. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Orders

On motion of Mr. Peterson of Bar Harbor, it was

ORDERED, that Rev. Ralph H. Hayden of Bar Harbor be invited to officiate as Chaplain of the House on Wednesday, April 25, 1951.

The following paper from the Senate was taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Tuesday, April 3rd, 1951, at ten o'clock in the morning. (S. P. 524)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

House Reports of Committees Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Finnegan from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Elderly Teachers' Pensions" (H. P. 924) (L. D. 526) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1681) (L. D. 1251) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Parker from the Committee on Highways on Resolve in favor of the Town of Bethel (H. P. 827)

reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1677) (L. D. 1245) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Harding from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Duties and Powers of Aroostook County Fire Marshal" (H. P. 535) (L. D. 304) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1678) (L. D. 1246) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted, and the Bills and Resolve, having already been printed, the Bills were read twice under suspension of the rules, the Resolve read once and assigned the next legislative day.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to Fees for Boiler Inspection and Certificates" (H. P. 1018) (L. D. 578) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1679) (L. D. 1247) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Brown of Baileyville, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for Thursday, April 5th)

Mr. Hand from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Paris Company" (H. P. 1662) (L. D. 1231) a New Draft of Bill "An Act Enlarging the Purposes of Market Square Building Association" (H. P. 678) (L. D. 412) reported the same new draft and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill "An Act relating to Mill Privileges, Dam Sites, and Flowage Rights" (H. P. 543) (L. D. 309) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1680) (L. D. 1248) under title of "An Act relating to Mill Privileges, Dam Sites, Flowage Rights, Pole Lines and Roads" and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted and the Bills, having already been printed, were read twice under suspension of the rules and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Campbell from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial

Affairs reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for Funds for Civil Defense and Public Safety" (H. P. 792) (L. D. 472) which was recommitted.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 4th)

Mr. Finnegan from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Compilation of Certain Decisions of Supreme Judicial Court (H. P. 1510) (L. D. 1104)

Mr. Delahanty from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Police Docket in re Juveniles" (H. P. 1232) (L. D. 785)

Mr. Hayes from the same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Clarifying the Definition of 'Compact' in the Highway Laws" (H. P. 1112) (L. D. 692)

Mr. Hawkes from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act Permitting Incorporation of Veterans of Foreign War Post Under General Law" (H. P. 1429) (L. D. 1034)

Mr. Edwards from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Assessments for Road Repairs in Unorganized Territory" (H. P. 1442) (L. D. 1053)

Mr. Peterson from the same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Sewer Service Charges" (H. P. 1238) (L. D. 790)

Same gentleman from the same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to the Salary of the Judge of the Western Hancock Municipal Court" (H. P. 560) (L. D. 318)

Same gentleman from the same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Salary of Judge of the Bar Harbor Municipal Court" (H. P. 559) (L. D. 317)

Mr. Travis from the Committee on Transportation reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Overtaking and Passing School Buses" (H. P. 94) (L. D. 39)

Reports were read and accepted and the Bills and Resolve, having

already been printed, the Bills were read twice under suspension of the rules, the Resolve read once and assigned the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass With Committee Amendment

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Finnegan from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Elderly Teachers' Pensions" (H. P. 738) (L. D. 425) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to accept the report of the committee?

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire from the Appropriations Committee what the cost of this bill is, giving effect to the Committee Amendment?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, requests information through the Chair of any member of the Appropriations Committee. Any member may answer if he chooses.

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

Mr. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are almost all at sea on this educational program. I wonder if it would be in order if this item could be laid on the table and be specially assigned for next Tuesday?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that it is in order. Does the gentleman care to make a motion?

Mr. JAMIESON: I do make that motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Jamieson, moves that Bill "An Act relating to Elderly Teachers' Pensions" lie on the table pending acceptance of Committee Report and be specially assigned for Tuesday, April 3rd.

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Designating Silicosis as an Occupational Disease" (H. P. 676) (L. D. 408) reported "Ought to pass" as amend-

ed by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Brown of Baileyville, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 17th)

Mr. JALBERT of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker —

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JALBERT: I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, requests unanimous consent to address the House. It there any objection? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't find the right page. With reference to Item 17, in answer to the request of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, the amount of that bill is \$58,550 for the first year and \$58,550 for the second year.

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Burkett from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Establishing a Tri-State Authority to Enable the Collective Construction and Operation of Institutions in Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont" (H. P. 928) (L. D. 541) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. McGlaflin of Portland, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 4th)

Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Stewart from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Uniforms for Members of Police Department of the City of Lewiston" (H. P. 1587) (L. D. 1159) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. St. Pierre of Lewiston, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report and specially assigned for Friday, April 13th)

Mr. Woodcock from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Hancock School District" (H. P. 1276) (L. D. 845) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"
to H. P. 1276, L. D. 845, Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Hancock School District."

Amend said bill by inserting before the enacting clause the following:

Emergency preamble. Whereas, the present buildings which house the schools of the Town of Hancock are overcrowded, inadequate and unsafe; and

Whereas, it is imperative that action be taken at the earliest possible moment to relieve these conditions, and

Whereas the overcrowded and antiquated conditions of the schools are detrimental to the public health and safety; and

Whereas new building construction is vitally necessary; and

Whereas the borrowing capacity of said Town will not allow it to borrow sufficient funds for necessary construction and equipment; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the legislature, these facts create an emergency within the meaning of the constitution and require the following legislation as immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety; now, therefore,

Further amend said bill by deleting from Sec. 1, the clause "for the purpose of completing, grading, furnishing, rebuilding, renovating and otherwise bettering the condition of any or all buildings within said town used for school purposes or which may hereafter be used for school purposes;"

Further amend said bill by striking out Section 9, and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 9. Emergency clause; effective date; referendum. In view of the emergency cited in the preamble, this act shall take effect

when approved, only for the purpose of permitting its submission to the legal voters of the town of Hancock at any regular or special town meeting called and held for the purpose not later than 8 months after the approval of this act. Such special election shall be called, advertised and conducted according to law relating to municipal elections; provided, however, that the board of registration in said town of Hancock shall not be required to prepare for posting, nor the town clerk to post, a new list of voters, and for the purpose of registration of voters, said board shall be in session the 3 secular days next preceding such special meeting, the 1st and 2nd days thereof to be devoted to the registration of voters and the 3rd day to enable the board to verify the corrections of said list and to complete and close up their records of said sessions. The town clerk shall prepare the required ballots on which he shall reduce the subject matter of this act to the following question: "Shall the act to Incorporate the Town of Hancock School District be accepted?" and the voters shall indicate by a cross or check mark placed over the words "Yes" and "No" their opinion of the same. This act shall take effect for all the purposes hereof immediately upon its acceptance by a majority of the legal voters voting at said meeting; provided that the total number of votes cast for and against the acceptance of this act at said meeting equals or exceeds 20% of the total vote for all candidates for governor in said district the previous gubernatorial election. The result in said district shall be declared by the municipal officers to the town of Hancock, and due certificate filed by the town clerk with the secretary of state.

Thereupon, Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Tabled

Mr. Jones from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Emergency Lights on Police and Fire Department Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 1491) (L. D. 1098) reported "Ought to pass" as amend-

ed by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 1491, L. D. 1098, Bill, "An Act Relating to Emergency Lights on Police and Fire Department Motor Vehicles."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 9th line thereof the underlined words "**and deputy chiefs**"

Further amend said Bill by striking out in the 10th line thereof the underlined words "**and assistant chiefs**".

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

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe that this amendment removes the major intentions of this bill and as Mr. Jones is not present today I move that this bill lie on the table pending adoption of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, moves that Bill "An Act relating to Emergency Lights on Police and Fire Department Motor Vehicles," with accompanying papers, lie on the table pending the adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

The motion prevailed and the Bill with accompanying papers was tabled pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A."

Mr. Gilman from the Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to the Military Law" (H. P. 344) (L. D. 203) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted.

The SPEAKER: This being a printed bill, is it now the pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended and the bill receive its first and second readings at this time?

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire what the estimated cost of this bill is, giving

effect of the Committee Amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, requests information of the Appropriations Committee through the Chair, and any member may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Jennings.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, the approximate cost, according to the amendment, would be approximately \$25,000.

Thereupon, the bill had its two several readings under suspension of the rules.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 344, L. D. 203, Bill "An Act Relating to the Military Law."

Amend said bill by striking out in the 11th line of that part designated as Sec. 50 the underlined figure "50" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '100'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of Somerset Academy" (S. P. 178) (L. D. 390)

Bill "An Act relating to Apportionments from School Funds" (S. P. 251) (L. D. 550)

Bill "An Act relating to the Taking of Alewives in the Town of Franklin" (S. P. 278) (L. D. 617)

Bill "An Act relating to Published Records of Vital Statistics" (S. P. 373) (L. D. 899)

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

Tabled

Bill "An Act relating to Taking Animals and Birds for Scientific Purposes" (S. P. 454) (L. D. 1068)

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

(On motion of Mr. Littlefield of Kennebunk, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.)

Bill "An Act relating to Hunting of Foxes" (S. P. 487) (L. D. 1168)

Bill "An Act relating to the Use of Drags in Bluehill Bay, Hancock County" (S. P. 468) (L. D. 1101)

Bill "An Act Adding Korean Veterans to Laws Relating to Veterans" (H. P. 98) (L. D. 45)

Bill "An Act relating to Request for Tax Exemption" (H. P. 333) (L. D. 192)

Bill "An Act relating to the Military Law" (H. P. 661) (L. D. 376)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Kittery School District" (S. P. 105) (L. D. 159)

Bill "An Act Providing for Merger and Dissolution of Domestic Mutual Insurance Companies" (H. P. 1512) (L. D. 1118)

Resolve relating to the Use of Purse or Drag Seines in Certain Waters (H. P. 656) (L. D. 374)

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

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the first matter of unfinished business on today's calendar which is Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1952, and June 30, 1953" (S. P. 495) (L. D. 1196), at the time of adjournment the Bill being read the third time and Item "Subsidies to Cities and Towns" in the paragraph entitled "Education, Department of" being under consideration.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe in our progress I said that I had an amendment to offer and asked for indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "J". I am sure that we did not break up in confusion, and I am quite sure that the House will not agree with the press in their statement.

