

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

Thursday, April 5, 1951

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Henry Larsen of Hebron.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that the Legislative Research Committee be, and hereby is, directed to study and appraise the recreational needs and standards of the State; and be it further

ORDERED, that the results of such study together with an recommendations be reported to the 96th Legislature. (S. P. 531)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

Senate Reports of Committees Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Authorizing Approval of the Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Compact" (S. P. 117) (L. D. 207)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. **HASKELL** of Cumberland
BARNES of Aroostook
— of the Senate.

WOODWORTH of Fairfield
HAYES of Dover-Foxcroft
Mrs. **FAY** of Portland
Messrs. **FULLER** of Bangor
DELAHANTY of Lewiston

— of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. **McGLAUFILIN** of Portland
HARDING of Rockland
— of the House.

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

In the House:

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair awaits a motion.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Hayes.

Mr. **HAYES**: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Majority Report "Ought to pass".

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Hayes, moves that the House accept the Majority Report "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Authorizing Approval of the Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Compact." Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Majority Report "Ought to pass" was accepted in concurrence.

Thereupon, the Bill was given its two several readings and assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Falsely Reporting Crimes" (S. P. 377) (L. D. 903)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Trespass" (S. P. 378) (L. D. 904)

Report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Parks reporting same on Bill "An Act to Create a State Recreation Commission" (S. P. 120) (L. D. 210)

Report of the Committee on Public Health reporting same on Bill "An Act Repealing Law of Manufacture and Sale of Bedding and Upholstered Furniture" (S. P. 394) (L. D. 941)

Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Registration Plates for Junk Dealers" (S. P. 446) (L. D. 1009)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Liquor Licenses in Unincorporated Places" (S. P. 380) (L. D. 906) reporting a new draft (S. P. 523) (L. D. 1249) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

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

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Relative to Itinerant Photographers" (S. P. 459) (L. D. 1073)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Creating the Eastport Public Landing Authority" (S. P. 440) (L. D. 1003)

Report of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Qualifications for Lobster Licenses for Veterans" (S. P. 443) (L. D. 1006)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Wholesale Lobster Dealer's License" (S. P. 311) (L. D. 662)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to the Taking of Alewives in the New Meadows River in the Towns of Brunswick and West Bath" (S. P. 279) (L. D. 618)

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to the Salaries of the Judge and the Clerk and Clerk Hire of the Auburn Municipal Court" (S. P. 288) (L. D. 627)

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Bills passed to be engrossed.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice and tomorrow assigned.

Tabled

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Authorize Cities and Towns to Accept Grants from Federal Government" (S. P. 461) (L. D. 1075)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mrs. Fay of Portland, tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting

"Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Membership of the Emergency Municipal Finance Board" (S. P. 39) (L. D. 22)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Interest of Unorganized and Organized Townships Funds" (S. P. 444) (L. D. 1007)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to the Municipal Regulation of Motor Vehicles" (S. P. 397) (L. D. 944)

Report of the Committee on Welfare reporting same on Resolve to Repeal Certain Special Resolve Pensions (S. P. 482) (L. D. 1145)

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Bills and Resolve passed to be engrossed.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the Bills read twice, the Resolve read once, and tomorrow assigned.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of the Winslow High School Civics Class, under the supervision of Mrs. Carl McKechnie, and also Cony High School, Augusta, Maine, Problems in Democracy Class, under the charge of Mr. Clinton Thurlow.

In behalf of the House, the Chair at this time bids you all a cordial welcome. (Applause)

Report of the Committee on Welfare reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Sale and Lease of Lands in Indian Township" (S. P. 328) (L. D. 815)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Resolve Authorizing Forest Commissioner to Renew Lease to Passamaquoddy Lumber Company (S. P. 327) (L. D. 816)

Came from the Senate with the Reports read and accepted and the Bills and Resolve passed to be engrossed.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence, the

Bill read twice, the Resolve read once, and tomorrow assigned.

Ought Not to Pass

Resolve Substituted for Report

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Authorizing Expenditure of Certain Moneys in Possession of Bangor State Hospital (S. P. 336) (L. D. 752)

Came from the Senate with the Resolve substituted for the Report and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A."

In the House: Report was read.

On motion of the gentleman from Orono, Mr. Bates, the House voted to concur with the Senate in substituting the Resolve for the Report as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

Thereupon, the Resolve had its first reading.

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

SENATE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 336, L. D. 752, "Resolve, Authorizing Expenditure of Certain Moneys in Possession of Bangor State Hospital."

Amend said Resolve by striking out everything after the last semicolon therein and inserting in place thereof the following: 'and provided further, that the balance shall at no time be drawn down to less than \$250.'

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the Resolve was assigned for second reading tomorrow morning.

Senate Report Recommitted

Report of the Committee on Transportation reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Penalties for Violation of Truck Weight Laws" (S. P. 460) (L. D. 1074)

Came from the Senate recommitted to the Committee on Transportation.

In the House: Report was read.

On motion of Mr. Jones of Bowdoinham, the House voted to concur with the Senate in the recommitment of the Bill to the Committee on Transportation.

Ought to be Adopted in New Draft In Senate Original Memorial Substituted for Report and Adopted

Report of the Committee on Judiciary on MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS (Joint Resolution Rescinding Proposal for Considering a Constitutional Convention of the United States or Amendments to the Constitution of the United States Relating to Strengthening the United Nations and Limiting World Federal Government.) (S. P. 205) (L. D. 460) reporting a new draft (S. P. 529) (L. D. 1258) under title of MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS (Joint Resolution Regarding a Constitutional Convention of the United States or Amendments to the Constitution of the United States Relating to Strengthening the United Nations.) and that it "Ought to be adopted".

