

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

*One Hundred and First
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1963

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Friday, April 19, 1963

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Carl Russell of the Episcopal Church, Winn.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate Senate Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass Covered by Other Legislation

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Enforcement of Laws Relating to Litter" (S. P. 430) (L. D. 1173), as it is covered by other legislation.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Non-lapsing Funds for Armory Expansion" (S. P. 89) (L. D. 226) 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, the 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. 89, L. D. 226, Bill, "An Act Relating to Non-lapsing Funds for Armory Expansion."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the 3rd and 4th underlined lines from the end and inserting in place thereof the following underlined words:

"shall remain a continuing carrying account until June 30, 1965."

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Authorize Private Game Preserves" (S. P. 452) (L. D. 1280)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr.	STITHAM of Somerset
Mrs.	SPROUL of Lincoln
Mr.	ATHERTON of Penobscot — of the Senate.
Mr.	COTE of Lewiston
Mrs.	WHITE of Guilford
Messrs.	FOSTER of Mechanic Falls BOISSONNEAU — of Westbrook COPE of Portland — of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 573) (L. D. 1518) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr.	GILBERT of Eddington — of the House.
-----	---

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted.

In the House: Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Dudley of Enfield, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Appointment of Chief Engineer of Fire Department of City of Westbrook" (H. P. 384) (L. D. 583) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in the House on March 29.

Came from the Senate with Committee Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Operation of Farm Trailers Without Registration" (H. P. 620) (L. D. 855) which was passed to be engrossed without Amendment in the House on April 10.

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

In the House: On motion of Mr. Coulthard of Scarborough, the House voted to adhere to its former action.

Orders Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Plante of Old Orchard Beach presented the following Order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the Senate and House Chairmen of the Joint Standing Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development be authorized and directed to engage a reputable and recognized professional consulting firm for a pilot study for the purpose of effecting reductions in operating costs, making a job analysis, performing a detailed study of the Simonds Payson Co. Inc. advertising account including all types of expenditures billed to the Department of Economic Development and determining the efficiency of the Department of Economic Development. The result or preliminary findings of this study shall be reported to the 101st Legislature not later than May 15, 1963. The expenses of this study shall be taken from the legislative appropriation.

(On motion of Mr. Plante of Old Orchard Beach, the Order was tabled pending passage, ordered reproduced and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 23.)

The SPEAKER: The Speaker is pleased this morning to recognize in the balcony the Girl Scouts Troop 11 from Scarborough. In this group, there are seventeen young ladies; their leader, Mrs. Wentworth; and the troop committee Howard Wentworth, Jr., Mrs. Crowley, and Mrs. Quinn. And two Brownies of Troop 74 of Scarborough.

On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you young ladies, a warm welcome and we trust that you will enjoy and profit by your visit with us here this morning. (Applause)

On motion of the gentlewoman from Guilford, Mrs. White, House

Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session in order to permit smoking.

On motion of Mr. Ross of Brownville, it was

ORDERED, that Miss Susan Jean Curtis and Paul A. Derocher, both of Bowdoinham, be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

The SPEAKER: The Sergeant-at-Arms will retire to the rear of the Hall of the House and escort these young people to their positions as Honorary Pages for the day. For the information of the House, the Chair will inform you that these are the grandchildren of Representative Curtis of Bowdoinham. (Applause)

Thereupon, Miss Susan Jean Curtis and Paul A. Derocher, were escorted to the well of the Hall of the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms to serve as Honorary Pages for the day.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would also advise at this time that due to the great amount of unfinished business and tabled matters, that the Chair would entertain motions now for reconsideration.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Corinna, Mr. Osgood.

Mr. OSGOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move reconsideration on House Paper 65, Legislative Document 89.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Corinna, Mr. Osgood, moves that the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Beverages in Returnable Bottles," on April 18, 1963. Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider its action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" Report?

(Cries of "No")

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Corinna, Mr. Osgood.

Mr. OSGOOD: Mr. Speaker, it is very evident that they don't want to reconsider.

The SPEAKER: It is possible that the gentleman's debate may change the minds of the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I move this be tabled until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson, moves that the matter of reconsideration be tabled until Wednesday next. Is that the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

**House Reports of Committees
Ought Not to Pass
Tabled and Assigned**

Mr. Hardy from the Committee on Municipal Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Increase the Term of Office of the Mayor, City Council, Board of Police and Board of Education, Warden and Ward Clerk for the City of Biddeford (H. P. 546) (L. D. 762)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Cartier of Biddeford, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 24.)

**Ought to Pass in New Draft
New Drafts Printed**

Mr. Easton from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Joint Committee Formed in Contracts Between Academies and School Administrative Units" (H. P. 633) (L. D. 889) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1062) (L. D. 1524) under title of "An Act relating to Joint Committee Between George Stevens Academy and Nearby Towns" and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Crockett from the Committee on Election Laws on Bill "An Act relating to Election Recounts" (H. P. 902) (L. D. 1310) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1058) (L. D. 1523) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Choate from the Committee on Municipal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Elections in the City of Biddeford" (H. P. 122) (L. D. 166) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1060) (L. D. 1526) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Wellman from same Committee on Bill "An Act Increasing Number of Superintending School Committee of Town of Baileyville" (H.

P. 986) (L. D. 1428) which was re-committed, reported same in a second new draft (H. P. 1061) (L. D. 1527) under title of "An Act relating to Superintending School Committee of Town of Baileyville" and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Tyndale from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act Creating a Sewer District in the Town of Berwick" (H. P. 497) (L. D. 699) which was re-committed, reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1059) (L. D. 1528) under title of "An Act to Incorporate the Berwick Sewer District" and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted, the New Drafts read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

**Ought to Pass
Printed Bill**

Mr. Easton from the Committee on Education reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Municipalities of Ashland, Garfield Plantation and Portage Lake to Suspend the Operation of Ashland Community School District and Reorganize as a School Administrative District" (H. P. 1036) (L. D. 1504)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

**Ought to Pass with
Committee Amendment
Tabled and Assigned**

Mr. McGee from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Disposal of Certain Real Property by Directors of School Administrative Districts" (H. P. 724) (L. D. 1053) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Curtis of Bowdoinham, tabled pending acceptance of the Committee Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 24.)

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Quorum of Maine Sardine Council" (S. P. 338) (L. D. 1003)

Bill "An Act to Update Validation of Street Installations" (S. P. 369) (L. D. 1035)

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

**Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act Providing Access Roads to Ski Areas Open to General Public" (S. P. 570) (L. D. 1515)

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

(On motion of Mr. Pease of Wisconsin, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 24.)

**Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act Providing for an Insurance Reserve Fund for City of Portland" (S. P. 540) (L. D. 1465)

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

(On motion of Mr. Philbrick of Augusta, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, April 25.)

**Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act relating to Motor Vehicle Registration Plates" (S. P. 569) (L. D. 1514)

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

(On motion of Mr. Viles of Anson, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 23.)

Bill "An Act Repealing Law Relating to Use of Prior Convictions in Suspension of Motor Vehicle Licenses for Driving under the Influence" (H. P. 738) (L. D. 1067)

Bill "An Act relating to Statute of Limitations for Actions Against Tax Collectors" (H. P. 868) (L. D. 1255)

Bill "An Act Authorizing County Commissioners for York County to Make a Loan for Courthouse Addition" (H. P. 1053) (L. D. 1520)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read

the third time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

**Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act Revising the Laws Relating to Litter" (H. P. 1055) (L. D. 1522)

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

(On motion of Mr. Wellman of Bangor, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 24.)

**Amended Bills
Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Grants-in-Aid for Construction of Municipal Sewage Treatment Facilities" (S. P. 90) (L. D. 227)

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

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

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that item 10 lie on the table until Tuesday next.

Mr. Rankin of Southport then requested a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested on the motion of the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod, that item 10 be tabled until Tuesday next. All those in favor of the tabling motion, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-nine having voted in the affirmative and thirty-nine having voted in the negative, the tabling motion prevailed.

Thereupon, the Bill was tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 23.

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Calais Water District" (S. P. 165) (L. D. 441)

Bill "An Act Providing for Trademarks under Potato Tax Law" (S. P. 550) (L. D. 1482)

Bill "An Act to Permit Towns to Choose Single Assessors and to Permit Certain Cities and Towns to Create Boards of Assessment Review" (S. P. 561) (L. D. 1501)

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

**Third Reader
Tabled and Assigned**

Bill "An Act Providing for the Vehicle Equipment Safety Compact" (H. P. 465) (L. D. 669)

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

(On motion of Mr. Waterman of Auburn, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, April 25.)