I will state now that the reason I asked for indefinite postponement of this Senate Amendment "J" was because I thought we were proceeding under rule of unanimous consent and therefore we had to consider and dispose of the amendment which was before us in order to get this matter before us in the House. I believe that was the procedure.

My amendment calls for an amount to exceed this Senate Amendment "J" and the adoption of my amendment would pay full subsidy under L. D. 551. I believe we can call before the House, this L. D. 551, even though it has not come before the House, because the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to consider it in their budget which they submitted to me. I believe they were just in their reasoning, and that is the reason for my motion to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "J."

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, is ill and is unable to be here and has asked me to explain what the committee's action was, what the Senate Amendment "J" calls for, and also to go into "Plan 8."

The Appropriations Committee reported to you the figures of the actual appropriations for the current biennium. They took the four plans or four groups for tuition, for teaching positions, for conveyance in lieu of teaching positions and for equalization of educational opportunity. They added these figures and also applied them to Plan 8, L. D. 551, in theory. How they arrived at these figures was by averaging the two actual years, which were, for the first year, \$4,533,111, and \$4,608,111; dividing that we arrived at the figure of \$4,570,611 for the biennium. They left the school census where it was.

Senate Amendment "J", passed by the Senate, took these four groups and also took the school census and added that money to the plan and also added the further sums of \$555,030 and \$566,530 for the second year. This means

that they also, even though "Plan 8" has not appeared before us — it is on the table in the other branch — they are accepting "Plan 8" but they are taking as I stated, the census money which is \$555,030 and \$566,530, and applied that to the plan and added additional funds.

Of course the motion of the previous gentleman, to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "J", would bring it back to what the Appropriations Committee recommended, which was \$4,570,611 and \$4,570,611, a total of \$9,141,222. In other words, the school census would remain where it is and we would be back to where the Appropriations Committee recommended.

The feeling of the committee, when they reported this bill, was that they wanted to somewhat hold the line. It was the opinion that some places, were they left alone, would take care of their educational program; some of them certainly need to be subsidized.

"Plan 8", the key concept of the new formula, is a partnership relation between the State and the local unit in financing basic school costs. The terms of the partnership vary according to the ability of the community to support education, as determined from its State valuation and the number of pupils being provided a free educational opportunity. In the plan the State is divided into nine classes, ranging from the least able (valuation of less than \$1,500 per child being educated) to the most able (in which the ability is \$7,500 or more per child).

The class to which a town belongs is found by dividing the State valuation by the number of resident children reported as attending school at public expense on April 1st annually in the returns required in Section 202 of Chapter 37.

For each classification the proposed subsidy allocation will be a percentage of the educational costs to the city, town or community school district, excluding expenditures for capital outlay, debt service, and repairs, and deducting incidental receipts. The cost of vocational education will be included as the net local expenditure for this service. The range of clas-

sifications and the percentage allocations as approved by the State Board of Education are as follows and you can find these figures on the copy distributed to you today by Representative Finnegan.

In other words "Plan 8" was accepted in theory by the Appropriations Committee, based on the actual expenditures, that is, what was given for the year 1949-1950 and 1950-1951, and of course when you say "actual" that means also the special session funds which were given. Then those funds were added together, divided, and you arrived at that figure for each year.

I am not attempting to be repetitious but I think it might be well to state again, that Senate Amendment "J" steps that up, takes the census money, throws it into "Plan 8" and adds further money. Again I repeat that "Plan 8" has been accepted in theory by the committee but if you start way at the top, this program will mushroom where we will not be able to get to it, and in that they did go along with the Plan, they felt that they would prefer to hold the line, at least to see how this Plan does work out. I shall go along with the motion of the gentleman.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, is there anything to prevent Mr. Dickey from offering an amendment to the Senate amendment rather than asking for indefinite postponement of the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that the rule under the consent is that we cannot amend a Senate amendment; we must dispose of the Senate amendment first; that under the rule, if the Senate amendment fails to be adopted, then amendments are in order on the bill as written. It is not necessary to indefinitely postpone the Senate amendment or any amendment. It can be taken care of by failure to be adopted by a majority of this House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham.

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I want to go along with the motion to postpone the Senate amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey. I think that all of us should have an opportunity to express ourselves on different amounts which will fulfill the purpose of this particular Plan 8 which has been talked about. I know this: that if we go along with the Appropriations Committee in their amount, Plan 8 will be entirely ineffectual, that it will pay off to the towns and cities 96 per cent of the school subsidies. We have been going along as far as we should, I think, in not meeting our obligations, Mr. Dickey's amendment is going to call for the full amount which will be disbursed under L. D. 551. If that fails of passage, I assure you that I have an amendment which will go along somewhat with the Senate amendment, but I am going to support the full amount.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that Senate Amendment "J" be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Friendship, Mr. Winchenpaw.

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to state that L. D. 551 is in the Senate on the table, with a very small amendment on it. It seems to me that by bringing in here L. D. 551 when nobody knows whether it is going to pass or not, we are mixing this thing up a little bit.

What I would like to say is that right now we are trying to determine how much money the Educational Department is going to have for the biennium. This money is paid out under four heads under the old plan, that is, Teaching Positions, Tuition, Conveyance in Lieu of Teaching Positions and Equalization money. I think if we forget L. D. 551 for the moment and if everyone will concentrate on how much money we think we can afford to raise and appropriate for the biennium for educational purposes, we

will get this matter over with more quickly.

I, for one, would like to congratulate the Appropriations Committee on the work they did in bringing this thing out, even though I do not agree, maybe, with some of the figures we have here. The Appropriations Committee put a lot of work into this thing and it was not all guesswork, and I, for one, would like to congratulate them.

I would like to say one word about that equalization money. I favor L. D. 551, but I think that we should forget that for the time being.

Equalization money makes me think of the story of the old preacher. He had a child late in life, and he went down to church one Sunday morning to preach a sermon. He had his little child by the hand. They had a system of putting money in a box out by the door. So when the old preacher went in to preach the sermon he put in a quarter. Evidently there were not very many people in church that morning, so when he came out of church he took out the money that was in the box and there was only a quarter in there. His little son looked up at him and he said, "Daddy, the more you put in the more you take out." (Laughter)

That was one unfair feature about the equalization money: the more you put in the more you took out. It was brought out in the committee that if a town had raised thirteen dollars more than they did they would have had several thousand more dollars out of equalization money. And so the department, or the State Board of Education, brought out L. D. 551. But regardless of what happens to L. D. 551, we need a certain amount of money to pay off the school money for the next two years.

I would like to read a little bit from the Governor's Inaugural Address:

"Education, health and welfare and institutions have been cited because the substantial portion of monies derived from general taxation, under our present system, is expended in these categories.

"It is a historic truth, embarrassing to admit but nonetheless ob-

vious, that down through the years we have failed to provide for these functions to the full extent of the law.

"It is high time we do so, or change the law if we are to keep faith with the people.

"Is there one among you who would retrench on the small advances we have made in education?"

I certainly hope that the motion made by the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, prevails and that we indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "J" so we can start over. Thank you.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First I will state that it is true that Plan 8 is not in here, L. D. 551, but if it didn't pass it would just go back to these figures and allocate these funds and that would be the end of it.

Speaking of guess-work—I have heard it several times in the last two days—but I do not think there is anybody here who, when I made the remark "guess-work," did not know that my remark meant on a studied basis. Studied guess-work, an estimation, if the dictionary is correct, amount to the same thing. If they did not know what I meant, I am telling them now. You are not going to drag that chestnut in here from now until the day we adjourn.

Now as far as meeting obligations, Mr. Dunham, when are the cities and towns going to meet their obligations to us? The State has obligations. We meet them. When the Federal government sends us down some money they have specifications, they have rulings, and we should abide by them. If we do not want to abide by them, let's send the money back. We should do the same thing with the towns and cities. I claim that if you step this up too high until in Maine the towns and cities meet their obligations with us by having a good, sound revaluation program, we are never going to get anywhere. That is their obligation to us. Let them meet us half way, and I am sure we will go along with them.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee, without any doubt in my mind, has spent much time in preparing this appropriation. But I also understand that they have handed down what they considered the minimum. Now the Governor feels that we need more money. I am trying to go along with the Governor for this reason: if we need more money and we only appropriate a part of what is needed, you are just coming back here again for a special session to raise more money. I think the commonsense thing to do is to put these appropriations high enough to meet the requirements.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. FINNEGAN: Mr. Speaker, I think we are all confused on this Plan 8. This includes the Governor's Budget Message, it includes Plan 8 approximately as called for under the schedule which you now have on your desks. It is covered by L. D. 551. I think all of the discussion here, to relieve the anxiety or the thoughts of our distinguished colleague from Portland (Mr. McGlaufflin)—I do call him distinguished and respect his judgment and always have—this \$1,600,000 increase over the appropriation for 1949-50 and 1950-51 plus a little more than a million dollars from the Special Session, is included—I mean that we have not attempted to take anything away from that program or that amount; although I think you could safely take away—this is going to be a little heresy to some of our educational friends—I think you could take the million dollars that was appropriated in Special Session and go back to your original appropriation and do just a little bit of setting up some legislation that would provide the things we are talking about which this bill plus the \$1,600,000 do not provide.