Came from the Senate with the original Memorial substituted for the Report and the Memorial adopted.

In the House Report was read.

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

Mr. GILMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the original Memorial for the Report, in concurrence with the Senate.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move to lay this matter on the table.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, moves that the matter lie on the table. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Calls of "No."

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the matter lie on the table will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Forty-two having voted in the affirmative and fifty-three having voted in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, that the House substitute the original memorial for the report.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Before we proceed to take any final action on this matter I would like to address the House to try to explain the situation as I understand it.

The action taken by the Ninety-fourth Legislature was in 1949. In April, 1950, there came up a case in the state of California before one of their Courts of Appeal. In that case it was held that the charter of the United Nations is a treaty like other treaties and is a part of the law of this country and takes precedence over conflicting laws of any of the states. As a result of that decision this Appellate Court in California purported to set aside the Alien Land Law of California which had existed in that state for many years and had been sustained against all sorts of attempts to have it declared unconstitutional.

Now the reason they did that was because of the wording of the U. N. Charter which had in it this phraseology about "respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." Because the word "race" was in there, this California court set aside this law which was a fundamental part of the law of the state of California. Notwithstanding the fact that this happened in April and May, 1950, in the fall of 1950 we all received this communication from the Veterans of Foreign Wars saying: "This group wishes to make it clear to each member of the Ninety-fifth Legislature that we wholeheartedly support the United Nations."

So there we have one of the groups that favored the original memorial that was introduced in this Legislature, attempting to rescind the other memorial of the Ninety-fourth Legislature. We have this group which says it still supports the U. N., and of course, before the Judiciary Committee, the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Daughters of Colonial Wars and so forth also said they supported the U.N. So it seems to me that the action

taken by the Senate on this matter is inconsistent and it must have resulted from a misunderstanding of the situation. A further reason why I feel that must be so is that after this decision in California, on October 15th, 1950, even the World Federalists who are involved in this controversy agreed to have some changes made because they wished to bring about this change, namely, "a reservation to the nations and their peoples of all powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations, thus guaranteeing to each nation complete internal sovereignty to manage its domestic affairs, and freedom to choose its own domestic, political, economic, social and religious institutions."

What bothers me about the action of the Senate is that the Ninety-fourth Legislature did not purport or never considered going anywhere near as far on this question of World Government as we have actually already gone if this decision in California is finally upheld by the ultimate Court of Appeals.

If you will refer to the phraseology of the redraft, prepared by the Judiciary Committee, you will find in it that what the Judiciary Committee asks the Legislature to do is to go on record as saying that we approved in the United Nations "such limited governmental police and inspection powers as are necessary to control armaments and prevent and punish aggression; it does not approve making the United Nations a strong central government with extensive powers which might, in the beginning, or through any subsequent process of amendment, threaten the individual freedom of Americans, of the domestic, political, economic, social or religious institutions of the United States."

It seems to me that the Legislature would be more consistent in going along with the Judiciary Committee and would better express the sentiments of the people of this State by adopting this memorial which the Judiciary Committee has prepared than it would by adopting the original memorial which was introduced in this Legislature.

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

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise to support the motion to substitute the committee's report, as I understood the motion, for the original bill. The only reason that I asked to table it was so that I could get together the material I needed, which would take about ten minutes, to debate this matter, but fortunately, in spite of the fact that you won't give me that opportunity, I know what I am talking about here, and you are not going to escape without hearing from me. (Laughter)

This original memorial came before the Judiciary Committee two years ago. We had no use for the thing whatever and we passed it out that it "Ought not to pass", but there was one of the veterans who was in this House at that time, Mr. Warren Payne, who was representing some organization, and it meant an awful lot to him, or he thought it did, if he could get some kind of a report out of that committee, and at last the Speaker of this House and myself said "We will fix it so that it doesn't amount to a thing" but will let the boy have it, and this is what we did: We took the teeth all out of it, and instead of being a memorial to Congress, it was a request that they give the matter consideration. That is all that we passed, that they give the matter consideration.

There was a hearing on that bill. There were some of the best citizens in this State who attended the hearing—I could name many of them—Mr. Howe of the Portland Federation of Labor, our honorable member here, Rev. Mr. Roundy, Mayor Sanborn of Augusta. Men of that calibre, whose patriotism could not be questioned in any way, were for that measure, as it originally stood—but the committee took the teeth out of it and passed this measure.

Now understand that we knew what we were doing. The Speaker must recall these facts. He knew what he was doing. I knew what I was doing, and we have no apology for what we did. But what happened? Much ado about nothing!

They came up here to a special session of the Legislature after that first session, and one morning we found on our desks, every one of us, literature that tended to show that the world was coming to an end, that the government was going to Hell right away, if that wasn't withdrawn. That matter was discussed on the floor of this House at that time and was indefinitely postponed by the Legislature that passed the act. Now they have got the nerve to come back here and tell us that we didn't know what we were doing and will we please go back to Washington and say to the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives: "We poor fools down in Maine didn't know what we were doing. Will you please send that back?"

Now why do I object to our withdrawing that memorial? It doesn't amount to anything at all as it stands. There is no danger of our losing our sovereignty. Let me point out to you that before you could get that constitutional amendment across, if we had asked for it, which we didn't, you would have to have a petition from thirty-two states and it has got to be passed by thirty-six states before it could become a part of the Constitution, and what did it amount to then? It amounted to just this: That it empowered Congress to negotiate with other nations to see if we could work out some plan for World Peace, and if they did it, that plan was to be submitted again to the states for their ratification. There wasn't any possibility of taking away our sovereignty. It had to have thirty-six states agree to it twice.