Bill "An Act relating to Suspension of Registration of Motor Vehicles Driven by Certain Persons When Arrested" (H. P. 914) (L. D. 1321)

Bill "An Act relating to Order of Divorce Concerning Minor Children" (H. P. 917) (L. D. 1351)

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

Orders out of Order

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Tuesday, April 23rd, 1963. (S. P. 576)

Came from the Senate today read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read and passed in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. MacLeod of Brewer, it was

ORDERED, that Peter and Pamela Easton of Winterport, be appointed to serve as Honorary Pages for today.

The SPEAKER: The Sergeant-at-Arms will retire to the rear of the

Hall of the House and escort these young people to their positions as Honorary Pages for the day. Peter and Pamela Easton are the children of Representative Easton of Winterport. (Applause)

Thereupon, Peter and Pamela Easton of Winterport were escorted to the well of the Hall of the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms to serve as Honorary Pages for the day.

**Passed to Be Enacted
Emergency Measure**

An Act to Authorize the Municipalities of Oakfield, Island Falls, Dyer Brook, Merrill, Smyrna and Crystal to Form a School Administrative District (H. P. 1007) (L. D. 1458)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a division was had. 116 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Enactor
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act to Correct the Name of Heron Lake Dam Company and Relating to Its Powers (S. P. 281) (L. D. 795)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

(On motion of Mr. Harrington of Dexter, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Friday, April 26.)

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Crossing Railroad Right-of-Way by Water Utility (S. P. 396) (L. D. 1099)

An Act relating to Transportation of Household Goods for Hire by a Common Carrier (S. P. 455) (L. D. 1282)

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

**Enactor
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act relating to Non-alcoholic Drink Products and Beverages (S. P. 469) (L. D. 1346)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

(On motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 24.)

An Act Adding the Maine Motor Vehicle Dealer Registration Board to the State Agencies Subject to the Administrative Code (S. P. 487) (L. D. 1339)

An Act to Revise the Laws Relating to Real Estate Brokers and Salesmen (S. P. 552) (L. D. 1484)

An Act Repealing Fee for Solemnization of Marriages (S. P. 565) (L. D. 1509)

An Act Providing for a Council-Manager Form of Government for Town of Gorham (H. P. 161) (L. D. 223)

An Act Increasing Amount of Wages Exempt from Trustee Process (H. P. 234) (L. D. 302)

An Act Increasing Salary of Members of Public Utilities Commission (H. P. 505) (L. D. 707)

An Act relating to Courses of Study at and Degrees by the State Teachers' Colleges (H. P. 636) (L. D. 892)

An Act Repealing Laws Requiring Fences Around Burying Grounds (H. P. 876) (L. D. 1416)

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

**Enactor
Tabled and Assigned**

An Act relating to Proceedings in Adoption of Children (H. P. 1024) (L. D. 1485)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

(On motion of Mr. Minsky of Bangor, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Wednesday, April 24.)

An Act Repealing Certain Laws Relating to Bowling Alleys and Bil-

liard Rooms and Relating to Minors Therein (H. P. 1039) (L. D. 1506)

An Act relating to Recording of a Memorandum of Lease of Real Estate (H. P. 1040) (L. D. 1507)

An Act Prohibiting Employment of Funeral Directors by Cemeteries (H. P. 1043) (L. D. 1510)

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

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the Chair now lays before the House the following matters of Unfinished Business as provided for under Rule 28 on page five of your House Advance Journal and Calendar, Item 1:

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965." (S. P. 549) (L. D. 1481) — Engrossed in Senate.

This Matter was before the House at the time of Adjournment yesterday.

Pending Question — Motion of Mr. Pease of Wiscasset to Recommit Bill to Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Speaker, I move the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the pending question that item one be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

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

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: Yesterday we spent over three hours discussing a motion very similar to this. I don't believe that there is any need to go over the same ground again. I would urge you to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, and when the question is put, I would ask for a division.

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

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House:

I promise this morning that I will not be as lengthy as I was yesterday morning. Yesterday morning on the floor of this House, we witnessed probably the most interesting coalition on a vote that has been seen in this House for a long, long time. We saw the majority of a Minority Party in this House, a majority of the Democrats in the House of Representatives, join with a minority of the Republican Party of this House in a vote for economy which was defeated—

Mr. JALBERT of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will state his point.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, under Rule 57 of our special rules, the rules of parliamentary practice comprised in Reed's Rules, shall govern the House—

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman state his point.

Mr. JALBERT: My point is that under Reed's Rules, the point is not debatable. Reading exactly, the motion that has been made is debatable, but the merits of the main question are not open to discussion on this motion, since that discussion will be in order when the Committee reports. Is it my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that where we do not have a special rule in our main rules, that we then follow Reed's Rules. Is that my understanding?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's point of order is partly right. Under modifications, a motion to recommit does not open discussion on the main question, unless coupled with instructions.

The Chair will rule that the gentleman may debate the merits of recommitment, but not the main question.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, if I understand it correctly now, I can talk about the motion to recommit this appropriations measure to committee?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may debate the reasons for recommitment, but may not debate the main question. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MacLEOD: Well, to me, one of the principal reasons why we

should recommit this to committee is because if this document is not recommitted, then we are going to be faced with a major tax increase.—

Mr. JALBERT of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's point is not well taken, and the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod, may continue.

Mr. MacLEOD: May I ask a question of the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may do so.

Mr. MacLEOD: A similar motion to this was before us yesterday. It was debated fully and completely, and I think quite often the main question was mentioned, and there was no objection, so I don't know just where I stand.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that yesterday there were instructions coupled with the motion.

Mr. MacLEOD: May I repeat that if this motion to recommit this legislative document to committee does not pass, then it is very likely that this House and this Legislature will be faced with a thirty-three and one-third percent tax increase.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: I would rise for a clarification on the question that has been raised by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert. Is not the main question now before us the engrossment of the bill?

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr. PEASE: And a member may speak on the motion to recommit as long—and debate the merits of his motion to recommit as long as he does not debate the propriety of engrossing the bill. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The main question being the bill itself is not debatable at this time. Reference may be made to the bill, but it may not be debated.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will go along and recommit this bill this morning. I feel it is the only way that I can get an inside look at a lot

of these things in this bill. Now at the time that these were being heard before Appropriations, I regret I was unable to attend. I was a member of two committees of this House, and I have done my very best to perform my duties. Therefore, I was unable to hear the discussions. There are some things in this that I really don't like. I don't know as six percent is the right method, but I do think the right method is to send this back so that we can go before the committee and be heard, our gripes, our dissatisfaction, and I think it is not asking very much that we have an inside look, a look-and-see — the members of this House that are very interested in what this state spends, and I am very interested also in the taxes that we may have to raise to pay for this. However, I am a reasonable man; I am a business man. If I can be shown that these things are reasonable and just, I am sure I will not be hard to deal with; but I would like to have a look-and-see, please.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Would it be in order for me to ask a question?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman may ask a question.

Mrs. SMITH: Could I ask a question through the Chair, is it now the intent of this question to again have public hearings on this? The gentleman has said I wish to hear and be heard or something to that effect.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Well, it is my understanding that it doesn't necessarily have to be a public hearing. I do think it ought to be a hearing amongst the people that are dissatisfied with the document before us; and namely, the conservative group of people in this House. I don't know as it needs to be public. I think it could be for the members of the House or any member of the legislative body in either

branch that might like to have a look-and-see.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I arise to oppose the motion to recommit the bill and to state my reasons. I have been interested in D.E.D. bills, some forty of them, and to keep informed, it has been necessary for me to cancel many social events that I would like to have attended, and I have worked Saturdays, Sunday afternoons and Mondays. The Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development are grateful for the House support in indefinitely postponing some of the bills. The Appropriations Committee has been most helpful in dealing with D.E.D. bills, and many of them have been withdrawn. I am fully satisfied with the budget they have presented in relation to this department. This talk of recommitting the bill for further study, I take with a grain of sorrow for certainly there must have been a way for at least one member of a committee to attend Appropriations hearings on bills related to the department and that they might have been interested in, I do not believe the motion to recommit will do anything except prolong the session, and I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused, and I am not sure that I can make this statement, but with the gentleman from Enfield saying that he feels that they should be able to come before the Committee—and please stop me if I am not answering the question, I am not quite sure how we should go about this, certainly he will have to have—he says he has not had the information that we have had, so somehow he must have that information. Apparently this group does not believe that we have the information or have used the information that we should have, so I wonder how we arrived at this. It seems to me that we have got into an entirely different field now