We are appropriating a lot of money to towns. There is not one cent of dedicated revenue in this money which we appropriate to the towns that requires any of the

towns or counties or cities to do a single thing but observe the minimum teachers' salaries.

Now, the penalty for not doing that is to lose \$2 for every \$1 you are deficient. That is not a terrific burden. I can't believe that there are many towns or communities or cities which are not observing those minimum salaries now. I am also offering this little bit of clarification of the purpose for which I had Mr. Ladd prepare this revised schedule. The original schedule which we had calls for \$1,600,000, approximately those figures, over the 1950 aid. That first schedule you had listed the towns alphabetically. You picked up your aid, your classes, just by going through that thing without having been concentrated so you could really look at the classes as they really exist. As a matter of appropriations, and we are considering that, it is very difficult to follow the program because we didn't know—we also had books there, we had an educational report — by going through it you could find out the number of teachers, the number of pupils and you could find out the state valuation—it was considerable effort to assemble these facts. In providing that information, myself, on the Appropriations Committee, we broke this thing up into these segregated groups, that is, we segregated the classes, we have given you some additional information, the valuation of the towns, the number of pupils and the other information which seems to be necessary in order that we may intelligently know what is being done.

Now, in clarifying my statement, in explanation of it, in support of it, you could take the five million dollar program of 1949-50 and 1950-51, state aid, and revise that program on the basis of actual needs. You must keep in mind that this whole program that we are talking about is about twenty per cent of the educational program of the State. Now, eighty per cent, or approximately that figure, belongs to the towns on any basis—I mean, we are only, from the standpoint of State support, providing about twenty per cent. Under this plan, you step it up to about twenty-seven or something like that but

taking the maximum grant from the State to the towns, it is around that figure.

The theory of state valuation as against the—the formula divided by the number of pupils, will give you a figure of \$1,500 or \$5,000 or something. Of course, it is unsound in its concept because as the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, pointed out, we have no uniform value. There are towns with a very low valuation and few children which will work out to some very inadequate and very unnatural results.

There is a case in point that I would like to just offer you—this is not the answer to the teachers' program or the educational program. Under this plan, which you have before you, you will find that the City of Bangor received approximately \$90,000 for state aid on an educational program of \$660,000. Actually, at one meeting of the school board within a month they increased teachers' salaries in the City of Bangor, \$86,000.

Now, you just resolve that into your educational program and see where you are arriving at this demand for more money from more towns. Now, the Federal Government has set a little pattern, as the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, has reminded you, of matching appropriations. When you are considering your Health and Welfare program, you will find Old Age Assistance is allotted so much money. That money is spent on Old Age Assistance. When you come to your ADC program, that money is dedicated to that program and it is set there, it doesn't go anywhere else in the welfare program.

Now what we are concerned with here and what some of these propaganda machines which are operating overtime should be reminded of is that they are directing their propaganda at the wrong source. The teachers are employees of the towns and cities. They are hired by them.

Now, if the selectmen or the mayors or the school boards of these various towns fail to do their duty by these teachers, their relief is going to be right at the source where they are employed. If they would

just direct their propaganda at the proper source and build up a public opinion in that direction, there might be some basis for their statements which they so very glibly pass out.

If we are going to provide the money for the youngsters—and I am dedicated to that, myself, that they should be properly educated and funds should be provided—if we are holding the twenty per cent end of that, for Heaven's sake, let's set up some regulations that will require if we give this aid that the proper amount is dedicated to the proper purpose and appropriated for that purpose. And, failing in that, aid be denied them.

Now, I haven't broken these down, I intended to do that over the weekend, I am going to anyway—we are now talking about Plan 8 and Plan 8 isn't before us, but Bill 551—but just to clear the atmosphere, if we appropriate five million dollars or six million dollars in this program, it isn't going to do a thing for these teachers or these children in these places unless some money is dedicated for the purpose of educational purposes and dedicated to that and made mandatory that the towns shall appropriate that money.

This Plan 8, I fail to understand how people of reasonable intelligence should offer that plan under its present form because, while they ask for money and have it allocated to towns in the most fantastic fashion—if you will read this break-down you have on your desks, which was furnished by the Educational Department—Incidentally, I just want to say in passing that Mr. Ladd and his committee have been very helpful, very cooperative, they have furnished this information in the form we requested it. You have it before you and while much of this debate and discussion will probably occur when L. D. 551 is presented, I remarked to the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, that it seemed we were a little premature in debating an educational program when the basic, fundamental thought behind the whole thing hasn't been even presented to us.

In closing, I would just like to say this that no matter what you

appropriate, whether it is one million six or two million six, under the provisions, the way this thing is set up, you will accomplish nothing but contribute some substantial aid to towns which may or may not need it. It is not dedicated revenue. There is nothing provided in the bill that is dedicated.

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

Mr. **PERRY**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I, personally, am somewhat confused and, in my opinion, either the Appropriations Committee must have information that I lack or I have definitely been misled. My friends, the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, and the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Finnegan, have just spoken of the unfairness in the valuation of what this is based on and that the towns and cities aren't holding faith with the State of Maine. I have been led to believe that this particular program has been based on the State valuation. Regardless of what the towns do, it has nothing to do with this program. It is a State valuation, and if someone isn't holding faith, it is the State and not the particular towns and cities. This has nothing to do with what the town's valuation is. It is based and shown right here in the particular report that it has nothing to do with it.

There is one more particular question that bothers me on the Senate Amendment, I notice that where they have taken the \$555,030 and so forth and added on to it it is in the Appropriations Committee's report under "Census" so it adds up to the same particular figure either way and in one case it puts it under Plan 8 and in the other case it is still in there so there isn't a difference in the amount of money, it is just whether that comes under Plan 8 or not, the way it looks to me.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey.

Mr. **BAILEY**: Mr. Speaker, I shall have to admit that in looking over this plan I am somewhat confused but on page 8 I just happened to notice two items that perhaps my friend, the gentleman from

Bangor, Mr. Finnegan, might explain. I understood that under this revised plan no town was going to get less than what it has been getting and I also understood the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, to say that the only reduction was in regard to teachers' salaries. Now, if we can get some light on that so that some of us who, perhaps, are not so familiar with the department as some others—I took the Town of Westport. It is a small town; it happens to be one that is in the locality near me and I am somewhat acquainted with the situation, where there is a valuation of \$199,000, forty pupils, which, as I remember, has two schools, and they have to forfeit \$230 in that. Now, if that is just on account of the reduced salaries of the teachers they surely must be getting a very small salary. It doesn't hardly seem possible that a town even with a low valuation would be reduced as low as that.

Then we take one of our most prosperous towns, the town of Lisbon. Probably it is not out of reason but I just happened to notice that.

In both of those cases, if you will check up, you will see the cost per pupil in there is around \$100 per pupil and they gain \$3,390.

Now, with approximately the same cost per pupil which the towns are paying, I can't see why one of our little towns should have to suffer whereby a larger town could gain.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller.

Mr. **FULLER**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think we are getting here just what we want. I think everybody should be well-informed when we vote. I certainly feel that everyone should at least know what he is doing when you vote five or six million dollars. I would disagree with Mr. Finnegan on one or two points. I say that this is dedicated revenue. At least, it is dedicated to four things: Teaching positions; conveyance; tuition and equalization and I can't see that Plan 8 is so complicated. If you think this is complicated, I wish you would go back and read your old equalization law. As I un-

derstand it, it covers approximately twenty-two pages in our Revised Statutes, and I know from experience that it is just impossible to understand and, as I told you one time at a caucus meeting, it is impossible for a superintendent of schools to go before his town meeting and tell his people how much state money he is going to get come next December.

With Plan 8, we would like, at least, to give it a trial. It is the best thing that we know about; it is one hundred per cent better than what we had before and it is very simple. All you have got to do is take your local resident pupils, divide by your state valuation of your towns and you automatically fall into one of the nine categories, and immediately you can see how much money you are going to get from the State. If they don't pay one hundred cents on the dollar, we will say they are paying eighty-five per cent. Then you take the total and take eighty-five per cent of it and you still have it. A superintendent of schools in a city or town could go before his budget committee or go before his annual town meeting and he can say: "Gentlemen, this is what we are getting from the State, it is not guess-work, it is actual pennies and this is what we must have if we are going to maintain this program of education."

I think you fail to realize — I haven't mentioned it here and I haven't heard it mentioned—that in the State of Maine we have 3,000 new pupils entering our public schools every year from 1949 to 1959 so that at the end of 1959 it is estimated that we will have 30,000 new pupils. It is going to take money to educate those youngsters and I say that this not a ridiculous program; I think it is a fair program and I think it is giving our youngsters a fair break.

Governor Payne told the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the State Board of Education this: "If you can simplify the subsidy laws it would be rendering a great service to the State of Maine." He also said in his Inaugural Address: "We should accept a firm program of State aid and fulfill it conscientiously. It should be noted, we now

pay at the State level only a little over twenty-two per cent of the costs of public schools against a national average of forty-three per cent." I would like to state right here that if we go along with the budget that is recommended by the Appropriations Committee, that would probably be cut to from sixteen to eighteen per cent.

I believe an enlightened citizenry is the only hope for a strong democracy. Communism thrives on misery and ignorance. Let's develop our human resources along with our natural resources. Civilization can advance only as fast as education and to me civilization means education. So, let's give our boys and girls a fair opportunity. The future doesn't look too bright for them, God knows, and I think the only thing that we can do is at least give them a decent educational opportunity. Thank you.

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

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is not my purpose, at this time, to speak either in favor or in opposition to Senate Amendment "J" nor to L. D. 1196, the Appropriations Bill, but I do believe that all this discussion on L. D. 551, the General Purpose Bill, is somewhat premature. After all, this Plan 8 is only a method of distribution for money we are going to appropriate for the Department of Education. I believe that the big question before us is how much more do we want to appropriate, if any, for the Department of Education, or, better still, how much more do we feel we can afford to appropriate.