If we pass this proposed memorial at this time, we are saying to Congress—now get this, because this is why I am so opposed to the memorial—I am not opposed to this bill that we worked up, but I am opposed to that original memorial, because this doesn't amount to anything, but if today or tomorrow we want to pass a memorial that we are interested in, it gives the Congress and the Senate a chance to say: "What is the good of paying any attention to a memorial from Maine? They will be back here tomorrow asking us to withdraw it." That is why I am

opposed to it. We haven't done anything to be ashamed of.

Now what has led to all this confusion is the fear that in some way we are going to get mixed up with Russia. Russia! Cruel, treacherous, despotic Russia. Without honor, without principle, and without God. Russia! Whose government is based not on high moral principle, but upon the teachings of Machiavelli Prince. Misrepresentation and deceit. Do you think there is any chance of this government trying to give up its sovereignty to that nation, or any part of it? Not while the sun continues to shine or the stars continue to twinkle in the high heavens. Members, I ask you to support that motion, that you substitute our findings which we have worked out with great care, that do not disgrace this House and this Legislature, but which explain that this Legislature does not believe in any World Federation.

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

Mr. FENN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very glad to hear the talk of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, today. In the Senate, yesterday, as many of you happened to have the opportunity of being in there when they discussed this situation they gave full credit to the Judiciary Committee - they knew the committee worked hard on this matter - and they, in all their sincerity and honesty, came up with what they thought was an amendment which would satisfy all sides. But in that amendment they had left, in the fifth line in the middle, three words, which is just the propaganda which the World Federalists want to use, and those three words are "World Federal Government." We, in the State of Maine, in the Ninety-fourth Legislature, passed a memorial on to them, as my good friend, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, has said, for consideration. That is not what the World Federalists used, consideration. They tagged—and they did it definitely, in black and white print,—they tagged the State of Maine as being

a member or going along with the World Federalists.

Now, this amendment which the Judiciary Committee has given us has left this thing so again they can use it as propaganda. Now since we had the hearing I have had the opportunity to travel quite a distance through the State of Maine and ask this question, and I feel definitely that the people of the State of Maine want to rescind this memorial; they do not want to have anything to do with it.

Now the question comes, and I am going to put it before this House too - they did it in the Senate: Are you or are you not a World Federalist? If you are, or if you are not. The second thing to do, in the mechanics of this situation, and remember, Members, a memorial does not go back and forth between the Senate and the House - we have just one chance to vote on it here today; whatever you do today does it; if you rescind or do not concur with the Senate Amendment to substitute the original memorial for the report, then this, the original, or, rather, this amendment stands.

Now I will get back to the original question of whether you are or are not a World Federalist. The mechanics boil down to this: The only one thing that you can do to clear the State of Maine from being tagged as a World Federalist member is to go along with the Senate. That is the only mechanics you have today, if you are for rescinding this memorial to Congress.

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

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, that, to me, seems a perfectly ridiculous argument, that we have got to pass this fool memorial because somebody cannot read English.

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

Mr. CHASE: If everybody has to be tagged, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought to say now that I have been associated with the World Federalist movement from its early beginning and so have many people in this State, whom I regard as leaders

in prominent affairs in this State. There is a difference of opinion among the World Federalists just as there is among the members of the American Legion or of any other organization. World Federalists don't all believe in the same thing. The limited objective of the movement was to establish some form through the United Nations of a limited world government which would have some power, acting together in concord, to prevent force and aggression. It is a movement to protect world peace.

Now the last Legislature, considering the situation as it then existed, was addressed in memorial. The advice given in that memorial should be considered as of the time when it was given. It was limited advice, asking consideration of strengthening the United Nations.

Now what would have happened if that advice had been taken? That is the only test of advice given in the past. If everyone had agreed then to press on through the United Nations, to test the possibility of it, as a force in the world for peace, how do we know today that we would be in Korea? How do we know today that we would have practically all of the force in Korea? Would we not have known, if we had gone ahead at that time to bring the issue to a head, would we not have known whether the other nations of the world would support us or not? When the decision was made to go into Korea, would we not have known whether we were going in practically alone, with mere token assistance from the other nations, or whether there would be a real world force there? How can we tell now?

It seems to me that for one Legislature to attempt to rescind the advice given by the other is an affront to that Legislature. If we want to start in from scratch here to address a new memorial, as the Judiciary Committee has, in effect, attempted to do, and which does not mention anywhere in it World Federalists, that I can find in the printed copy, should we not give such advice as we deem to be wise now and not attempt to go back and say that someone, two years ago, in giving advice in the light

of conditions as they then saw them, was a bunch of saps? I think, if we are going to memorialize Congress, we had better start from here and state the situation as we see it now and not foster this agitation and fight which has been built up between two organizations. I therefore hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, to substitute the original memorial for the committee's recommendation, will not prevail, and that the House will go along with the attempt of the committee to reconcile this difference of opinion.

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

Mr. FENN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Legislative Document 1258, I think I can read correctly, one, two, three, four, the fifth line from the bottom has three words in it that says "World Federal Government." I hate to stand up here and oppose and contradict my good friend from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, but those three words in there, those three words in there to me, seem to satisfy me pretty clearly. If I am correct, and I think I am, the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, says that we shouldn't try to overrule legislation by the Ninety-fourth Legislature.

There are members in this House who were here in the Ninety-fourth Legislature, and I have asked some of those men and they honestly did not know what they were voting for.