than just recommitment, but I can be so wrong in this area right now.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer, if they choose to do so.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I think that what the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, means in his question or on what he said in his remarks was if this bill is re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, I think that they will have an indication, they know the mood and the intent of this House, and I would say that they in their infinite wisdom would do what is right to this bill once they get it back.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank you for your patience. I am used to grappling friendly with one Pease from Wiscasset, but two of them is quite a mouthful, and I surely have a great admiration for both of them. I would like to state my position clearly. If this bill would be re-committed, there are two things that the Committee could do. They could just sit on it and do nothing, and I don't think that the tempo of the committee and the makeup of the committee is such that they would do that. Or else, we could reopen the whole book. Then when we come back here, it is reopened again, and believe me that calls for August 1st as far as adjournment is concerned. And believe me when I tell you this, it is a fact. Now we had the bill before us. We can spend weeks debating it here and the committee as a whole if you may. This is a very important point, and I hope that you people realize that, the seriousness of recommitting this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Tyndale.

Mr. TYNDALE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I heartily concur with my colleague, Mr. Jalbert. Obviously, there is little lack of knowledge on some of

the movements of legislative procedure. We could very well be here beyond August 1st. We have been here now over three months, and with a red book planted on your desks from the beginning and if anybody hasn't had a chance to look-see now, how long will that look-see be necessary? This, gentlemen, is a current service fund which has been prepared for us by many members of the legislature before us. There is nothing to be gained by a recommitment but a prolongation—if I may be colloquialistic at this point, by bringing out a prolonged discussion with the ending to a nebulous ending. It seems to me, gentlemen, this is a responsible House. I believe in it. I have worked with it for these three months, and I believe that they have reached their point of responsibility and if they haven't, how long will it take? No one knows.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Easton.

Mr. EASTON: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke in opposition to a motion somewhat similar to this. There is one basic difference, however, this particular motion requests that the bill be sent back to the Appropriations Committee, the Committee which examined this document in the first place, the committee which has heard the witnesses, and the committee which has the work sheets. What I said yesterday is just as true today. There is undoubtedly a considerable amount of fat excess personnel, excess programs, that the Appropriations Committee can, and I suggest should, cut and cut responsibly. We could here in this House perhaps make cuts, but we cannot be sure they will be responsible cuts. If it would take until Labor Day to do the job that we were sent here to do, I suggest that we can do no less. I support the motion to re-commit.

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

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: My good friend from Winterport, Mr. Easton, has suggested that the

Appropriations Committee cut programs. I suggest to you that we have amendments here on our desks before us which will do just that. Why do we need to commit and have them make some suggestions which have to come out here and then be re-debated? Why don't we just debate the amendments that are before us? I can't see what will be gained by any recommitment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker, well I just wanted to inform this House that I am not confused, not one bit. I know where I am going. I know what I am interested in. I just want to have a good look, and I might say this, that if some of this very economy bloc don't get a good look and are not convinced that we need these services, they will certainly have a hard time to pass the sales tax in this House. You had better give us a good look and convince us that these services are needed because you are going to be needing our votes when you come to get the money to pay for this. So you had better give us a good look.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Viles.

Mr. VILES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I fully concur with the gentleman from Enfield, and I am not in favor of a short session if I have to stay here until Christmas, if it is going to be at the expense of the taxpayer. What I am interested in, as many of you are, is a good, sound, economic government that will keep Maine competitive and progressive with the other forty-nine states. As a freshman legislator, I noticed in one of the reports that was brought into us at the beginning of the session and I would quote excerpts from part of that report. That the power to tax is the power to destroy. Now I certainly appreciate the efforts that the Appropriations Committee has given this Legislature, but there are also many of us here that have had experience on working with budgets on both sides. If you ever want to keep progressive and com-

petitive then you must look what the other states are doing around you.

I would remind you that some of our good sister states have well over-spent. I am not saying this with any criticism of these great states. I merely point out that it can happen in the State of Maine. I think all you have to do is take a look at the record of the State of Michigan. This state went bankrupt a few years ago, and it needed all the help it could get from the industries that were located there. In other words, they were pledging their faith in the State of Michigan, and they advanced payments on their taxes. If that isn't clear enough, then I would hope that you would take a good look at the records of the State of Massachusetts, which is a sister state of ours, and I certainly don't stand here with any intent to downgrade in any way the intent of the legislators in that state. But what I am saying is that if we don't take a good look at the records of some of the states that have over-spent, and again I would admit that I was one of the people back home when the 100th Legislature convened. I was one of those people that the Press kept hollering about, that was demanding these services.

I purposely went home last night to see what the reaction was of the people back home. And as many of you know, this was played up on television, our debates yesterday were played on television, they were played in the press. I had two telephone calls, and they both were in the same category. They were friends of mine. They are businessmen. They know how to add and subtract. And they said, Bob, we want to know how you voted, and I told them. And they said we are glad to hear that we have finally sent somebody down there that will vote for economies for good government.

Now it doesn't necessarily mean that we have to spend to have progress. This has been tried by the Federal Government. And I will remember it. From the first news commentary that I heard on the radio, and I listened to these same

commentaries in the four years that I was in the Armed Services and I said to myself, if the opportunity ever presents, I shall look at both sides very carefully, if it takes spending for progression, then I will vote to spend. If it doesn't, then I won't. And I am sure that many of you have recognized my position on many bills, especially on the roll call bills. I still go along with the same thought in mind, that you cannot spend yourself into prosperity; and when we have been faced with over one hundred percent of increase in state expenditures in the past ten years, then I think it is time to apply the brakes in some way or another. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, would prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have always felt that we should stay here as long as it is necessary. I do not feel that recommitting will accomplish any purpose. I have heard brave talk in this House today about we shall stay until the Fourth of July or Labor Day or Christmas. When this session ends today, you will receive your eighth check. Your ninth check will come the first week in May, and after that, you will work until the end of the session with no money other than your travel money. Now I have been here before, and let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that when you prolong the session for six or seven weeks after the ninth check, people begin to hurt and they prove it to you. I have known people in the 99th who lived on their travel money. Now if you want to go ahead, delay the session for no purpose, that is your privilege. But I am at this time opposed to recommitment.

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

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to point out one fact to the members of the House. I have in my hand blue paper which I understand the state has got a very large supply of. I am opposed to

the recommitment of this bill, and I suggest to these gentlemen if they feel they can do a better job than the Appropriations Committee, then to go out and avail yourselves of our vast supply of this paper and bring in your amendments and I will probably be glad to vote for some.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies, and Gentlemen: I would call to the attention of the House one remark I made yesterday, in debating the question of recommitment this morning, in that we would be threatened with staying here until June or July or until such time as it might be necessary for us to rubber-stamp the programs that are being dictated in all directions. I note with interest in this morning's Daily Kennebec Journal the quoted phrase "incredibly irresponsible." I call to the attention of the members of the House this phrase because it appears to me that on the question of recommitment, on the question of recommitment when these threats can be again made, or these indications made, that your pocketbook and mine are going to be the club or the wedge or the threat that is necessary for us to spend this state into oblivion, I think it is high time we did recommit this bill. I think the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs has done a very good job thus far. I think they can do a much better job when they understand the temper of this House, the temper of this House not to lead the State of Maine down the garden path to a fiscal impossibility. I would urge you to take the action to recommit and let the members of this committee and others in the legislature and others who have the responsibility by statute in the Constitution of the State of Maine consider well the program that they suggest we adopt.

Mr. Speaker, I ask when the vote on the motion to recommit is taken, it be taken by a roll call so that the citizens of the State of Maine can see where each one of us stands on the question of the financial responsibility that we have

and that we are passing along to them.

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

Mr. MINSKY: Mr. Speaker, I have sat very patiently here the last few days and not spoken on this matter of recommitment. I thought that I could keep quiet during this debate, but I am afraid my own patience is somewhat coming to an end. Certain people do not like being called irresponsible. Private opinions can be expressed and they will continue to be expressed, but these same individuals indicate that they do not wish to go along with the rubber-stamp programs which are being forced upon them. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I am not a rubber stamp. I am not a rubber stamp for the Governor; I am not a rubber stamp for the economy bloc.