Last night, I went over some figures here and this is what I arrived at and I believe this is what we should decide; this is the big question right now. During the current biennium, we are spending for the four items which will be included in L. D. 551 and the School Census, \$10,215,334. Now, if we feel that this is about the amount of money that we want to appropriate for the next biennium, we should go along with L. D. 1196, the Appropriations Bill. That will mean that we should raise about \$60,000 more for the next biennium than we have for this biennium. If we go along

with Senate Amendment "J", it means that we have to raise or appropriate \$1,318,618 more than we have for the present biennium. If we go along with the Governor's Budget message appropriation, it would mean an increase of \$1,700,000 over the present biennium.

I think the big question before us is to decide how much more, if any, we can afford to appropriate and come to that conclusion.

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

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, the situation, as I understand it, is this: We have got a new Plan 8 for school subsidies which would be about \$1,600,000 more than the old plan. When the Appropriations Committee made its recommendations, which we find here, they were quite a bit less than what the schools are now getting in the way of subsidies.

Senate Amendment "J" is a compromise figure which was designed to bring the amount of school subsidies up to what they are getting now. There was a mistake of about \$30,000 so that under Senate Amendment "J" the subsidy figure is about \$30,000 less than they are getting now. If we feel like going along on a compromise, Senate Amendment "J" is O.K. If the members who want to postpone this amendment indefinitely get what they want, their proposition is to jack the figure up \$1,600,000 to correspond with what is wanted by this Plan 8, that new subsidy plan. It seems to me that there is one missing factor that has not been mentioned, and that is the question whether or not you are going to repeal the state tax on municipalities. If you do, the figure which the Appropriations Committee has recommended would probably be sufficient if you decided to pay no subsidies to the larger towns and cities. If that property tax is repealed, it would be a great windfall for the large cities because it would bring back to them thousands and thousands of dollars which they really won't know what to do with. I hope they will spend some of it for schools. I think the question is whether or not you are going to try to compromise now because I believe that in any event

no matter what figure you put on this today, the figure will have to be re-examined later in view of any action that may be taken on the repeal of the state tax on municipalities.

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

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I had understood before I came into this session of the Legislature that Plan 8 was to make order out of chaos. Apparently, this morning, it has just created it.

It is my understanding that Plan 8 was arrived at after seven other plans were disposed of as unworkable. They had gone through various and many formulas and Plan 8 will give to the cities and towns a hundred per cent appropriation subsidy only if the \$1,600,000 is added. If Plan 8 is used in conjunction with the appropriation suggested by the committee, it is my understanding that the cities and towns would get approximately eighty-five per cent of the recommendation made by the Governor.

Under the old formula, however, if Plan 8 is not put into effect, cities and towns will get approximately ninety-five per cent if they go on the old figures. I do not feel, and it is not my understanding, that the men who created Plan 8 expected to be included in it the so-called "School Census Subsidy" and I feel that that should be left out when we arrive at the figure to be included for subsidies in this appropriation bill.

Speaking of state valuations, there has been some confusion with respect to that. State valuation is made independent of the valuations of the cities and towns and we must remember that Plan 8 is based upon State valuations and the success of it depends upon the equalization of these valuations.

I think we appreciate how the State arrives at their State valuation for cities and towns. It is my understanding that the state assessors will go into a city or town and take their over-all valuation and, on the basis of that valuation, go out and in certain instances pick out certain pieces of property, appraise them and then compare them with the value placed upon it by

the city and then the percentage of difference is that difference you will find reflected in the city valuation and the State valuation. Hence, I do not believe that on that type of valuation that Plan 8 can be effective until we have a complete, thorough and honest statewide valuation.

I would speak now solely for the purpose of leaving out of this subsidy, or Plan 8, if it is to be effective, that part which relates to School Census. I feel that with this left out and reduced to the figure arrived at by the committee that the cities and towns will be favored as well as they should be by this Legislature.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't see why there is any need to be confused in this matter. The Governor with the aid of the school department has given this very careful study. They have been two years at it. Now, I cannot afford to spend the time to go into it as they have and I do not believe the committee can. They have had two years; we have established an Educational Department and their business is to be honest and honorable and give us the facts. They are on the field.

Now, it seems to me that the question is, shall we put the dollar sign above the training of the youth of this State? Shall we put the dollar sign above education, morality and the spiritual side of learning? We can't afford to do it. The question is: Shall we put ignorance and illiteracy in the foundation of the buildings of this State. If we do, members, the structure is going to topple.

I want the man who comes down here and sits in my seat to be more highly educated than I am and more highly trained. I want him to have all the Education Department and the towns can possibly give him.

I want to bring this to your attention, then I am through: What a few extra dollars has done for the poor boys of the State of Maine who otherwise would be out here hunting oil or maybe calling on for help to dependent children.

Two years ago this very winter, I was coming to the State House. I went to a man and woman with a baby in a push cart, a push sled. They were up here where we have to wait to come across the Lewiston Highway. We stood together, and it was snowing and freezing. I looked in at the little fellow and I patted his cheek and said: "You are a beautiful baby." I said: "It seems to me that you are out in quite a storm." The woman said: "Yes, we have to be", and I saw that she was in trouble. I said: "Sometimes we have to." She said: "Yes," And I said: "What seems to be the trouble?" "Well," she says, "we are looking for a room; we have been ordered out of our room." I said: "What are you doing here?" She says, she seemed to do the speaking, I suppose most women do because they know they have better judgment than we men and she says, "Well, we are down here attending this State school, the automobile school," and she says: "We haven't got much money and we have got to find a room tomorrow." I said: "I don't know as I can help you but I know a man who can." And the fellow said: "Who is it and I will go and see him." "Well," I said "you won't have to go very far to see him." I said: "I am speaking about the man in the sky." I said: "Have you prayed—I will guarantee that he will help you." We were out there in the storm. "Now," I said, "do you believe in the Bible?" He said: "Yes," I said "All right, if you people want to know how to give a good gift to your children, how much more will your Heavenly Father give the things to you that you ask. Do you believe it?" He said: "I do." I said: "Let us pray." We prayed to God Almighty and I want to say I didn't take my hat off either. I said: "Remember," and went on. The incident kind of left me. A few days ago I went down to visit that State school and a young fellow came along to me with a paper in his hand and said: "Is your name Bubar?" And I said: "Yes". "Representative Bubar?" And I said: "Yes." He said: "Do you remember the time two years ago when I met you out here on the street in the storm?" I said:

"Yes." He said: "Do you remember you told me of a man who could help me?" I said: "Yes. How did it turn out?" He said: "We found a room that night." He said: "Mr. Bubar, let me tell you that in June I am going to graduate and I have a job now for \$70 a week." He took me by the hand and he grasped it and he shook it and he slapped me on the shoulder and said: "Thank you, thank you, thank you."

Members, that is what a few dollars of the State's money will do for poor boys who can't go to academies and colleges. Members, I believe that we ought not to be niggardly with our money for these boys who will take your place and mine very soon to carry on the job we are attempting to do.

Thank you.

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

Mr. FINNEGAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Without any idea of continuing this discussion, I would just like to remind the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, that what I am contending for is what he hopes to get but you will never get it under Bill No. 551, which is the document that goes with it, because no matter what anybody tells you, you can read the bill itself, there isn't a dollar of dedicated revenue that any town is going to match or appropriate money to carry out the provisions of education.

I am not going through the long thing here; I just happened to glance at the Town of Gorham which gets a hundred and twenty per cent increase. They have a valuation of \$3,500,000; they have a thousand pupils. Their educational cost is \$101,000. In 1950, they got \$16,000. Under Plan 8, they would get \$35,419 an increase of \$19,000, or one hundred and twenty per cent.

You can take your Class 1 under the segregated plan you have here and you will find—you can go through the list—you will find five towns in the distress area who are receiving less. You will find no town—this is the percentage of change: 20%, 11%, 43, 56, 38, 32, 86, 23 and so on down the line. Under this bill, there is no effort

being made to equalize this thing. As I said before, it is an award to towns without requiring anything from the town.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Whitefield, Mr. Chase.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, we seem to be all at sea here on this education business. The first figure we had here we passed and there wasn't a word said on education; this was Departmental Operations. It seems to me that that shows we had faith in our Education Department. There isn't a member here in the House who would want to deprive his children of additional education and I believe, myself, until we, ourselves, can offer something, some kind of a program to work on, we should accept that offer to us. It is too late now to devise a program. This is the only one offered. That Plan 8 hasn't come before us and we don't know when it will come before us. It seems to me we should go on here and I will agree with the many who have said that we should accept Senate Amendment "J" and give a little more to the Education Department. We are increasing practically all of the other expenditures in the various departments. It seems to me we aren't taking too much of a chance if we go ahead with an increase on this one. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterboro, Mr. Bradeen.

Mr. BRADEEN: Mr. Speaker, I am always disturbed at any move that seems to cut corners with education at the expense of dollars. I went into a store in Augusta a few days ago, a drug store. I had occasion to make some casual remark about State affairs and the proposed taxes and so forth and so on and the man who was obviously the owner of the store, or the manager, he, in the parlance of the day, proceeded to jump on me. That didn't disturb me because I have had such experience before. He said: "If you fellows up there on the hill,"—this was the substance of it—"would go through the departments and make some changes," and he said, "yes, start

in with the Governor's Council, kick those fellows out." That is exactly what he said. I looked at him—I suppose, perhaps, my face reflected my disgust because that was exactly the way I felt about it. I said: "My friend, did you ever see a man who at some time or other did not need advice?" He did not answer me; he walked off.

I have had that today, that thought, for this reason only: It is a well-established maxim, I think, that you can't beat something with nothing.