Mr. Speaker, when the question comes before the House on going along with the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, I ask for a roll call.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: I want to make a correction, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his correction only.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: Mr. Speaker, I misunderstood the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman. I stated in my argument that I supported it. Now I am informed that he — I would like to find out what the gentleman's mo-

tion was. May I have that information?

The SPEAKER: When the gentleman is through, the Chair will state the question.

Mr. McGLAUF LIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Mr. Gilman to restate his motion.

The SPEAKER: When the gentleman has yielded the floor, the Chair will state the question.

Mr. McGLAUF LIN: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I favor the report of the Judiciary Committee and I am definitely against the memorial as presented to this Legislature. Now I stated otherwise. Please get that clear. I said I was for Mr. Gilman's motion and I thought he moved to go exactly different from what they did in the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to inform the gentleman that he can speak but twice on the same issue.

Mr. McGLAUF LIN: I have stated my position, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, that the original memorial be substituted for the report of the committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Farley.

Mr. FARLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems that about every time I get up, I get up with something that is very unpopular. I would like to say to the members of this House that two years ago we had a Veterans' Organization in this House, that does not exist today. It was an organization led by Representative Chapman, from Portland. That was an organization for the interests of the Veteran.

This question which now comes before us, from the Judiciary Committee, was thrashed out by the veterans in their meetings that we held by ourselves, and the Judiciary Committee did not go along at first with that resolution. Finally they went along with it, with some teeth taken out of it, and we as an organization went along with that resolution, and from that organization and from taking that stand, we received a very fair consideration from the members of this House

when we attempted to have some other veterans' legislation put across in this House. I think I would be in error, after having voted with the gentleman from Portland, although it is going to be unpopular with some of the veterans' organizations, but still I battle with them as I do in my own party.

I am going to go along with the gentleman from Portland, as I did two years ago, and support the Judiciary Committee in that report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair, at this time, notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of the Waynefleet School, Eighth Grade, of Portland, under the charge of Miss O'Reilly.

In behalf of the House, the Chair at this time bids you welcome. (Applause)

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

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: May I say by way of preface to my argument here today that there is no man here in this House that came to this session of the Legislature with a more — and I use the word advisedly — bitter feeling toward the program of the World Federalists than I did. I even dreaded sitting through the hearing that we held with relation to this Memorial. I have expressed the opinion on many occasions that I thought the Memorial that was sent by this Legislature at the last session was the wrong thing to do.

I have heard it said here this morning by my good friend and colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. McGlauffin, that that Memorial did not mean a thing. Well, it was my personal experience to have a call from one of the members of the World Federalists, a salesman I would qualify him as, and he indicated, after I showed no particular interest in the organization, that it had been approved by the Maine Legislature. That caused me to open my eyes, members, and take into consideration what he was saying, simply because this body, for which I have always held the greatest esteem, had given their program that

consideration. I found then that many men and women of this State—and the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, for whom I have the greatest respect, was one of them—were members of the organization. It did not change my feeling, however, because they were using the Memorial that this Legislature sent as a selling point. As an organization, I had not any argument with them as long as they did not attempt to use this Memorial as they attempted to use it on me.

When I sat through that hearing I listened attentively to the arguments, and then in our executive session we had many and long discussions concerning it. We arrived at what might be said to correspond to the watered-down Memorial that the last Legislature passed.

Reference has been made this morning to World Federal Government being on the fifth line of the Memorial that was reported out by the Judiciary Committee. If we examine that Memorial we will find that it is restating the Memorial that was sent by the 94th Legislature. But it was the sense of that committee: "That the Maine Legislature approves giving the United Nations such limited police powers and inspection powers as are necessary to control armaments and punish aggression. It does not approve making the United Nations a strong central government with extensive powers which might in the beginning or through any subsequent development threaten the individual freedom of Americans, or the domestic, political or economic, social or religious institutions of the United States." And it was further resolved that that be sent to our representatives and senators in our Congress. That there was the sense of the Judiciary Committee.

I want to give no springboard to any organization that would use this body for a means of propaganda. I had hoped that this resolution would meet with the sense of this body. As I say, I have not changed my attitude toward World Federalists, and I have felt that this resolution did meet the requirements that would take out of the World Federalists that

stand they have taken to use this as a sounding-board for their organization. If it is the sense of this body that that does not do what I hoped it did, then I am in a rather peculiar situation, because if it does not take away from the World Federalists that which they have been looking for, then I would be inclined to go along with the motion made by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman. That places me in a rather embarrassing position.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair at this time notes in the balcony of the Hall of the House the presence of the York Junior High School winners of the Good Citizenship Essay Contest, under the supervision of Mrs. Fred Marshall, and in behalf of the House the Chair at this time bids you a cordial welcome. (Applause)

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

MR. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was against the Memorial as a member of the 94th Legislature, I spoke against it, I voted against it, I have lived against it since then, I have raised my children to be against it, and my grandchildren will be against it, and I want to continue to live against anything that I have ever yet seen come out of Moscow! I believe that it exemplifies the spirit of Joe Stalin, and therefore I am against it and I will continue to live against it and I want to die against it.

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

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am going to try to attempt this morning to clear up some misunderstanding in relation to why the 94th Legislature passed this Memorial in the first place.