Now these people will pay a polite compliment to the Appropriations Committee and then will simply say they have done a wonderful job, but let's give it back to them. I think we have done a good job. We have spent three and one-half months on this, not two weeks. We have gone into this program. We have studied it carefully.

I would point out to you that some time in this three and one-half months time, I would have thought that more members of this House could have come to the Appropriations Committee's hearings, but two members to my recollection came. The gentleman from Hampden, Mr. Littlefield found time to oppose certain bills, and the other bill that was opposed was opposed by a member of the Appropriations Committee, and that bill happened to be a bill of a second member of the Appropriations Committee being namely mine.

At no time did they find time to come. They keep talking of the economy. They keep talking about the people who couldn't come, but I can tell you time after time when our committee room was filled. I can tell you time after time when we had to move to Room 105 to accommodate the people who came down to speak for the programs, to speak for the programs which

the Appropriations Committee has approved, not as a rubber stamp, but in their wisdom, as proper and fitting for the people of the State of Maine.

I would point out to you that these same people who have become experts in two weeks, have had this program delayed twice, and I say to you that they have failed because the best they have come up with was a six per cent across the board or recommitment. They will say to the Appropriations Committee, we don't know where to cut, but you go back and do it. We have done it once. Let them come up with amendments. They have some amendments here. They don't cover the six percent they want to find. They have had their chance, now let them do it. Let them come forward on the floor of this House. If they say it can be cut; let them cut it and let them cut it here and don't ask the Appropriations Committee to do what they cannot do. I am concerned about the temper of this House, but I am more concerned about the temper of the people of the State of Maine.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Anson, Mr. Viles.

Mr. VILES: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am aware that most of the two-year members or more knew what the salary was when they ran for this office. I will confess that I did not know what it was and that was the least of my interest. I had encouragement enough, and I wasn't approached as you have to run or you must run. I wasn't one of those candidates. I had enough encouragement so that I ran for the office which I hold now. If that being the case, I am sure that most of the two-year members or more—and I have the greatest respect for you people, it is a sacrifice and I have learned it. I also have respect for the Appropriations Committee, but I must refer to the remarks that were made here earlier that everybody doesn't have a chance to attend these committees—if you are going to do justice to the ones that you have been appointed to.

Now I am certain that there is one member of this House whom I

supported for the Speakership that knows the committee assignment that I wanted. I am not saying that I would have done any better, nor my qualifications were any better than those that were appointed, but what I am going to say is this, I have noticed from the arguments that have been presented from the Appropriations Committee that there were no dissenting votes or every decision in other words was unanimous. If you will look at your calendars, you will notice that most committee reports have been divided. I certainly have been in the majority for the committees that I serve perhaps as much as anyone. I think this is an individual right. I have been brought up and lived in a decade that has been very kind, and if there is one thing that I could do for the people that are going to come behind us and I have children of my own, I want to give them the same treatment that we have had. In other words, I am a believer in the philosophy that you take care of the young and the old and the middle-class will take care of themselves.

Now we are all or most of us are in the greatest earning power of our career, but this is no sign that we should legislate carelessly or otherwise. I would also remind the House the fact that in essence what you are saying if you do not practice economy, you are telling the department heads that are running the State of Maine that you don't have to cut, but you are telling the very people that are paying the bills, you must cut yours. Now I am sure that many of us have relatives and friends back home that are living on a mere \$40, \$50, and \$60 a month pension. I certainly will stand here as I said before and stay here until Christmas if this is the way to get justice for all.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would interrupt debate for just a moment to recognize in the balcony of the House, ten students from the eighth grade of Kenduskeag Grammar School, accompanied by some parents, Mrs. Bradford, Mrs. MacDevitt, Mrs. Welch and Mrs. LeClair who is the president of the local Parent Teachers Association. These

young people are the special guests of Representative Carter of Etna.

On behalf of the House, the Chair extends to you people a warm welcome and we trust that you will enjoy and profit by your visit here this morning. (Applause)

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

Mr. McGEE: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate yesterday and today at great length, and no matter how far we go on, I think most everybody have their minds made up now. I note in the tone of the speakers in this House, I know that there are many interested and we should have due consideration of this bill. I do not see any harm in recommitting this bill and asking for a quick return because we have not put anything compulsory on the Appropriations Committee. By the time it comes back, I think the smoke will have died down and we can get at the fire and give it the real consideration it needs.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hope, Mr. Hardy.

Mr. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This has gone on two days; it will go on a lot more before we get through, but I did want to stand here and defend the Appropriations Committee just a little further and I think a little better than perhaps it has been done. If each one of you will take your Senate Calendar which is before you and take note of some of the sixty-odd items on the Senate Appropriations Special Table, and if you will think back and it can be found in the record if you desire to look, the times that the Appropriations Committee asked where you were from the floor of this House in regard to some of these measures, I felt that they were asking for our cooperation, for our presence at their hearings. I think they have done a very good job, and I think it is not in order to pursue this thing as intently as we have been in the last few days. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Jobin.

Mr. JOBIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is one of the very few times that I have become disturbed with what this House of Representatives might do in its wisdom. I am disturbed because, number one, we have had a committee, a highly selected committee to act on appropriation measures. The proponents for recommitment have agreed that this committee acted in the very best faith. They have agreed that they have acted according to their consciences, and at the same time, now they are asking them to go back and in essence vote against their consciences. They are saying in effect lock yourselves up in your little cubicle over there, call in all the department heads, invite the public to come in, do the very best job you can, but don't spend any money. This I think is exactly opposite to what I believe the principle of recommitting this bill is. I don't think for a minute that the Appropriations Committee is absolutely perfect. However, neither do I think that we could necessarily cut anywhere's near the amount of money that has been requested out of our current services budget. I ask you to visualize as was mentioned before a long and drawn out extension of this session. The question in my mind is this, would many extra weeks of legislation be a move for economy or would it not wind up with us probably saving a few thousand dollars but spending many many thousand dollars for just being here in session. I would like to conclude by asking a question if I may through the Chair. At this time, I would like to ask just how much it cost the State of Maine to operate the Legislature for one day?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Jobin, has posed a question through the Chair to any member who may choose to answer.

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

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, the figure that sticks in my mind is \$7,000 a day.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I

would like to ask a question through the Chair to anybody that may desire to answer. What would it cost the people of the State of Maine one day if the sales tax increase went up to four percent?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Childs, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if he chooses.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, the one per cent extra would be nine million dollars divided by 365. I can't do that in my head, but I think it is a substantial sum of money and more than \$7,000.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman.

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, somewhere during this session I read of a forecast of an eight cent sales tax for the State of Maine plus a state income tax. Now I don't want to see an eight cent sales tax in the State of Maine. I also remember reading somewhere that Mark Twain thought that the basic difference that he could see between a taxidermist and a tax collector is that the taxidermist at least left you your skin. Now I hope that this House will go along this morning and recommit this bill so that we will be able to exercise some moderation and restraint in conducting the affairs of this session.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Hendsbee.

Mr. HENDSBEE: Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday in opposition to recommitting this bill; I feel exactly the same today. I had some telephone calls last night. After they had seen the six-thirty news, they said, were you in the Legislature yesterday and I said I was, I spoke against the bill. Well, we didn't see you in the pictures, well I said maybe Hank ran out of film I don't know. Anyway I didn't come down here to just get my picture taken or anything of that sort. But as I listen to the debate on this particular measure this morning, it causes me to wonder how much

difficulty you are going to have to get an Appropriations Committee next time. I have great respect for the people who served on that committee. They have given many many long hours and careful consideration to all the measures that have come before them, and I think that they are entitled to our support.

Now I have heard things here that I do not agree with and many of us are the same way I am sure, and I feel that prolonging this issue is not going to help the matter one bit. I am a taxpayer; I am not interested in paying more taxes or anything of that sort but I am perfectly satisfied to go along at any time with the recommendations from such a committee as we have on the Appropriations.