Now, we have before us a bill which probably has some defects. I don't know of a bill of any type, offhand, that I can recall that isn't defective in some way or other, perhaps to some degree. But this bill represents, as I understand it, the considered opinion of individuals whom I believe to be qualified to pass judgment upon the educational needs of the State of Maine and that is what we are here today to consider. Not the matter of a half a million dollars, or a million and a half. The money will come from some place or other, we will get it and you and I know where that will be, it will be from the people of the State of Maine and it will go back there to train our children.

Now, we have this bill and until we have something which is considerably better and which seems to me to be more logical than this, this is the bill that I propose to vote for. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recess until 1:30 P. M.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, moves that the House recess until 1:30 P. M. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House so recessed.

After Recess

The House reconvened at 1:30 P. M., Eastern Standard Time, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that Senate Amendment "J" be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that Senate Amendment "J" to L. D. 1196, the paragraph "EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF: Subsidies to Cities and Towns" be indefinitely postponed, will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and Senate Amendment "J" was indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, the delay seems to have been due to considerable confusion regarding figures. I offer an amendment which I understand raises the general subsidy account \$100,000 per year over the Governor's budget, and it is with that intent that the amendment is presented.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, presents House Amendment "S" to "EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF: Subsidies to Cities and Towns." The Clerk will read the amendment.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "S" to S. P. 495, L. D. 1196, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1952, and June 30, 1953."

Amend said Bill by striking out from the paragraph entitled

"EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF"

"Subsidies to Cities and Towns:

for General Purpose

Educational Aid to

Cities, Towns,

Plantations and

Community School

Districts

4,570,611 4,570,611

For school

Census

555,030 566,530"

and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Subsidies to Cities and Towns:

for General Purpose

Educational Aid to

Cities, Towns,

Plantations and

Community School

Districts 5,897,092 6,078,677'

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. FINNEGAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The adoption of this amendment is the adoption of L. D. 551. The schedule which you have on your desks directly refers to that, ties directly into that bill and is part of it. Now we are accepting the provisions of L. D. 551 which has not yet appeared in this House and is not available for amendment, correction or discussion. I understand the good old steamroller method, but I think, in the interest of the people who are interested in education, as I am, that to pass that amendment in the form that the bill L. D. 551 now exists and with the schedules it proposes would be definitely a most unwise step to say the least.

I move that that amendment be indefinitely postponed until such time as we have had a chance to discuss L. D. 551 with the accompanying schedule. I move that it be indefinitely postponed for that reason.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I definitely do not go along with the thinking of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Finnegan. This L. D. 551 has not been acted upon yet, and we can use our judgment when that thing comes in here. Supposing we do not adopt L. D. 551. We have still got the money to pay our responsibilities to the children of the State of Maine. If we want to adopt it, we can pay 95 per cent of what it calls for without disturbing the bill. But you cannot tell me that we, in our judgment, cannot change that to pay a hundred per cent. But if you do not want to do that, we will follow the old subsidy laws

and we will pay a hundred per cent under those laws.

Now I am one of those fellows who does anticipate a new tax. I do anticipate a new tax. And if we do ask the people of Maine to pay more money are we going to give them something in this hand and then turn around and take it back from them with this other hand?

I have told my people time and time again what I stand for. I stand for returning the property tax which the State collects to the cities and towns, and I assure you that they are not going to throw that money away.

Have you been reading the town reports of late? Have you been reading of some of these towns up in the northern part of this country that have better than a hundred mill tax? Are you trying to tell me that they cannot use that seven and a quarter mills to good advantage? With forty thousand more pupils to enter our schools, who need teachers, books and supplies, need new classrooms, is anyone trying to tell me that these cities and towns cannot use it? It is silly. I do not think you have got to call out the National Guard to present the two per cent take in a sales tax.

I think we can meet our responsibilities, give the boys and the girls in the State of Maine a fair educational program. It will raise, to be sure, our subsidy program from 22 per cent up to around 26 per cent. This education business is a state and a local affair. Why, if we are out of step the rest of the country must be way out of step. The rest of the states are returning to their towns and their cities 46 per cent of the educational costs. You can't tell me we are out of step when we raise this money and help our towns and our cities to build up their educational program.

I may be a propaganda machine, but if I am, I am a machine for good. I have got grandchildren growing up and I want to see them have a chance, and I hope you ladies and gentlemen will get behind this bill. It is the Governor's Budget plus \$100,000 per year, which we can pay for by a suitable tax. We can help out our towns and

our cities and put some of that money back into circulation. They will gain approximately seventeen million dollars by raising the debt limit from five per cent to seven and a half per cent. My little county down there in Hancock will gain a quarter of a million dollars by returning the seven and a quarter mills to them. You cannot tell me that is not progress. Of course it is progress, and that is the kind of a program I am going along with and I hope you support it.

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

Mr. HAWKES: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will state the nature of his question.

Mr. HAWKES: Would the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, please explain to us how this proposed amendment fits into this sheet that we have before us that we are taking up item by item, and what it covers in that particular sheet?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Saco, Mr. Hawkes, requests information of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase. The gentleman may answer if he chooses.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, the amendment strikes out—I do not have a copy of it here at the moment—but the amendment strikes out \$4,570,611 and the following figure \$4,570,611, also strikes out the preceding figure \$555,030 and \$566,530, and inserts in place thereof one figure, \$5,897,092, and in the other column one figure of \$6,078,677. This is somewhat higher than the Senate amendment to the same item which was indefinitely postponed. I cannot give the gentleman the exact comparison, but it is somewhere around \$100,000 higher the first year and possibly \$300,000 the second year.

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

Mr. FENN: Mr. Speaker, this House amendment that Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth has offered us—the Senate has already sent in their amendment raising it just a little bit above the Governor's recommendation. It seems, as I have

talked around the House here since we recessed, that everybody is all mixed up on this bill, L. D. 511. This bill, L. D. 551, has nothing to do with the appropriation of the money, right at the present moment. That is just a formula, as I understand it, to appropriate the money which you are going to pass here, whether we got one dollar or five million dollars. The plan could still be adopted. So I am definitely going along with the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, on this. Let's get this over with, appropriate this, and go along with House Amendment "S."

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think that we want to get along with this thing. I want to say that this is a compromise measure, and I hope that everybody will get behind it and go along with it.

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

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: To be very brief, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Bangor (Mr. Finnegan) to indefinitely postpone the amendment. If I understand the motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth (Mr. Chase) correctly, they are including the school census. We have heard much of this Plan 8, which I want to keep away from as much as possible, but they are including in that something that was never intended to be included in it by the planners of that particular Plan 8. Then that takes us back to the mention that was made here a moment ago of the 100 mill tax rate. The reason that we have a 100 mill tax rate is because they have low valuations, which is again the basis of Plan 8.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Bangor (Mr. Finnegan) will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Finnegan, that House Amendment "S" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee.

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to just clarify one point here. If I understood the gentleman from Bangor (Mr. Finnegan) he said he would like to definitely postpone this to a certain date. I cannot understand that.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman made the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "S." That is the question before the House. Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Finnegan, that House Amendment "S" be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Twenty-four having voted in the affirmative and eighty-three in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "S" does not prevail.

The question before the House is on the adoption of House Amendment "S".

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller.

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adopt House Amendment "S".

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the adoption of House Amendment "S".

All those in favor of adopting House Amendment "S" will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "S" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will continue the reading of the item.

The CLERK (reading):

"For School			
Census	\$555,030	\$566,530	
For Temporary Residents	2,000	2,000	
For Professional Credits for Teaching Positions	65,000	65,000	
Schooling of Children in Unorganized Towns	195,711	196,226	

Superintendents of Towns Comprising School Unions 183,000 183,000"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman may state her question.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anyone on the Educational Committee can tell me how many superintendents we have classified under the school unions who have perhaps one other town but all of the pupils are being taught in one town, because it is costing the State of Maine \$1350 for each superintendent under that arrangement. If that is the case with our consolidation, with our moving into towns, it does seem as though we might save a little money right here. Can anyone give me the answer to that?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, asks a question through the Chair of any member of the Educational Committee. Any member of the Educational Committee may answer the question through the Chair.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller.

Mr. FULLER: I believe I understood the question of the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt. Her question is that if there is a union of towns but only one town is serving as an educational center—is that right?

I do not think there is a single union in the State where all the children are going to just one town. There is one case where there are several towns in a union. I can mention one. For instance, Bowerbank is in the Dover-Foxcroft union and there are no youngsters in school there, they go to school in other towns. But we have other towns in the union besides. We have Atkinson. I do not think there is a single supervisory union in the State that has all of the youngsters going to one single town.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker, with apologies to the gentleman, I would like to state that I know of at least one such instance, and if there are others and we can save the State money, I think this is the time to do it.

If I may continue on. Am I out of order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman is in order.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue on, I will say, I did not arise to talk on the general purpose of education, but at this time I will try to make my position clear, I might say my general position clear, on education.

I think we have reached the point where education is something sacred, everyone must consider education something that you cannot touch. One gentleman has spoken of his grandchildren. I will state "my children."

I am very much interested in education. I have a son who went to school in the fall, but I am thoroughly convinced that there are several things traveling under the guise of education costing the taxpayers of the State much more money than it need cost them. I think there has been great reluctance in anyone getting up to say anything against education. But I will state this: A teacher said to me the other day, "Do not get the idea that the children in the schools are any happier in these wonderful schools than they were in the schools they had before."