As the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, has said, there were two individuals in the 94th Legislature, members of this House, who were very much interested in passing a Memorial to Congress in support of the World Federalists, and they used every parliamentary move and procedure that they

could to get it through. Finally the Memorial was watered down so that it was merely for the Congress to give consideration to it. And so I feel that most of the members at that time thought that the Memorial in that form could do no harm. Unfortunately, the World Federalist movement used the Memorial which we passed, which we thought was harmless, in support of their argument for World Government. The Judiciary Committee has attempted to correct this by passing another Memorial. I am afraid that this will merely add confusion to the issue, and therefore I would support the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, that we get rid of this Memorial once and for all. I understand that the State of Maine is not the only state that has rescinded this Memorial. Therefore perhaps we would not look as foolish as the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, would make us think we would.

The SPEAKER: The Chair notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of the Island Falls High School, Junior and Senior Classes, in charge of Principal Mr. Willette and Miss Lewis, and in behalf of the House the Chair at this time bids you a cordial welcome. (Applause)

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There has been a lot of water over the dam in the last two years. I supported that memorial two years ago and I am happy, this morning, to get up on my feet and say that I am not going to support it now.

If you people have been reading, keeping up with the times, you know this: that hypocrisy has taken the place of commonsense. Hypocrisy has been taking the place of commonsense in this world. When I say that I am thinking right now of what is going on over in Korea, I am thinking that our country is standing ninety per cent—ninety per cent of our boys are standing the burden over there. I say to you that hypocrisy has taken

the place of commonsense. Therefore, I stand up here to support the motion of my friend, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman.

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

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will say I have received more letters and printed matter in regard to this than any other issue that has come up here in this Legislature.

I feel that we, as Legislators, should think seriously of what we are doing today and if other men and women in this House have had the feelings of the people by and large back home they could consider seriously on the move today.

I feel that what we did in the 94th Legislature is being whipped around and they are using what we did then to please themselves.

I, therefore, would like to go on record in support of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman.

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

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was a member of the 94th Legislature and I well remember the memorial at that time and how it was amended and I wondered afterwards—I had the same experience as the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Delahanty, had—before this session of the 95th Legislature, I had a representative of the World Federalists wait on me and he did, wilfully, misrepresent himself and stated to me that Maine had gone on record as supporting the motion of the World Federalists.

I became very confused after he told me that and even then I wasn't sure of what we had tried to accomplish in the 94th Legislature. But I have had the feeling even after that when the original memorial was put in, before it was amended, I felt that it was an attempt wilfully to mislead the members of this Legislature and, after the teeth were taken out of that memorial, as the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, has stated, from my experience afterwards I have had that continual feeling that we were being misled

right along. Maybe it isn't clear to the members here what is being accomplished and what has been accomplished but we have the memorial before us and I am not ashamed to petition our Congress in another memorial and tell them: "Let's skip it. Let's forget it."

I think I understand what the movement of the World Federalists is; they are trying to accomplish world peace, but I still feel I am being led down a blind alley. Maybe they don't; maybe they know where they are going but I want no part of it. So I just want to go on record as supporting the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Damarscott, Mr. Gay.

Mr. GAY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems that the question before us now is this: Modification of the memorial passed two years ago. Does it take Maine out of the camp of the World Federalists? As far as the motion is concerned, will it or not? In my opinion, the only way we can get out of this situation now is by rescinding the memorial of two years ago. The terminology and the phraseology of this bill is not in favor of the World Federalist Government but I think that the State of Maine has been tagged and the only one way that we can get out and get untagged is to, at this time, rescind the memorial of two years ago.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I have not arisen to prolong the arguments as to whether we should or should not repeal or rescind what we have done. If you think that I am taking valuable time to digress a moment I apologize but I think it is justified. I have traveled around the United States somewhat and listened to some of the fathers, who deny World Federalism, give their talks. I have been a member of my own Officers Reserve Corps in Bangor and have heard the World Federalists denounced and here I come to the Legislature and I hear senti-

ments ranging from wholehearted approval to the label that this movement originates and gets its concept from Moscow.

I repeat, in what we do here this morning regarding the memorial I will respect your judgment. I believe that misrepresentations may have been made. I still don't think, basically, that the United World Federalists are a group of super-salesmen trying to slip one over on the United States, but I do feel that beyond any question of a doubt it should be cleared up here this morning that the attempt to smear, to libel, to insinuate, to hint, to come right out and say directly that the United World Federalists are pink-tinged or originate from Moscow has no basis of proof whatsoever.

I will guarantee you, you have simply got to look in the most recently published list of subversive organizations in the United States, put out by the F.B.I., Attorney General, Washington, and you will find that nowhere is any organization connected with United World Federalists listed as being subversive. I simply want to get that point straight.

As a member of this House, who himself had doubts and sent a telegram to one of our Congressmen asking: "Are there any indications that the United World Federalists are pink-tinged or communist-associated", and the reply was a definite "no".

Ladies and gentlemen, I repeat, I can understand your confusion on this issue, I will certainly understand your vote, but I do ask you that unless you thoroughly understand this movement, don't show your ignorance by calling it communist-tinged or pink-tinged. That is not the fact, and there are too many very fine citizens in the State of Maine who believe in this movement to ever stand for such libel.

The SPEAKER: The Chair, at this time, notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of the St. Rose School of Chisholm, Eighth Grade, Nuns of St. Joseph in charge.

On behalf of the House, the Chair, at this time, bids you a cordial welcome. (Applause)

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

Mr. GILMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do want to agree on one point with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, in that the original memorial of the 94th Legislature really does not have any teeth in it. Nevertheless, it has not stopped the World Federalists organization using that: that the State of Maine does endorse World Federalism.