It has been asked of me some weeks or so ago when are you going to get up there and get started. Now I have been told that people like to hear me speak. They like to hear my voice because they can all hear me; probably that is the only reason. I do not hope, ladies and gentlemen that I will have to cast aside my mantle of meekness and really get tough on the floor of this House because I have no such desire to do such a thing. I am perfectly satisfied with the way everything has gone. I will offer my full support to the Appropriations Committee and oppose recommitting this measure.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. Bradeen: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House: Some years ago the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann delivered the commencement address at the commencement exercises at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. I recall that among other things that Mr. Lippmann said at that time, he observed that there was no book of prophecy in which one might read the future. How true. Nevertheless, I assume that we are all familiar with the old adage that coming events cast their shadows before.

Now I think that all of the members of this House have a deep re-

spect for the membership of the Committee on Appropriations and Finance. I recall that when the roll call vote was taken yesterday, that all of the House members voted against the motion to recommit. Now I would like to ask this question of you ladies and gentlemen as responsible representatives of the people of this state. Should we recommit this bill to those people, those same people who have given unstintedly of their time, their efforts and their ability to bring to us a budget based upon the judgment that they have used when they have considered the factual data presented to them for their consideration?

I am reminded of certain comments that you will find in the minutes of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. America's first citizen was called from his home on the banks of the Potomac at Mt. Vernon to preside at that convention, and I think you will find somewhere in those minutes, something of this nature. If to please the people we support that which we ourselves disapprove, how then can we afterward defend our work? Let us then create a standard to which the wise and honest may repair. The event is in the hands of God. My good friends, the event at the moment is in your hands to decide. I am opposed to the motion to recommit. I hope you will give it your most careful, impartial objective consideration. And I thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Raymond, Mr. Edwards.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I got home last night, there was a letter on my desk and in the closing of that letter was these three lines. It said coming together is the beginning; keeping together is progress; and working together is success. Now yesterday we came together and we made a beginning. Today, we should keep together in order that we may make progress; and for that reason, I say to you, this is not the time to recommit. There

are a lot of questions yet that are not answered. We have on our desks a lot of amendments. Many of us do not know the reason for those amendments, nor what lays behind them. I believe that it is proper that everyone in this House should know the reasons for these amendments and why they are placed on our desks. And third, the line said working together is success. I am sure that once we have thoroughly discussed this bill, once it has been passed, then we may all go forward working together that this legislature may be a success.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Everything must not altogether be too serious. I would like to take this opportunity to answer the question of my good friend from Portland, Mr. Childs, as to the cost of the three to four percent by saying that it will cost about as much as it cost when we raised it from two to three percent and he jumped in with us as a member and voted for it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise first on a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his privilege.

Mr. CHILDS: May I say to the gentleman from Lewiston, that the insinuation is being given that I shall vote against the sales tax. Let me say to the gentleman from Lewiston that the very last thing that is said to a jury before the case goes before them, which is said by the Clerk, he says harken to your evidence. I have harkened to the evidence, and I may possibly vote for the sales tax increase, but at the present time, I haven't been convinced yet.

The SPEAKER: Is the House now ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Benton, Mr. Kent.

Mr. KENT: Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning with mixed emotions in regard to the motion to recommit this bill. Yesterday morning I was not able to be in the House to hear a great deal of this debate because I had to go to court. I have sat here this morning and listened to a great many different opinions. I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for their job. I also want to commend the members of the economy bloc so-called who have tried to dig into this thing to find out where we can save money for the State of Maine. Now whether this would be a good thing to recommit this thing or not is a question which many of us have to decide in our own minds. However, with the fact that the time that the Appropriations Committee spent on this, I believe after listening to all of the debate on this question, that if we are going to cut this budget, the amendments have been brought out and they are on our desks, and if these amendments here that we have can be shown to this body that legitimate cuts can be made and not hurt the economy of the State of Maine, I think probably this is the place to do it. Again I say I have every respect for the people that have dug into this to economize, but I believe the place now that the Appropriations Committee has put this out onto the floor and spent the time that they have, I believe the place now is to bring these amendments out and show where that they can be cut and show that it will not do any harm to our state. I hope that the motion to recommit does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, that Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965," Senate Paper 549, Legislative Document 1481, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. A roll call has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: In the interest of time and the many matters of unfinished business that we have before us, I will withdraw my request for a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, withdraws his request for a roll call.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: I request a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the membership present. All those in favor of a roll call, will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, more than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is ordered. The Chair will restate the question. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease, that Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965," Senate Paper 549, Legislative Document 1481, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

All those in favor of recommitting, will answer "Yes" when their name is called; all those opposed to recommitment, will answer "No" when their name is called.

The Clerk will call the Roll.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Anderson, Ellsworth; Ayoob, Baldic, Bedard, Berman, Bernard, Binnette, Bourgoin, Brown, Fairfield; Bussiere, Chapman, Childs, Cookson, Cressey, Crommett, Dudley, Dunn, Easton, Foster, Gallant, Giroux, Hammond, Harrington, Hobbs, Jameson, Jewell, Karkos, Laughton, Levesque, MacGregor, MacLeod, McGee, Nadeau, Osgood, Pease, Phil-

brick, Pitts, Poirier, Prince, Oakfield; Roberts, Roy, Sahagian, Scott, Smith, Strong; Snow, Taylor, Townsend, Turner, Viles, Waterman, Watkins, Williams, Young.

NAY — Albair, Anderson, Orono; Benson, Berry, Birt, Boothby, Bradeen, Bragdon, Brewer, Brown, South Portland; Cartier, Choate, Cope, Cote, Cottrell, Coulthard, Crockett, Curtis, Dostie, Drake, Edwards, Ewer, Finley, Gifford, Gill, Gustafson, Hanson, Hardy, Hawkes, Hendricks, Hendsbee, Henry, Humphrey, Hutchins, Jalbert, Jobin, Jones, Kent, Kilroy, Knight, Libby, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lowery, MacPhail, Maddox, Mathieson, Meisner, Mendes, Minsky, Mower, Norton, Oakes, Oberg, O'Leary, Osborn, Pierce, Plante, Prince, Harpswell; Rand, Rankin, Richardson, Ricker, Ross, Augusta; Ross, Brownville; Shaw, Smith, Bar Harbor; Smith, Falmouth; Susi, Thaanum, Thornton, Treworgy, Tyndale, Vaughan, Wade, Waltz, Welch, Wellman, White, Guilford; Whitney, Wight, Presque Isle; Wood.

ABSENT — Blouin, Boissonneau, Burns, Carter, Davis, Denbow, Dennett, Gilbert, Lebel, Linnekin, Noel, Reynolds, Rust, Tardiff, Ward.

Yes, 53; No, 82; Absent, 15.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will announce the vote. Fifty-three having voted in the affirmative, eighty-two having voted in the negative, with fifteen being absent, the motion does not prevail.

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

Mr. WELLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I now move that we reconsider our action and I hope that you will all vote against me.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wellman, moves that the House reconsider its action relative to recommitment. All those in favor of reconsideration say aye,

Mr. CHILDS of Portland: I request a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of the motion to reconsider will rise and remain standing until the mon-

itors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had.

Five having voted in the affirmative and ninety-six having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Mr. MacLeod of Brewer offered House Amendment "C" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "C" to S. P. 549, L. D. 1481, Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965."

Amend said Bill under the caption "HEALTH AND WELFARE, DEPARTMENT OF" by striking out from the paragraph "Aid to Dependent Children" the line:

"All Other \$935,000 \$935,000"
and inserting in place thereof the line:

'All Other \$900,000 \$835,000'

Further amend said Bill by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the Chair, before I start my remarks, as to how free I can be in my remarks on this amendment. Am I restricted?

The SPEAKER: The bill and the amendment are before the House.

Mr. MacLEOD: Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This amendment calls for a reduction in the amount of money appropriated for the Aid to Dependent Children Program by \$35,000 in the first fiscal year of the biennium and \$100,000 for the second fiscal year of the biennium. If this amendment is adopted, it represents a loss in matching money from the federal government. It represents a loss in matching monies from the communities of the state, but I feel that this program should be reduced and can be reduced. Over 10 percent of the cases under Aid to Dependent Children have been on the books for

over ten years. Over 28% of the cases under the program of Aid to Dependent Children have been on the books for over five years. There has been an increase of over 500 cases in the last I think it has been three years, I think since 1959, four years, it has increased over 500 cases. Our population has not increased by that amount, and you have probably read in the paper the last couple of days where some members of the Welfare Committee have at least suggested that consideration be given to having a new man head up that department. They quoted some excerpts from a department document of 650 cases involving ADC families with a man in the home. The illegitimacy rate in the State of Maine is one of the highest or the highest in the nation, that three out of every hundred live births are illegitimate. I asked Mr. Simonds of the Department of Health and Welfare what the rate of illegitimacy was under our A.D.C. program. They just completed a study and he said it was over 13 percent. So families that are under the Aid to Dependent Children Program have an illegitimacy rate of over four times the state average which is one of the highest in the nation. This should give us enough reason to know and to believe that this paper of 650 cases of unrelated man in the house, that illegitimacies result from these associations and the state pays the bill.