I think there has been a little bit too much of a trend to take our children from our homes into our schools where they have everything, where everything is given to them and they are taught to believe that the future will hold everything perfect; that if you haven't the money in your home, then the city or the State or the government or someone is going to give it to you. I think we need to get back to the basic idea that no one gives us anything. We have to pay for it. We are paying for very expensive frills in our educational system. They are too expensive. Possibly it is because I am a Yankee, but I want my children in their school to come out able to read, write, spell and add,

and I want it in such a way that when they add they don't have to add red figures all the time. I am not afraid and I am not ashamed to get up and say that I think that for the future of our children these things that have come in under the guise of education should be taken out. We are riding along. We will pass them the bill.

Now the school unions—and I will stand here and admit that I am no enemy of consolidation and I am not ashamed of it—some of the towns have gone along with consolidation and some haven't. But I want to know how many superintendents are getting money from the State. I will say this, that in my city our Superintendent of Schools is getting \$1350 because he is superintendent of a school union in Bath and West Bath, and every child in West Bath comes to the Bath schools. He is receiving \$300 traveling expense, and the school meetings are held in the City of Bath. He is receiving a salary from the City of Bath; he is receiving a salary from West Bath. Now I know of that incident, and I am wondering if there are more.

Now we are here earnestly trying to reach a solution to our problems. We are not reaching a solution if we are going to pussyfoot over something for fear we might hurt someone. Believe me, in all sincerity, I do not mean to hurt anyone's feelings; I am not saying it in any bitterness; but I have already said that when I am convinced that we need new money in the State of Maine I am ready to go along with it; but I do not want to go home and look at my working people, look at my people on stated incomes and say I voted for a tax and not be able to say I tried to cut out some of the frills for you folks and for the future.

Rather than bore you a little bit later on, I will say I notice that Physical Education, \$37,500 for 1949 and 1950 and 1950-1951 is not taken in in this year. Possibly it is absorbed somewhere else. Can anyone answer me that? If not, I will say I would hate to see physical education left out of our program because the proper interpretation of physical education is building a

sound mind in a sound body. Here again, I will state that that has been forgotten, that has been terribly neglected in our school system. In too many of them, about the only exercise that a girl gets in a physical education program is if she is a cheerleader for the basketball team. Now in this day and age our education program should be built up, it should be built up just as long in school as you can, I do not mean athletics; I mean a good sound program of teaching that child to grow up healthy.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you can inform me what step I can take on this matter until I am able to get the figures on how many superintendents we have.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt makes a parliamentary inquiry?

Mrs. MOFFATT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentlewoman that the matter now under consideration is "Superintendents of Towns Comprising School Unions." The gentlewoman's inquiry is whether the matter could be passed by for the moment?

Mrs. MOFFATT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Under the consent order, the Chair would advise that this matter could be passed by, to be taken up at the end of L. D. 1196.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller.

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any time, but I think I am right when I say that the State subsidizes city superintendents to the tune of \$1350 just the same as they do union superintendents. I do not know whether it is the law or not, but I suppose it is.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is item "Superintendents of Towns Comprising School Unions."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mr. Dow.

Mr. DOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: On the question that has just been dis-

cussed, I will say I had occasion to look that up two years ago, and at that time I think there were 112 superintendents, and apparently each one received the State subsidy of \$1350.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion?

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I apologize if I seem to delay, but I would like to ask permission for this to be passed by and taken up later.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentlewoman care to state where she would like to have the matter set ahead to?

Mrs. MOFFATT: At the end, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, moves that the item under "Education, Department of: Superintendents of Towns Comprising School Unions" be taken up after the last item, "Veterans Affairs, Division of: General Law Pensions." Is this the pleasure of the House?

All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion under this item? If not, the Clerk may proceed with the next item.

The CLERK (reading):

Vocational Education		
—State	115,961	120,657
Vocational Training Program	40,728	48,153
Vocational Rehabilitation	35,000	35,000
Administration of Federal School Lunch Program	22,210	22,210
Special Education for Physically Handicapped Children	20,000	20,000
Industrial Education	28,000	28,000
Secondary Education for Island Children	2,200	2,200
Board for Approval of Institutions Offering Specialized Training	450	450

Education of Orphans		
of Veterans ...	1,200	1,200

Total Department		
of Education	6,569,605	6,537,746

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the agony on this educational department, but I can detect a little bit of chicanery here from my friend, I think.

I understood the amendment of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, eliminated the school census, but I notice the Clerk read it over as if it was still included in the budget. May I have that cleared up. I do not presume you are trying to have both—or are you trying to have both?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, asks a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase. The Chair would state for the information of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, that the Clerk has the amendment here. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, would like to have the Clerk read the amendment again?

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want the Clerk to read the amendment unnecessarily. As I understood, the amendment was worded in the same fashion as Senate Amendment "J" which, in the substituted figure, consolidated the subsidies of cities and towns and school census under one figure. I understood Mr. Chase's amendment did the same thing; but then the Clerk continued to read "School Census" as being included in the budget. If I am wrong, I stand corrected.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that the Chair does not purport to interpret amendments.

The Clerk will read the amendment.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, for an interpretation?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, requests information from the gentleman

from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase. The gentleman may answer if he chooses.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, may I see the amendment?

The SPEAKER: Yes, the gentleman may.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, the amendment strikes out the item "For School Census."

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Clerk has read "School Census" and there was no objection raised, I believe it would now be necessary to introduce an amendment to omit the school census. Am I right or wrong?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that the Clerk was reading the bill, not the amendment.

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the House wishes to pass both Amendment "S" plus the School Census?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that the School Census is no longer in the bill. It has been amended out.

Mr. TOTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That answers my question.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion. If not, the Clerk may proceed.

The CLERK (reading):

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

Departmental		
Operations	41,750	38,750
Art Commission .	1,000	1,000
Executive Council	10,125	15,200
Governor's		
Expense		
Account	10,000	10,000
Blaine House	16,650	16,500

Total Executive		
Department	79,525	81,450

FINANCE COMMISSIONER AND BUDGET OFFICE

Departmental		
Operations	31,619	38,263

FISH AND GAME, DEPARTMENT OF INLAND

Search for Lost		
Persons	1,500	1,500

FORESTRY DEPARTMENT

Departmental		
Operations	18,400	17,000

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, would I be in order to offer an amendment at this time?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inform the gentleman that there is already Senate Amendment "C" which would have to be disposed of first.

If there is no objection, the Clerk will read the balance of the Forestry Department Paragraph. The Clerk may proceed.

The CLERK (reading):

State Forest		
Nursery	5,600	6,000
Aid to Towns for		
Forest Fires	45,000	45,000
Control of White		
Pine Blister Rust	20,000	20,000
General Forestry		
Purposes	159,420	159,597
Aid to Small		
Woodland		
Owners	15,000	15,000
Entomology	76,863	75,831

Total Forestry
Department 340,283 338,428

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "C".

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "C" to S. P. 495, L. D. 1196, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1952, and June 30, 1953."

Amend said Bill by striking out that part which relates to "Forestry Department" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'FORESTRY DEPARTMENT

Departmental		
Operations	18,400	17,000
State Forest		
Nursery	5,600	6,000
Aid to Towns for		
Forest Fires	45,000	45,000
Control of White		
Pine Blister Rust	15,000	15,000
General Forestry		
Purposes	159,420	159,597
Aid to Small		
Woodland		
Owners	25,000	25,000
Entomology	76,863	75,831

Total Forestry
Department 345,283 343,428'

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that

we adopt Senate Amendment "C" in concurrence; and at this time, if I might, I would like to explain the differences, if any, in the Budget Report. In the first item, "Departmental Operations" in the Budget Report, or in the Governor's recommendation rather, the Budget Committee increased that by \$1497; and that was for the purpose of microfilming of the records in the Department of Forestry. The records are over one hundred years old, and some of the books are in rather bad condition, and if these records are to be preserved they must be taken care of. That is the reason for the increase there. The Nursery Department, that is the same as the Appropriations Committee Report; it is a little in excess of the Governor's recommendation, and that is due to the increased demand for nursery stock trees. Aid to towns for Forest Fires is the same as the Governor's recommendation and the appropriation bill. Control of White Pine Blister Rust is increased by five thousand dollars. General Forestry Purposes is the same. Aid to Small Woodland Owners is increased under Senate Amendment "C" by \$10,000 in each year, which will give the State statewide coverage on farm foresters in all sixteen counties. Senate Amendment "C" increased the appropriation bill by only \$5000 in each year of the biennium. I would like to point out at this time that this is one of the few departments that are asking for less than they did in the last biennium. The first year they are asking for \$51,668 less than they did in the first year of the last biennium, and \$19,141 less than the second year of the last biennium. That is also taking into consideration that the spraying of trees and control of brown-tail moths has been changed from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Forestry. Therefore, I would strongly urge that Senate Amendment "C" be adopted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, moves that the House adopt Senate Amendment "C".

All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and Senate

Amendment "C" was adopted in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Assistant Clerk will proceed with the reading of the next paragraph.

The Assistant Clerk (reading):

"G. A. R. DE-
PARTMENT OF
MAINE \$ 1,200 \$ 1,200
HEALTH AND WELFARE
DEPARTMENT OF
Bureau of
Health \$319,637 \$322,298"

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

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I notice there is an increase of \$20,000 for each year over the Governor's recommendation. Apparently that is an estimate of some kind, and I would like to inquire of some member of the Appropriations Committee why that appropriation should jump \$20,000 a year.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Woodworth, requests information through the Chair of any member of the Appropriations Committee. Any member of the Appropriations Committee may answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE: Mr. Speaker, I will try to explain the increase. The increase in the Bureau of Health, the amount of \$20,000 each year, provides for the necessary State funds to replace the estimated federal funds which have now been determined will not be forthcoming, and will maintain only the current services for the coming biennium. In other words, this would just carry on the department at the same level.

Mr. WOODWORTH: I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion on the item "Bureau of Health?"

If not, the Clerk may read the next item.