Senator Slocum has talked in the past with the head of the World Federalists and told him that that memorial was just a consideration sent to our Congressmen and it should not be printed in their booklets that the State was in favor of it. The President of the World Federation at that time apologized and said it would never be done again. However, in booklet after booklet and month after month it has been done again. That is the reason I want the original memorial rescinded so that they do not have anything to use as such propaganda. In using that as such propaganda, they classify me and they classify you as "Mainiacs" here, living in this State, as World Federalists.

I think there are very many well-intentioned people who are World Federalists. I think they stand with both of their feet firmly planted in mid-air. Gentlemen, I do not want to be classed with them, and I do not think that most of you do either.

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

Mr. SPEAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In order that you do not become more confused, I would just like to have it stated clearly here. We hear various speakers, particularly the last speaker, speak about the original memorial. But we have two original memorials here, unless I am confused. He speaks of the original memorial as being the memorial of the 94th Legislature; but the original memorial as we have it, as stated in the bill and what was considered by the Judiciary Committee, is L. D. 460, which is before the 95th Legislature. The amended memorial, or the redraft of the

memorial is L. D. 1258, so the original memorial really is L. D. 460, unless I am confused.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would state that the original memorial was L. D. 460, S. P. 205. That is the one that we have before us and which we are substituting for the report of the committee.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Perhaps there is confusion among many of us at this time regarding how we will be called upon to vote shortly. But, may I ask permission to state that L. D. 460, was originally introduced for the purpose of withdrawing from Congress a memorial which the previous Legislature sent to them, and the report of the committee which is now before us would not withdraw it; so I believe it is a question before the House when we vote to decide whether we wish to withdraw the memorial made two years ago. If the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman prevails, we will have voted to withdraw in concurrence with the other body of state government. If his motion does not prevail, we will be in disagreement with the other body of the state legislature.

While I am on my feet, I would like permission to state a few views which I believe prevail throughout the State of Maine among the citizens and voters. I do not believe that Maine in general wants any part or anything to do with World Federalist Government. I believe that we have had ample opportunity to watch our country play big brother to the rest of the nations of the world. I do not want our State to become involved in any way with a proposition which may lead us to continue in that same path, for it will surely break this nation beyond any point that we have ever seen. Neither do I want this Legislature to go along with any whitewash proposition or any measure which has no teeth. Let us say outright that we are in favor of World Federalist Government and are endorsing it one hundred per cent, or let us be frank and honest with ourselves and say we are opposed.

Therefore I hope that when you vote you will vote on the motion favorably, to wipe the slate clean. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, prevails, and when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was a member of this Legislature two years ago. I was confused at that time as to whether we should pass this memorial or not. I feel that I am not confused at the present time, and I want to go on record in support of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman.

Mr. FENN: of Bath: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FENN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the Chair recognized the motion of Mr. Burgess for a division, as I already had a previous motion for the roll call.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman who already has the floor has asked for the yea and nay vote. Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Fay.

Mrs. FAY: Mr. Speaker, I am agreed in part with the statements made by both the people supporting the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, and the people who have arisen against it.

Two years ago we passed a resolution which is not what is stated in L. D. 460: "Whereas the principles enunciated in the Memorial of World Federation as set out in the said 1949 memorial are not now approved by the Legislature of the State of Maine." That is not what we did two years ago. If you support the motion of Mr. Gilman today, you are sending something again to Washington which you do not understand.

We have had lengthy hearings, and we have been exposed not to one organization for the last two years but to two organizations. The second one has not been mentioned here today. That is the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I am extremely

friendly to both organizations. I feel strongly for the veterans, and, as Mr. Farley spoke to you earlier as a veteran, he was in support of the resolution we sent two years ago.

This was considered at a public hearing which, if you members had all attended, you would have had the same impression that most of us on the committee had: that this issue was used as a sounding-board, not for one organization but for both, for the World Federalists as well as for the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I say to you, members, that if you go along with rescinding you are simply using yourselves as a sounding-board for the other organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, instead of the World Federalists.

In committee I was not privileged to discuss or to talk with the members who prepared this resolution that comes to you as L. D. 1258. We have some able legal minds on Judiciary. I was not with them when they drafted this L. D. 1258, but I am in complete accord with the diplomacy which they have shown. They have come forward with an answer, with a solution which you members should seriously consider. You will no longer be considered the sounding-board for the World Federalists or the Veterans of Foreign Wars if you will go along with L. D. 1258.

Now it has been said by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Fenn, that we use the words "World Federal Government." In that document, L. D. 1258, when that phrase is used, we are referring to the memorial which was sent in 1949. Mr. Delahanty ably corrected that statement. Now if you members will only read both, you will see that you will be in as bad a position if you pass L. D. 460 as you were two years ago, and you will still be hounded by both sides. I do believe that it is time that we strengthened our own thinking and also read a bill through so that we understand it, not in part but in relation to the whole.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, does not prevail, because of these reasons which I have stated and also because of an understand-

ing which we had between Senator Reid and Mr. Gilman. I understood that this was to be tabled this morning and that Senator Reid would have an amendment to correct L. D. 460 and the obvious mistakes and misstatements which are made in it. The opportunity has not been given us, and we must make a decision here on the floor. I plead with you to at least read both memorials.

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

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say in reply to the lady from Portland (Mrs. Fay) that at this very present time, according to the discussions, that we are now doing our own thinking, if you please. This morning our thinking is not being done by Joe Stalin or any other communist. We are doing our own thinking, if you please, and we know whether we are going or coming, and we know whether we are for it or against it. Thank you.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker, since I was a member of the 94th Legislature that sent this Memorial to Congress, I will admit that I, for one—I might have been stuck in a snowbank or something, but I did not even know the memorial went to Congress, and at the special session last winter I voted to have it rescinded.