I said on the Floor of this House yesterday that under this A.D.C. program and the philosophy as expounded in the policies as laid out by our Health and Welfare Department, we are encouraging immorality and we subsidize the illegitimate births that result from this immorality, and I say this type of a philosophy is alien to what the people of Maine believe in.

Let me cite you a few examples of the policies and the philosophies of this department, and how if this amendment were adopted perhaps they would be more stringent in the awards to the mothers. When the head of this department was chided or kidded a little bit because his legislation wasn't having too good luck with our Committee on Welfare, the answer was the rea-

son why this legislation that I favor is not receiving favorable consideration from your committee is because there are no members of that committee qualified to judge on the merits of my legislation. The gentleman who heads up this department when asked where he would cut if he had to take 5 percent out of the Health and Welfare budget, he would cut old age assistance. That is where he would make his cut, from the aged and the indigent, not from the 650 families with a man living with a woman, with a wife or the mother. Not from his \$5,000,000 payroll, one of the largest of any department in the state, over 2½ millions per year payroll. There could be no cuts there. The cuts would be made in the old age assistance program.

This amendment, if adopted, would just about take care of the elimination of these 650 cases from the rolls. Now perhaps some of these men that are living with these women would prefer to make their relationship permanent rather than having to move out, and they may marry the girl, and if they do, then perhaps the children would be brought up in a little different atmosphere. Listen to the comment: Relationships not fleeting, most ly have lasted from two to twelve years and provide "stable" homes for children. Stable homes for children. A man that has no relationship to the child except as the illegitimate comes along, the illegitimate ones come along, he becomes their father, but they can't call him Daddy. Relationships vary from a "few genuine boarders," and again in quotation marks, to mostly common law. Mothers have eye on pocketbook, and eye on pocketbook is in quotation marks, and if contributions cease, they terminate relationship. Some of these men contribute a small amount weekly to the support of the mother and the children. If the contributions to the pocketbook cease, they sometimes terminate the relationships. This almost puts this type of a thing on a par with the oldest profession in the world. I move the adoption of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod, moves

the adoption of House Amendment "C."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I feel that this amendment constitutes a cave-man philosophy to a problem concerning human needs, primarily the needs of the children involved, and I am opposed to the amendment because it doesn't meet the 20th century problem, and I move that the amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, that House Amendment "C" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. I kept quiet the last two days, and I voted against the economy bloc, but when you get into this, you are hitting me right where it hurts. In my town if you mention A.D.C. you want to get ready to run and run fast, and I am going to tell you exactly why.

We have a man and wife, there is no immorality in this case, we have a man and wife, they have six children. I have got this in black and white too; the man is getting \$188.20 per month social security. Now I thought the limit was \$110.00, but he is getting \$188.20 because he is totally disabled. If you would see — I won't go into any personalities, but he is not too disabled, he has got six children to prove it. His wife is receiving \$112 per month A.D.C. and you add the two together you have got \$300.20 a month, which isn't a bad income, especially when you are in a town with a bunch of pensioners who don't get that much.

Now, under date of April 11, 1963, and I have it right here before me, the Town of Brownville receives a notice from the Department of Health and Welfare to the effect that this mother's A.D.C. allowance is to be raised \$102.00, it is to be raised to \$214.00 a month now. Now guess why. It is going to be raised,

and it is right here in black and white, because you have an increase in shelter cost due to the fact that you have purchased a new home and have different living arrangements. Now the Town of Brownville pays 18 percent of that, 18 percent of just the increase is \$19.36 for quick figuring, \$19.36 a month additional coming out of the taxpayers of the town of Brownville so that these people can buy a new home. They are driving a 1959 car. A lot of our pensioners are walking, and when I tell you that I think changes should be made in this setup, I think that is all I have to say.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Falmouth, Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. SMITH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is my intention as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to try to bring to you as nearly as I can, what will happen if these amendments are passed. We have tried, not only I, but other members of this Committee, have tried to inform ourselves as well as we can, and as nearly as we can so that we can act in that manner. We will endeavor to show you what we think might happen, and I think it is up to you to then make the decisions. I shall try only to be factual and I will try in all the statements that I make to only be factual and not emotional.

In regard to this A.D.C program, I think a lot of us have been disturbed by it, but I also think that when we start cutting these things, we ought to know what the ramifications might be. Now it is all very well to say we can cut the A.D.C. program, but there will certainly be other monetary considerations when this happens, not only the federal matching money or the state's money, but there will be some repercussions on the towns because whether these people are living morally now or immorally, they are still going to be living after we cut the budget and someone will have to look after them. I don't know where these will be, because I haven't been able to get into this and study it that much. I do feel

that this commotion, if you might call it that we are having, will have beneficial results in everybody's thinking how they might solve this problem, and I think it is a problem. I think it is a problem to the department and I think it is a problem to us.

Now I have here some notes on the Aid to Dependent Children program. As regards your request relative to Aid to Dependent Children program, or otherwise known as the A.D.C. account as administered by the State Department of Health and Welfare according to existing records for the biennium the towns paid 12.4 percent, the state paid 12.2 percent and the federal government paid 75.4 percent during the fiscal year just ended, 1962. According to the existing records for the fiscal year 1963, which we are now in, the towns so far have paid 12.2 percent; the state has paid 12.8 percent and the federal government has paid 75 percent of the A.D.C. accounts. Now the figures shown as the federal and towns share for the fiscal year 1963, and I have these figures which I am not going to read you the total amount, I don't think it would help you any, are substantially estimates and will be very near the actual expended figure at the close of 1963.

Now in our present Aid to Dependent Children case load there are 6,175 cases in which 16,553 children are receiving support. Reduction of A.D.C. state grant funds per year of \$100,000 and this amendment gives us about \$135,000, if I have figured it correctly, will result in the loss of approximately \$600,000 per year of federal funds and \$100,000 of local funds. The overall result will be the necessity for a program reduction in the general nature of one of three alternatives: Reduction in the average grant from the present \$106 per month, to approximately \$95; closing of about 625 to 650 cases in which there are 1,625 children, or some combination of one or two. Now it is obvious that we may not like this, but these children will have to be provided for some way.

I will only bring a few things to your attention. An annual reduction of this degree would necessitate

the release of approximately 20 workers representing about one-third of the present staff carrying pure A.D.C. case loads. Such a staff reduction would necessitate a total case load reduction of a minimum of 25 percent or about 1500 cases. This contemplated reduction in staff is completely contrary to current federal requirements which are anticipating in the foreseeable future a worker case load ratio considerably lower than anyone else, and he goes on to say that this is why he has additional workers in the Part II budget of which we have given him no consideration.

Now we will have to bear in mind that the federal does set up many specifications in these grants in aid, and unless you know how and decide what you want to do and then make a specific plan, it is very difficult to work in this area.

Now at this point, I am going to sit down. I have quite a lot of material here. It does take me a few minutes to pick it up for you because as you change the figures, they are a little bit difficult to follow. If any of you have questions, I would be very happy to answer them, but I certainly would hope you would not pass this amendment unless you have been able to give it a great deal more careful consideration as to how you were cutting than you have.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the lady that I have given this careful consideration, and I would like to tell you some of the things that I have found.

I am sure that we all know that the statements she made, or perhaps we know it now, that the federal government in most of these cases furnish 75 percent and the state and the towns only 25 percent, and under old age assistance the towns don't put in anything and the federal government 75 percent. I am very glad that this Legislature or anybody in the State of Maine does not rule in Congress now entirely, and since Congress makes these laws, why then we have to abide by them.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that some of these things that the gentleman made concerning our standing for this thing is because of the federal government, which requires certain things and we have never appropriated enough money to Health and Welfare to carry out those things. Now we have a case load in this state much higher than most of the states. In fact we are going way down along like the negro states where they have a heavy case load, but we have 127 here of staff members, and they have over 100, about 120 people that they have to attend to, different cases, you can just imagine what that's all about. And in fact they are getting so overworked that we had a turnover in the last year of 27 percent, that is 27 percent of the people working here decided because they were worked too hard or wasn't getting enough money, they quit, and now to get other ones to take their place why they had to hire new ones. Well it costs the state a lot of money to educate them to what the federal government requires that they should know.