The CLERK (reading):

"Sanitary Water
Board \$ 15,000 \$ 15,000
General Admin-
istration-
Welfare \$435,131 \$435,842"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE: Mr. Speaker, I will state that, for the same reason, the increase is due to no federal funds. It carries on the same as before.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further discussion?

The Clerk may proceed.

The CLERK (reading):

"Aid to Blind \$172,000 \$179,000
Services for Blind 85,851 87,163
Aid to Dependent
Children 720,000 756,000"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The reduction of \$480,000 the first year and \$504,000 the second year eliminates the funds necessary to provide for cases in which the parents are divorced, legally separated or deserted. Now I was prepared to defend the Appropriations Committee report here as to the sums recommended. Due to fact that the others have not been held down, I do not think it is just and fair that we cut Welfare.

I would like to explain just what this cut would amount to if you adopt, approve it. It would mean that 1700 on the list now of A.D.C. would be eliminated, at a saving, as I said before, of \$480,000. In return, we are losing \$1,139,000 in federal funds; \$2,400,000 in federal funds for the biennium. I do not think it is wise to lose federal funds which are due the State of Maine just by cutting the small sum of \$480,000 from A.D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I move that we adopt Senate Amendment "K" and when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "K", and then the gentleman may make his motion.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "K" to S. P. 495, L. D. 1196, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1952, and June 30, 1953"

Amend said Bill by striking out under the part of said Bill which

relates to "HEALTH AND WELFARE, DEPARTMENT OF" the following:

'Aid to Dependent Children
720,000 756,000'

and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Aid to Dependent Children
1,200,000 1,260,000'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE: Mr. Speaker, in explaining this amendment, I wish to state that this just puts it back to the current level under which we are operating now and have been for the past two years.

I move that we adopt Senate Amendment "K."

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman moves to adopt Senate Amendment "K".

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

Mr. FINNEGAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This decision to eliminate these two classes was after a little conference with the Commissioner. I think we should be reminded just what this Aid to Dependent Children is pyramiding into. I will give you the facts and you can make your own decision. The facts do not amount to very much anyway, but at least we can state them. This appropriation, Aid to Dependent Children, is rather misnamed; it is really "Aid to Delinquent Fathers." That is how it should be properly characterized. That is the little item that started in 1936, "Aid to Dependent Mothers, \$386,000." In 1949-50 we were asked to appropriate \$2,781,000; in 1950-51 we were asked to appropriate and did appropriate \$3,615,000. In 1951 and 1952 according to this bill which we are discussing here, we were asked to appropriate in this particular case \$4,422,000; for 1952-53 \$4,708,000.

Now if it is the mind of the people of this Legislature that you can go on indefinitely perpetrating this racket, which it certainly has become—if you have not read the Saturday Evening Post, September, 1950, you should do so.

This is an article by the Judge of the Court of Domestic Relations of the City of New York, who was firm for all of these things when

they started out but who now says that if this thing isn't checked a great, terrific upheaval in the morals and the families of this country will take place. The number of families affected by this elimination of divorced and legally separated people is 1200; in the desertions, there are 700 cases involved. The average cost of these per case is \$79 per person. You might be interested to know how this Aid to Dependent Children was provided for under the regulations.

A mother and one child is entitled to receive \$54 per month under matching appropriations. \$18 per month is added for each child and when you have reached eight children the grant amounts to \$180 per family. These are the facts. There seem to be four divisions in this Aid to Dependent Children. There happens to be some families receiving aid, families who are incapacitated to support their children, bedridden, crippled children who are desperately in need of aid and it has been preserved.

Here is another class of Aid to the Blind which is also provided for.

It seemed to be difficult for the Commissioner to make any adjustment of this thing because it would be necessary for him to pick out the good mothers and the bad fathers and that just can't be done. So, after listening to his report of what could be attempted, the Appropriations Committee were unanimous in executive session that this decrease should be recommended. That is your explanation. The case is in your hands.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think you will honestly join me when I say I can't help but chuckle when some of the members have got up and said if we do this we will lose federal funds. There is the Federal Government again. Now you are being inconsistent the other way. This program of ADC, I, personally, have always been opposed to. I would prefer mothers' aid even though mothers' aid would prove to be more expensive because you have a check on mothers' aid. In other

words, the old program of mothers' aid the individual concerned had to present to the welfare officers what their slips were, where they spent their money, their receipts and there was an honest count, which you got.

This leaves the widows, and justifiably so, in the program but it stops, in many of those instances, the divorcees, the legally separated or deserted from picking up the check out of the mail box and having the erring husband come in through the back door. It happens in many, many instances. This was approved by the committee. It was one of those cases where if we were going to cut we could cut. I appreciate the fact that in some instances it could prove harmful where the children come into this picture but again some of those cases could well be taken care of sometimes on the local level.

I move the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "K".

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, moves the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment "K."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not arise to criticize this program or to especially approve of it but I think it should be brought to the attention of the Members of the House that in eliminating this amount from our appropriation of State money that we cut out \$2,400,000 of Federal money.

In this program the towns and cities contribute eighteen per cent and the State thirty-two per cent of the funds, and the Federal Government the remainder. It is quite a lot of money to lose in a program that we shall probably carry on.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If there were some way to make the fathers of these children suffer instead of the children, themselves, I should like to go along with this. Now, if my arithmetic is correct and these members will correct me, my information says that there are around 1700 of these cases and the average cost is \$73.91. Multiply that

by 12 and that will give you a million and a half dollars. It is estimated by the Commissioner that eighty per cent of this cost will be absorbed by the town, which will be \$1,200,000 and, as it has already been brought out, we would lose in Federal funds \$2,400,000. As Mr. Campbell has said, the cost at the present time is divided this way: Eighteen per cent the town pays, which brings it up to \$271,000; twenty-two per cent by the State, which is \$331,000, and the Federal Government pays the rest of it.

Now, the Commissioner estimates out of these cases, one-third of them will be State charges and two-thirds will be town charges. I don't think it takes too much figuring to see that the towns are going to suffer a whole lot under this. I believe in two years hence it will take a truck to bring the number of cases in here for you to settle upon in the way of claims. I can hardly see where we are gaining anything here; we are losing something. The towns are going to be hurt.

I don't think we are approaching this problem right. I think there has got to be some way of getting this thing back to a local level and, if I understand the law right at the present time, that can be worked out. You can submit your plan to the Federal Government whereby you may possibly get some way to handle this at a local level. So far as turning all these cases back on the towns, I cannot go along with it.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, could the House be at ease and off the record just for a moment?

The SPEAKER: The House will be at ease and off the record.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am inclined to go along with the thinking of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Pinnegan, on this particular issue. The people I talked with back

home, and I am more fortunate than some, I can get home every night, are growing concerned with this problem and with the problem of the Department of Health and Welfare. They think that it is just running away.

Now, the question that they raise is: Is the State of Maine going to be a party to aiding and abetting the breakdown of the home? Under this program of ADC, especially in divorce cases, that is exactly what the State of Maine is doing.

Now, I submit to you that if there are two families living side by side and they have five or six children or three or four children, or what have you, and both are struggling to get along. And one family decides to get a divorce and they immediately receive this ADC. What is the natural reaction? This family is getting ADC, and probably living better than they have ever lived in their lives, and the other family is still struggling to get along. And so they say: "Why struggle any more? Let's get a divorce and we can get this money and the children will probably be better taken care of."

I say it is wrong in principle and certainly the State of Maine should not aid and abet it. It may temporarily cause some burden to the towns because they will have to absorb some of the cost of taking care of the cases already on the books. I think if the towns had anything to do with it, they would make every effort to find the delinquent father or mother, as the case might be, and make them pay or put them in jail where they belong if they don't make every effort to support their family.

Therefore, I am pleased to go along with the Appropriations Committee on their recommendation in regard to this particular item.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Keene.

Mr. KEENE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have got to disagree with my colleague, the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, because I want to arise to go on record as favoring the motion of the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

First, it has been mentioned that we would lose from the Federal Government if we went on record as indefinitely postponing that amendment, \$2,400,000, and from the figures that I have been able to get from the Commissioner of Health and Welfare there would be an increased cost to the towns and cities of \$532,723.28 each year and an increase in the cost to the State of \$70,362.32.

Now, I think that we are all here for one purpose, to try to save money, and if we are going to adopt something that is going to cost more money, I don't think that that is a good move. It has definitely been pointed out that this is going to cost the State more money, it is going to cost the towns and cities considerably more money, and furthermore, we are going to lose \$2,400,000 in Federal grant.

I want to go on record as favoring the adoption of Senate Amendment "K".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, if the children are to blame for this divorce?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, asks a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown. The gentleman from Wayne may answer if he chooses.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to answer. I am sure that the children are not to blame, but I am not so sure that the children are happier under the divorce condition than they were before when the family was living together and struggling to get along although perhaps they didn't have as much money to spend.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, if he wishes to penalize these children for the mistake of the father and mother?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, requests further information of the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown.

He may answer if he chooses.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, I do not believe that the children are going to be penalized, because in the cities and towns if there are needy cases I have never known of selectmen or overseers of the poor ever not attending to their duties and seeing that they were taken care of but I do think it would tend to stop this ever-growing number of cases of divorce where the family splits up and throws the children on the State.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, I can tell you of many cases where the towns have neglected and they are suffering and during the last fifty-two years, I have married a great many couples. I never knew a couple to be divorced in order to throw their children on welfare or on the town. And, so far as the children living happily together, more happily, if they are not divorced, I am telling you the worst hell you can put a child in is to put a child in with a father and mother who are scrapping and fighting and hating one another all the time. They are already divorced the minute they begin to scrap. The divorce simply means nothing more than a legal separation.

I tell you we must look after these children who are going to sit in your chair and mine some day and they can't be abused.