I would just like to read to you the next to the last paragraph on Page 2 of L. D. 460. It says: "Resolved, that we your Memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress that said Memorial of 1949 be repudiated and rescinded."

I certainly hope that the motion made by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, prevails.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am kind of confused, and I think Mrs. Fay has confused me. What I am interested in is this: I want to wipe the slate clean; I want no resolution whatsoever of this nature to go into Congress. If I have mis-

understood this one, it is just because I guess I haven't read it. But I want to wipe this thing clean. I do not want to be associated with the other states who have gone along with this thinking and which they themselves are now thinking that they want to repudiate, their former stand. I want to repudiate my former stand also. Now if this motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, does not do that I won't go along with him, but I supposed that it did. Am I wrong?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Fay.

Mrs. FAY: Mr. Speaker, shall I assume that Mr. Dunham is asking me a question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The Chair must inform you that he has not. He may, if he desires.

Mr. DUNHAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask Mrs. Fay if I am wrong.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, asks the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Fay, a question through the Chair which she may answer if she chooses.

Mrs. FAY: Mr. Speaker, it is like something else you have done and wise to wipe the slate clean; you cannot do it by sending something else to replace it, which you are doing by sending L. D. 460.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

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

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker, at the time of the hearing on this bill the proponents, a couple of them, were in agreement with the committee that there should be several amendments in it. I am just wondering now if those amendments are not made and the bill is sent along, whether or not there could be an agreement or can anything be done now?

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman raise his voice and repeat his final question?

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker, can anything be done now to cor-

rect L. D. 460, if that is going to be the bill that is sent as a Memorial?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman that if L. D. 460 is substituted for the report of the committee it will be open to amendment. Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, that the original Memorial be substituted for the committee report. Now the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Penn, has requested a roll call. Those who desire a roll call will please stand and the monitors will return the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is satisfied that not one-fifth of the members present request the yeas and nays vote.

The question before the House is now on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, that the original Memorial be substituted for the report of the committee. The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, has requested a division.

All those in favor of substituting the original Memorial for the report will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and eleven having voted in the affirmative and thirteen in the negative, the original Memorial is substituted for the report of the committee.

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

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I understand you correctly, this is still subject to amendment? Am I correct?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have not the slightest objection to this Legislature passing a memorial that they are opposed to everything that they think they are, but what I am opposed to is trying to make another Legislature retract what I say this Legislature has no right to do.

I would like now to move that this matter lie on the table so that

we can draft a new memorial from this Legislature, saying emphatically that we are against it. I so move.

The Chair would remind the members that the question before the House is on the adoption of the Memorial.

The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, if he moved to table?

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: I did, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, moves that the Memorial lie on the table pending adoption. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

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

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to move that this memorial be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, moves that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Now, I am positive that there is confusion.

You have just voted emphatically to wipe the slate clean. If I am wrong in my next statement, I trust our good Speaker will correct me, the proper procedure is to give the bill its first and second readings and then it will be open for amendment. Will the Speaker correct me if I am wrong?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, the Memorial does not require any reading. The Memorial does require to be adopted, which is already before the House.

Mr. BURGESS: In that case, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I can see no reason for giving it further consideration. You have adopted it by a large vote, we have demonstrated our position emphatically, and I hope that any motion

to detain or otherwise will be defeated.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the House that the question which we recently voted upon is substituting the original Memorial for the committee report.

The question before the House now is the adoption of this substitution and the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, has moved that it be indefinitely postponed.

Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed, no.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, has the motion been made to adopt the memorial?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the question is before the House, it has automatically been made.

Mr. JONES: Then I have no motion, Mr. Speaker.

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

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the Memorial?

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

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will be very brief. I want to say now that I mentioned previously that there should be an amendment to it and I said that in all sincerity because those who were most outspoken for it, the original memorial, the proponents, in response to questions from members of the committee, readily agreed that there should be an amendment and that, I believe, is the only reason I would have that it should be tabled and, if one of the strong proponents of it here would move that it be tabled, I think that it should be corrected and then placed before the House for consideration as amended. The amend-

ment would be only to correct the inaccuracies in it.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

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

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may ask her question.

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman (Mr. Delahanty) through the Chair if the amendment could be prepared if we should take a short recess of five minutes.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, requests information from the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Delahanty, and he may answer if he wishes.

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the lady from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, I would say that if I could get a couple of members of the committee with me, I think we could work out those amendments that were suggested. We would have to review our notes and possibly we could get together with the proponents of the bill who are now in the upper branch of the House and have them ready in a short time before we adjourn for the day.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Delahanty, move to recess for five minutes?

Mr. DELAHANTY: Would it be possible, Mr. Speaker, to lay this matter on the table until later on this morning and I would be willing to leave the House for the purpose of making those amendments.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that it will be possible to delay the matter until later in today's session provided the House gives unanimous consent.

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

Mrs. MOFFATT: Mr. Speaker, I think that we are all going around in somewhat of a whirlpool and if I could make the motion for a five-minute recess, or someone could make the motion to give us a little time to settle down from this whirlpool, and see what is going to be suggested, I think perhaps that we would all feel better in the long run. We are just striving toward something now and we do now know exactly where we are

going; time is passing and we feel: Take something. Are we going to take something that we will regret? Therefore, I move that we have a recess of five minutes and try to get settled and come up with something that will be acceptable.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Bath, Mrs. Moffatt, moves that the House recess for five minutes. Is this the pleasure of the House? of the Memorial.

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

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

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

The Chair will put the House at ease for five minutes.

HOUSE AT EASE

Called to order by the Speaker.