Now what we are up against now, for this case load, these people, why the state is only matching 50-50 because we don't — we have too much of a case load, and they will not go along with it. Now what the federal government requires is that we have enough people handling these cases whereby they can do something about rehabilitating these people and getting them off from the backs of the taxpayers, so-called, and that is just exactly what we all want. Now there is in — the law became effective late this fall whereby the federal government says unless we do something about this heavy case load they are not going to meet our matching funds, and by 1967 why we are going to be right in trouble, but if we appropriate enough money now so that we can increase our state load — our case loads, if we can decrease them enough, as the federal government requires, why then they will keep on and they will eventually take 75 percent of that cost. But if we pass this amendment and cut out this money, why what we are going to do, we are going to

get ourselves right in trouble with the federal government, because they have given us 'til 1967, and if we appropriate some money and make the start, they are giving us these two years to make this start, or three years, why then we are going to apply to the federal government to increase the 50-50 up to 75-25, so I don't see why we would be saving any money.

Now I just wish to say to my good friend and seatmate here who is much disturbed, and I don't wonder at it, that regardless of it costing his town some hundred dollars, but the federal government is going to give them 75 of that for that new house, and then they may increase the taxes, so I don't see that they are going to lose any. In reference to these illegitimate children, I wonder just what we want to do with them. Do we want to drown them or do we want to put them to sleep with ether or something, or what are we going to do? I do run a farm and I keep hens and chickens and we buy thousands of dollars worth of grain, and we do have rats and mice coming in, so we keep ten cats. Well, my grandchildren very happily came to me this morning and said "Oh Gramp, you know we have got a lot more cats? Old Fanny has had four" and someone else, in other words we have got seventeen cats this morning and now we are going to do something with them. We're going to etherize them or we are going to chloroform them, we are going to get rid of them, but I am just wondering if that is what this House wants to do with these children. They didn't ask to be born, but they are here. Are we going to chloroform them or are we going to take care of them? I think it is about time somebody did a little mite of thinking and used a little mite of sympathy in reference to these children who are forced to be born and it was no fault of their own.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, for indefinite

postponement. I also rise to add something to the remarks of the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis.

I have seen this paper about unmarried people living together. In fact last week I had occasion to use the services of Health and Welfare. I have a family that needs their help and needs it badly, and I spoke to Mrs. Smith for an hour. Now we all admit that nothing is perfect. Even the Members of this Legislature will admit that we are not always perfect in our judgments. It is a biological fact and a fact of life that men and women are drawn to each other, and if they were not, you and I would not be here. I feel this is a good thing for the continuation of the race.

Now it so happens, and I think we are all in agreement with this, we don't condone illicit relationships, but it so happens that when a woman has four children, she does become lonely. She isn't an old woman, but she isn't young, and the sexes, even after they pass the age of thirty, are attracted to each other, so she finds someone who she can be agreeable with and perhaps they establish a relationship of which we do not entirely approve, but nevertheless, for which we can see some basis of need. And it is true that through some of these relationships the department does receive a certain amount of money in the form of dollars per week given by the man to the woman.

Now as the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis says, we can't destroy these children, and it is the duty of every one of us who are well and able to take care of those who through no fault of their own cannot help themselves, and these children cannot help themselves. We cannot cast them adrift in a boat. We cannot abandon them in the woods. We cannot sit them on the garbage dump. They are with us. And I maintain, ladies and gentlemen, that should the day ever come when we, the people of the State of Maine, are unable to support our unfortunate children, then we should give up entirely, for as a people, we shall be finished, done and dead.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, I am not against aid to dependent children; neither are the people in Brownville, but we don't feel that it is right that the allowance should be increased \$102 a month to buy them a new home. They are not out on the street now, and furthermore, there is no control over this \$102 increase. Frankly, the husband, he embibes, and how do we know he is not going to drink \$102 more every month.

The main point in this whole thing is, the people up there objected to practically doubling this allowance so they can go purchase a home, and a lot of them there can't buy one themselves. To further this just a little bit, you add their income together and it comes to \$402.20 a month which is a pretty doggone good income for sitting in your rocking chair.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southport, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Brownville, Mr. Ross, I think he has a good point, but today we are not debating individual cases, we are debating a tremendous program, and whereas I sympathize with him, I do not think we should base our judgment regarding this amendment on one individual case.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I hate to take issue with my good friend from Brownville, Mr. Ross. I believe the changes he recommends are not in the reduction of this \$100,000 but to get this one particular case straightened out.

A reduction of A.D.C state grant funds per year of \$100,000 would result in the loss of approximately \$600,000 in federal funds and \$100,000 in local funds. The overall result would be the necessity of a program reduction in the general nature of one or two alternatives; reduction in the average grant or the closing of about 650 cases in

which there are some 1600 children involved. The related effect of this proposed reduction may well be an increase in the number of commitments who must then be cared for through state funds only, and I heartily support the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard, Mr. Plante.

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

Mrs. HENDRICKS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I too oppose this amendment. I think that we have a very big problem and I have been concerned about it ever since I served my first term. However, I don't feel that this amendment will do anything to aid in solving the problem. I do feel that state and local authorities and many departments within the local authorities should get together and work closer to try to solve the problem, but I do oppose this amendment.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Young.

Mr. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: One thing I would like to clear up here, there has been said several times that the municipalities contributed 12 percent. They contribute 18 percent. And I would like to ask a question of anyone that can answer it: where does federal money come from?

The SPEAKER: A question has been posed through the Chair of anyone who may answer.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod.

Mr. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the gentleman from Gouldsboro asked that question because we all know the answer. There is no magic factory in Washington that turns out these greenbacks to come down here at no charge to us. Every dollar that comes to us from Washington on a matching program is first sent up there by ourselves out of our own pocketbook, and up there it loses 15 to 20 percent in the grease to keep that machinery going, and eventually funnels back through, and we accept these, and then we con-

tribute some more money from this level and the local level to match them. There is no magic in Washington that provides this money for nothing. It is our own money.

I would also like to make a remark to the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach. I resented the implication that he directed I think at me, when he said it was a cave-man philosophy—this type of thinking represented a cave-man philosophy. I don't think the members of this House think that it is a cave-man philosophy to oppose spending local, state and federal monies to maintain admitted illicit relationships and immoral relationships. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Pease.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to amend, and to oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone the amendment.

I think that the attitude that has been shown by the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. MacLeod, is exactly what I attempted to point out to the House yesterday when I made the motion to recommit and again this morning, the same motion. Some of us are sincerely interested in reducing the current services budget to such an extent that it might be possible for some of you to come back here two years hence—obviously, I won't be here, because the people that are demanding all these services are going to vote me out of office—but to assist some of you when you come back here next year to give you something with which to work and not have you automatically be faced with a tax increase request or demand next year. The purpose, and the whole purpose behind this, was to attempt to find some common ground where that might be worked out. And knowing that the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee had at their disposal as a Committee the wherewithal to do these things, we felt and I still feel that it is the proper approach. As I noted in the Associated Press report this morning, which heads—the Daily Kennebec Journal, it indicates, and I quote: "The criticism

directed at the department's ADC program, centered on a department report which found in a spot check of 650 of the department's 6,100 ADC cases that there were 207 cases involving unrelated men living at ADC homes." This is exactly the point I attempted to make. We who are sincere in these efforts were told and led to believe that out of all the department's ADC cases, there were only 650 of these. Now we find that if this quoted report is correct, that the figures that were given to us as individual Members of the Legislature are incorrect. And the figures on which Representative MacLeod had to base his amendment after doing what research was possible by an individual member, without the assistance of all those things which the Appropriations Committee has at its command, the basis of his amendment is based on only 650 cases. Now it turns out that perhaps there are 1952 cases. If this spot check showed 207 out of 650 checked, or about 31 percent, 31 percent of the total cases may well be nearly 2,000, so that in all probability, his amendment cuts the current services budget by much less than it should to effectuate what he has in mind.

I would certainly urge that you would go along with this amendment, even admitting that it does not do all that he would hope that it might do or that it does all which some members of this House hoped that it might do.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mexico, Mr. O'Leary.