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

Mr. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I doubt if anybody hardly can name more than one or two cases where the husband gets divorced and then sneaks in the back yard. I think that is all out of the question. I would be just as strongly averse to paying them money, you understand, as anyone else but I sit down to this welfare proposition about twice a week and I know something of the conditions that happen, continuously day after day. I will say this much: I don't believe that the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Brown, or anyone else has enough information from his inhabitants

where he lives and so forth to indicate that they would hate like the devil to chuck over fifteen or twenty or twenty-five or three or four or five hundred dollars a year to take care of them. I don't believe they want to do that and I don't believe he has got anybody who says they want to do that. Now, you have heard pretty well on this situation as is but I will say this Appropriations Committee has brought in the appropriation for a drastic cut in State money. This cut was made by dropping certain cases.

If your appropriations are cut back to the Appropriations Bill then, on July 1st, 1951, 1700 cases where the parents are divorced or legally separated or deserted will be dropped from the rolls. The amount of State money cut out of the appropriations would be \$480,000 the first year and \$504,000 the next year, a total of \$984,000. I will say the amount of federal money lost has been stated as \$2,400,000.

Of the 1700 cases dropped, a large number will fall on general relief and as has been stated before, but I wish to bring it into your minds so you will thoroughly understand it, at least eighty per cent of those cases will be on general relief inside of three months and two-thirds of that will fall on general relief and will have to be paid by the towns, one-third will be paid by the towns and the towns reimbursed through the State provided there are sufficient funds in the State for that account. The towns will be required to pay considerably more for administration. It will be necessary for the town treasurer to start legal action in the courts and to spend a great deal of time in administering the Aid to Dependent Children cases that are dropped in view of the fact that the father in the divorced, legally separated cases should be made to contribute. A conservative estimate would indicate that the towns would be required to pay between three-quarters of a million and one million dollars additional from the town poor funds if the 1700 Aid to Dependent Children cases are dropped.

The amount appropriated for board and care of neglected children will also be insufficient if the

1700 Aid to Dependent Children cases are dropped. A conservative estimate would indicate that \$200,000 per year should be added to take care of the board and care of neglected children, if the appropriation to take care of Aid to Dependent Children cases, which would be committed by the courts for the most part upon petition by town officials.

I hope the appropriations will be carried along. I haven't any small children of my own but I have got some grandchildren and some great-grandchildren and I think I have a right to say that I don't think mine will have to be carried on the pauper list and I don't want to see anybody else's. So, if we can carry them along with this situation, I hope you will carry this through and give us the million dollars or whatever is called for in that to take care of these dependent children.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is really a serious question you can see from the great difference of opinion. When I was handed the Budget Book, when I first entered this Legislature, I tried to study it reasonably well. I was very much taken by the fact—struck by the fact—that the fastest pyramiding account was Aid to Dependent Children.

I am not supporting my colleague, the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Finnegan, on his educational viewpoint nor do I support Mr. Finnegan just because he comes from Bangor but I will support him in his basic thinking here. You have an account which someone has either got to put the brake on or you will have to make up your minds that you are going to give them a blank check. It has evolved itself into a blank check. It gets bigger and bigger every year.

For the purpose of records and statistics, I would like to correct one statement which was made, I think the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, mentioned the figure of 1500 or 1600 cases. I have before me a general comment made by Mr. Stevens in front of the Appropria-

tions Committee: "We now have for January 1951, 4,400 cases. We anticipate having for the fiscal year 4,970 cases." This is roughly an increase of 500 cases.

I would like to offer an amendment for this reason. I believe the people who think it is time to put the brake on somewhere, to some extent, are basically right. I also agree with the members who say a drastic cut may end up costing the towns more than they are going to gain. Each side has some very good merits.

I, personally, feel looking at this particular account as the gentleman ahead of me just pointed out, we have cut the first year \$480,000 and the second year \$500,000. Off hand I think that was a rather serious cut, it is about 40 per cent. Breaking it down, in the first year we would use about 40 per cent. I would suggest that we put the brake on but not confuse it with an axe. In other words, not put the axe to it but put the brakes to it.

I would like to get the opinion of the House in cutting this account down in a more modest way to the sum of a million dollars, which amounts to about one-half what it has been presently cut by Senate Amendment "K" and I make that motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, may offer his amendment after the Senate Amendment, which is pending before the House, has been disposed of.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin.

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think this thing should take care of every needy child in the State. I think they should do it no matter what it costs and I do not believe in making these children suffer or putting them back on the mercy of their towns because some cuss has got a divorce. Let the State make the husbands, the fathers of those children, pay but don't put it back on the children to make those collections. I am in favor of this increase for this purpose.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell.

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker, what I think is the idea of this mixup, we learn that approximately eighty per cent of the cost, provided this cut is made, will go back to the town, either the town or the state. I would like to consider the other twenty per cent. We assume those who are undeserving cases. I can't see any particular advantage in expending \$1 for an unworthy cause for the sake of getting \$2 from the Federal Government to spend for that same unworthy cause.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Clements.

Mr. CLEMENTS: Mr. Speaker, I merely want to clarify one point that has been brought out. I gather the impression that the department isn't trying to do anything about these fathers. But I assure you that they are in all cases trying to collect something from them. I understand the department, at the present time, has two men in jail, two fathers. One of them, I think, is going to come through with a little and the other is just sitting around enjoying himself and is going to do nothing about it. But the department is making every effort in every one of these cases to try to get something out of them.

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

Mr. LACHARITE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am in favor of Aid to Dependent Children but I do not believe that it is the wish of this honorable body to encourage an increase in the number of divorces and desertions that we have throughout the State and I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that every time that we support some of these cases we are just simply encouraging new ones.

There was a question brought up by a member here just a few minutes ago: Are the children to blame for these divorces? I would like to say this: The children are not to blame for it but I think that we are to blame, or we will be to blame, if we continue to support these cases.

The question was brought up in regard to federal subsidies. Someone said that we are here to save

as much as we can, but I am sure that is not what we think we have is one case where it is the wrong been doing so far and I think this time to begin. I would like to go along with the indefinite postponement of this amendment. I would like to state also that I know in my own town of at least four cases where some girls gave birth to a child and the man came around and married them afterward so that they could get the ADC and after they started getting ADC the men would go away—I mean, the men would go away after they were married and then they would apply for ADC and get it. I know of at least four cases in our town that got it and I think that it is definitely encouraging divorces and desertions.

I hope that the amendment will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the brother who says we of the State ought not to encourage divorce by taking care of dependent children, I object to that. We are not encouraging divorce. I will tell you a clergyman has a story of almost every divorce case in his town before the court gets it, and they are not divorcing for the purpose of throwing their children on the State. They are divorced because their heart is divorced over some difficulty and they hate and despise one another. You tell me that a man and a woman who love one another are going to get a divorce? Never! Never! Do you want to make that child live in conditions like that? By taking care of their children, we are not encouraging divorce. Let us take care of every dependent child and every helpless child. He is going to make a man some day. Maybe he will be a father or a mother. Let's take care of these children and do it right.

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

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have heard mention of the subsidy of divorce of this particular appropriation. We have heard that it is the cause of divorce. I wonder if

we can recollect many years ago that our predecessors in office promulgated the divorce laws to make it rather easy in this State and that is the reason some of these divorces are prevalent today. But in discussing these things which I think are immaterial, we lose sight of the fact that this matter should, when at all possible, take place on a local level. I think when these cases are presented to the city fathers or your selectmen, they are going to investigate every case very minutely and determine the worthiness of that case. If there is a delinquent father they know that it is costing them out of their pockets in that particular city money to take care of the children that that delinquent father is not taking care of. I think that those fathers can be more readily brought to prosecution as a result of vigorous effort on the local level than we have here on this wide area we have to take in the State of Maine.

For that reason, I will go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentle from Portland, Mr. Burkett.

Mr. BURKETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Burkett, moves the previous question on the amendment. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question it requires the consent of one-third of the members present.

All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third of the members present having arisen, the motion for the previous question is entertained.

Mr. PATTERSON of Freeport: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PATTERSON: To ask for a yea and nay vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is whether the main

question shall be put now on the amendment.

Mr. BUBER of Blaine: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BUBER: Mr. Speaker, will you be sure to clarify this question so everyone will know exactly what they are voting on.

The SPEAKER: The Chair proposes to properly inform the House on the question.

All those in favor of the main question being put now on the amendment will please say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that Senate Amendment "K" be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. PATTERSON of Freeport: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PATTERSON: To ask for a yea and nay vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Patterson, requests a roll call. In order for the Chair to entertain this request one-fifth of the members present must consent.

All those in favor of having the vote taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise.

Obviously, a sufficient number not having arisen, the consent is not granted.

Mr. JAMIESON of Presque Isle: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, didn't I understand the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole, to move for the adoption of that Senate Amendment before the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, made his motion?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Jamieson, that the motion made by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, is a ranking motion which takes priority over the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Finnegan.

Mr. JAMIESON: No, Mr. Speaker. I meant the motion of Mr. Cole of

Liberty. I thought that he made a motion first.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert takes precedence over the motion made by the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

Mr. JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that Senate Amendment "K" to Aid to Dependent Children be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lacharite, asks for a division.

All those in favor of Senate Amendment "K" being indefinitely postponed will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Twenty-four having voted in the affirmative and seventy-five having voted in the negative the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

The Speaker: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Keene. For what purpose does he arise?

Mr. KEENE: Mr. Speaker I move now the adoption of Senate Amendment "K".

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise that the motion is already before the House.

The motion before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole, that Senate Amendment "K" be adopted in concurrence.

All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voice vote being taken, the motion prevailed and Senate Amendment "K" was adopted in concurrence.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, moves that the House do now adjourn until ten o'clock, April 3rd, next. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House was

Adjourned until 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon on Tuesday, April 3.