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

Mr. GILMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present House Amendment "A" and strongly urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gilman, presents House Amendment "A" to the Memorial to Congress, and moves its adoption.

The Clerk will read the amendment.

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 205, L. D. 460, "Memorial to Congress Rescinding Proposal for Considering a Constitutional Convention of the United States or Amendments to the Constitution of the United States Relating to Strengthening the United Nations and Limited World Federal Government."

Amend said Memorial by striking out the 3rd and 4th paragraphs thereof and inserting in place thereof the following paragraphs:

'Whereas, the said memorial did not favor nor recommend any form of World Federalist Government; and

'Whereas, the Legislature of Maine did not and now does not approve any form of World Federalist Government.'

Further amend said Memorial by striking out the next to the last paragraph thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

Resolved: That we, your Memorialists, do hereby rescind and repudiate the said Memorial of 1949 and respectfully urge that the same be disregarded.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of this House: To show you how completely unaware of what you were doing this morning, I want to read you what this resolve proposed. I want to do this so that you will know what you are doing when you vote on this amendment. The resolve was this: "We, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the members of Congress that this memorial be repudiated." In other words, this Legislature moved to adopt that memorial asking Congress to repudiate a memorial that they never had anything to do with. Now this corrects it and we repudiate it. I want you to understand that this amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. DELAHANTY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The amendment is drawn to conform to the suggestions that were recommended at the time of the hearing and this memorial and the resolve that "we, your memorialists, do hereby rescind and repudiate" means that we are rescinding and repudiating that memorial that was passed here at the last session of the Legislature, and I hope it will be adopted.

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

All those in favor of adopting House Amendment "A" to the Memorial to Congress will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the adoption of the Memorial as amended by House Amendment "A".

All those in favor of the adoption of the Memorial as amended will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the memorial as amended by House

Amendment "A" was adopted in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act Prohibiting the Printing of Pauper Assistance in Town Reports" (H. P. 206) (L. D. 128) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" in the House on March 15.

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

In the House:

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its former action.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, moves that the House insist on its former action. Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its former action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, that the House recede from its action of March 15 whereby Bill "An Act Prohibiting the Printing of Pauper Assistance in Town Reports" was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B".

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can assure you that it is not a pleasure for me to arise in opposition to my good friend, the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins. However, I do believe on a previous date the House so emphatically stated its position with respect to the provision of prohibiting the printing of pauper lists that it should not now, in such a short time, repudiate or rescind its position. I do not feel that it should. We thoroughly discussed it; everybody understood what was going on.

The amendment which has been offered by the other branch of the Legislature would make it optional for the towns, therefore making it debatable and even a more deplorable situation than now prevails.

If we are going to subject the recipients of town pauper funds to a complete discussion annually in town meetings as to whether or not their names shall be printed, if they find themselves in a position to request and receive public assistance from the town, then we are injuring them rather than helping them and I would much prefer that the law be left as it is than to have this come about for annual discussion of their means and their positions in open town meeting.

I hope that the House will vote against the motion of my good friend, the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, and that you will again vote with me to insist on our former position which will allow our action to go back to the other body and I have confidence that eventually we can accomplish what we so emphatically stated and started out to do a few days ago.

I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, does not prevail.

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

Mr. ROLLINS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise on this issue again on the basis of dictation to the towns. The big issue with me was that we sit here and tell the towns what to do when we so emphatically deny and reject being told what to do. Over and above that, I believe there is an item there—there is a law that says that paupers shall not vote in municipal or state affairs and, if they are not listed, who is it that is going to challenge anybody's vote? They do not know who receives aid. That law should be rescinded too and let paupers vote.

If this bill should receive passage, if the House accepted, it—also there is the matter of the town's right which is forefront in the whole issue. The backlog of democracy is the town meeting. If those people at town meetings have not the right to say what they want

to do at this town level, we are fast centralizing everything right here in Augusta, patterning after some that we criticize.

I hope the motion to recede prevails.

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

Mr. MCGLAULIN: Mr. Speaker, we discussed this matter thoroughly a few days ago and pointed out the iniquity of having the names of these paupers published, the suffering that would come to the family, the wives and children, and we defeated that in this House—two to one.

Right on top of that vote, my good friend, the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, has the nerve—and it must have taken some—to get up here and propose this same amendment and we killed it definitely then. Let's keep it killed.

I am against the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hermon, Mr. Nowell.

Mr. NOWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins.

When this Legislature comes over here and takes the rights from our small municipalities, I do not think it is right. I, therefore, want to second the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins.

I believe this places the matter squarely up to the towns, where it belongs.

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

Mr. BRADEEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It gives me a great deal of pleasure, in this particular instance, to sup-

port the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaulin, and of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

It seems to me that I recall that not too long ago we explored this situation very carefully, every member of this House who was interested in any way, to any extent whatsoever, in the equities involved, had an opportunity at that time to express his or her opinion. Consequently, at this time, I see no reason why a vote of something like two to one should be upset.

Therefore, I can't go along with that type of thinking. Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Medway, Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not know how many members of this House have attended town meetings in the smaller towns. If they have, they will realize that the matter of town finances is very, very carefully taken up. I wonder which would be most embarrassing to the town poor: to have their names published in the town report or have the overseers of the poor question them in regard to their expenditures and the name of each man who had received aid from the town read and the matter questioned of whether he needed that help or not?

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Rollins, that the House recede from its former action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" on March 15.

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

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-three having voted in the affirmative and sixty having voted in the negative, the question to recede did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, that the House insist upon its former action.

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

On motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, the House

Adjourned until 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.