Mr. O'LEARY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I won't be long or lengthy, but as I understand, this is not aid to delinquent mothers, it is dependent children that we are talking about. To my way of looking at it, dependent children of mothers who live with men to whom they are not married are just as hungry and deserving of aid as any other dependent child. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have a

great deal of sympathy for the proponents of this amendment, and I find myself in concurrence with them in some areas. However, I notice that this is a cut in the "all other" category of this Aid to Dependent Children. I seriously question if we should make this reduction, whether it would accomplish the thing which the proponents of this amendment seek, in which I sympathized with their motives. I don't think we would have any assurance that the cut would be made in the areas which they would feel that it could be made or should be made. I think if we are dissatisfied with the administration of this department, I think it should be approached from another area. I believe that the money is necessary. This money is turned over to the Health and Welfare Department and they make the rules. Now unless you tie this down very carefully, I am very confident you are not going to accomplish the things you seek, and I find myself in opposition to the proponents of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Benton, Mr. Kent.

Mr. KENT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am serving going into my ninth year as overseer of the poor in the Town of Benton. During this period I have had a great many contacts with the relief cases, ADC, old age assistance and all types of assistance from these cases.

I would like to cite you one particular case, not that I don't have many. There is one family, five illegitimate children, one right after the other. Today, that woman is married to this same fellow, and there is two more children, seven now. The ADC grant has been stopped, but your state is supporting the entire family, nine people. I don't want to stand up here and tell you that I don't believe that the ADC program is a good program. It is a salvation for a good many of the small towns and the taxpayers. It most certainly is. But I am here to tell you that if there is not some different change in administration where is this budget

ever going to end? Where is it ever going to end? Because you can say that maybe this man contributes some, but so does the grant increase every time there is an illegitimate child born. We realize that we have to support those children. We cannot chloroform them or anything as the gentleman here to my right has mentioned. Definitely, they have to be taken care of and the people expect to take care of them, and any others, but somewhere along the line there has got to be some control through our state administrative departments. And the fact has been mentioned that this federal matching money that we have to cut our case loads down, and which probably is true and will have to be done, but in putting more case workers on, are we going to make more contacts and are we going to increase the case load limit to more than they can handle?

I have had times when I have had cases which I have asked and written into this department to consult me in regard to making a grant of ADC, and I have not only not either been contacted personally or by letter on it, and I have had to make a special trip into Augusta and make a personal visit, yet that worker was right in my town and it would have taken probably five minutes to come up to my place. I hope that maybe if this amendment is not passed, but maybe enough has been brought out into public light and to our Excellency and our Council, and the people who have some control here or some influence that maybe we may get a better administration in our Health and Welfare Department. Thank you.

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

Mr. CHILDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems that the problem or what seems to bother most of the members is not this appropriation, but it is that there are men living with women and they are receiving ADC. If you would look on your desks you will find an amendment to Legislative Document 1392 which is filing 252, and I will read it to you. It says: "A mother receiving an aid to de-

pendent children grant for her child may not live in a single house, trailer, an apartment or a room with a male person unless they are blood relatives, the male person has a wife in the home, there exists a bonafide housekeeping arrangement in the home of the male employer whereby the mother receives payment for such services, or the father is physically or mentally incapacitated as provided in subsection I." I think this is the amendment that will take care of that problem and not the amendment that is before the House now, and I concur with the gentleman from Old Orchard that it be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think that this morning and no doubt justifiably so, we are doing a little look-seeing. Insofar as the amendment is concerned, a program like this is cut off, it is not reduced. When you reduce, you reduce at random and where does the blow strike. You might strike at somebody that really is in need.

I think this might be as good a time as any for me to tell you what I think possibly we could accomplish, and it can't be done, believe me, in one day or two days or a week or a month. I have had in mind over the years as the occasion arises such as this where we come up with the appropriations bill, we have the supplemental bills still in committee, the bond bills and all these L.D.'s, that now we are going to rush through something, and it is certainly not the intention of you nor I. My thought is, and I might give this suggestion to these people who are presenting these amendments, and while we are talking about it as was said this morning, we who are sincere, I think that we should include everybody in this. I think we are all sincere. We may not always agree but I think we are all sincere. My thinking is that this committee, this Appropriations Committee, or another committee that would be — have the experience and the background, should continue after the adjournment of

this session, trying it out for one session, and really go to work. They would have to meet a couple of times a month and then meet a little bit more as time progresses, and then they would have all the time necessary to really go through and study these programs the way they should be studied. To tell you that there is no "fat" anywhere would not be telling you the truth. But frankly I think that any of you that serve on committees realize just how often we just tell people who appear before us, be brief. They travel hundreds of miles but we tell them to be brief, so that we are brief ourselves and sometimes you might think that a committee might be brief with the remainder of the membership of the House. I think if a program like this was entertained for one solid two-year period, it might well be at the end of that period at least if nothing else is accomplished, a great many questions could be answered.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish to just comment on this illegitimate children's thing that you are talking about. Now 70 percent of ADC children is caused from broken homes. Some 10 or 15 percent perhaps is because of death of a father, and some that the father has run off to places unknown, so the mother gets ADC and she may not be too old a woman, she may be only 25, 28 or 30, and eventually she gets acquainted with a man and they get married, and what happens to ADC? Now this isn't a law, but it is a ruling of the department. It was made some years ago, and I am not going to tell you who made it, but it has been continued, and I think it is unfair. The minute they get married why he adopts for all purposes these children and the ADC stops. I know cases where there were four children, the man married the woman and in the case of a year or fifteen or eighteen months they had one of their own and another year they had another one, the fellow lost his job after three or four years

and he just found that he couldn't take care of these children. Now what are they going to do about it? I think the department or else this Legislature should adopt that there should be some setup and that is why these mothers sometimes don't get married, because they know if they do, why the whole thing is upset, and I think it is all wrong. I think the department—they have the power themselves to do it, and I should hope that some day they would do it, that if this woman who has three or four children, and this case that I am referring to, they were good people and everything, but the load was too heavy, so what happened, the man after a while he took off and left the whole bunch of kids.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Harrington.

Mr. HARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Curtis, suggests that we not only subsidize the illegitimacy, we also subsidize the children of people that are married? I think that would be a fine step in a socialistic country or something like that, but I fail to see where it would solve any of the problems, when you can look through the records in years and years back and the same names, the same family names appear upon these rolls, and I believe the whole system, the whole scheme of things is not contributing to anything but a continuation of it, and as it grows and grows the larger it gets.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Baileyville, Mr. Townsend.

Mr. TOWNSEND: Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment with all my heart and soul because I know what the conditions are within my area, being a town official roughly twenty years, and we get very little support from the Department of Health and Welfare on our cases if we try to make an adjustment—if we want to make an adjustment. Therefore, I would like to have seen this department under partial town control and therefore at this present time I say again I shall sup-

port this amendment in full force. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, that House Amendment "C" to Legislative Document 1481, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1964 and June 30, 1965" to amend said bill in the Department of Health and Welfare by striking out from the paragraph Aid to Dependent Children the line:

All Other \$935,000 \$935,000
and inserting in place thereof the line:

All Other \$900,000 \$835,000

Further amend said Bill by correcting the totals therein affected by the adoption of this amendment.

Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jonesboro, Mr. Snow.

Mr. SNOW: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: We have a lot of cases in our county. I think from hearing these gentlemen we all know it. We want to be very careful in cutting an overall thing in the good and the bad which we are cutting. I am going to agree with my good friend Mr. Kent from Benton. A greater part of our trouble has been the supervision. Much of our aid to dependent children is aid to dependent mothers. The children are not getting it, they are spending it on other things while the neighbors take care of the children. On the other hand, we have some very nice families taken care of by ADC. It does not pay to cut all of them alike. I think this amount of money can be saved with correct supervision in the families in which it is not needed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a division, and the question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, that this amendment, House Amendment "C", be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will please rise and remain standing in your places until the monitors have made and returned their count.

A division of the House was had. Sixty-one having voted in the affirmative and sixty-two having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante.

Mr. PLANTE: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken, I move that it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Plante, now requests a roll call. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present.

Those in favor of a roll call will please rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

(Less than one-fifth arose)

Obviously, less than one-fifth having arisen, a roll call is not ordered.

Is it now the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "C" be adopted?

The motion prevailed.

On motion of Mr. Wellman of Bangor,

Adjourned until ten o'clock Tuesday morning, April 23.