

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

Legislative Record

OF THE

Ninety-Fourth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

Special Session, February 6, 1950

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Wednesday, February 8, 1950

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

Prayer by the Reverend Mr. Golding of Augusta.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair at this time notes the presence in the Hall of the House of the gentleman from Vinalhaven, Mr. Ames, the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Duquette, the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Gauthier, the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Letourneau, and the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Wight. The Chair further understands that these gentlemen were in attendance at the session of yesterday.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair at this time notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of a delegation of students from the Deering High School in Portland in charge of Mr. Elliott. On behalf of the House, we bid you welcome here this morning. (Applause)

The **SPEAKER**: For the information of the members of the House, the Chair will state that it is proposed shortly to take a recess for the purpose of bringing before the House the report of the committees on the bills now in their possession. If there are no items at the present moment, the Clerk will read the notices.

On motion by Mr. Burgess of Limestone, the House voted to recess until the sound of the gong.

AFTER RECESS

Called to order by the Speaker.

House Reports of Committees

Majority Report of the Committees on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, Welfare and Education jointly on Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies to Supplement Appropriations for the Expenditures of

State Government and to Appropriate Monies for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1950 and June 30, 1951" (H. P. 2126) (L. D. 1626) reporting same in two New Drafts, New Draft "A" under title of "An Act to Appropriate Monies to Supplement Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and to Appropriate Monies for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1950" (H. P. 2129) (L. D. 1629) and New Draft "B" under title of "An Act to Appropriate Monies to Supplement Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and to Appropriate Monies for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1951" (H. P. 2130) (L. D. 1630) and that they "Ought to pass".

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WILLIAMS of Penobscot
EDWARDS of Oxford
BOWKER of Cumberland
McKUSICK of Piscataquis
—of the Senate.
Messrs. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth
WINCHENPAW of Friendship
BIRD of Rockland
FULLER of Buckfield
COBB of Lee
RICKER of Turner
WEBBER of Bangor
TAYLOR of Lyman
Miss LONGSTAFF of Crystal
Messrs. JOHNSTON of Jefferson
LACKEE of Addison
SANDERSON of Greene
PALMER of Nobleboro
GATES of Millinocket
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committees on the same Bill reporting same in two New Drafts, New Draft "A" under title of "An Act to Appropriate Monies to Supplement Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and to Appropriate Monies for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1950" (H. P. 2129) (L. D. 1629) and New Draft "C" under title of "An Act to Appropriate Monies to Supplement Appropriations for the Expenditures of State

Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1951" (H. P. 2131) (L. D. 1631) and that they "Ought to pass".

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DENNETT of Kittery
JACOBS of Auburn
JALBERT of Lewiston

—of the House.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I move we accept the majority report of the committee.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, moves that the House do now accept the majority report of the committees. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As far as I am concerned, I am willing to go along with the first part of the bill to take care of expenses for this year. I question whether it is proper for this Legislature to legislate beyond that stage. Very shortly, as far as time goes, the Legislature will be assembled here again, the Ninety-fifth Legislature, and I believe we should not legislate matters of great importance at this time but leave it to them who will follow us, whoever they may be. I do not believe it is right; I know the program was set up to take away practically every dollar in our unexpended surplus. To me it seems not the right thing to do at this time. Sure, we have it available but I think in every one of our lives, in our business practices, whether it is on the farm, or in the store, in a hardware store or whatever it may be, if we have a balance in the bank, we like to leave it there for emergencies.

In my opinion no real emergency exists for the second period. There is one now for the rest of this year but I believe that we should go along and take care of our needs for 1950 and leave the rest to the next Legislature to determine in their own minds what they want

to do for the best interests of the State of Maine. That is my position and I feel that I have a right to my opinion as well as you all do, but I do not like to see,—I do not believe that any of you really like to see,—the surplus of the State of Maine wiped out at this Special Session.

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

Mr. McCLURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: During the past session of the Ninety-fourth Legislature, you will recall I was in favor of spending our surplus where necessary for necessary things for the State. I was, as you all know, opposed to new taxes, income, sales or taxes of any description. Since the Legislature adjourned, I have received from many quarters a lot of criticism; that perhaps is true; perhaps we should have a new tax. During this Special Session there has been very little I have heard mentioned on economy.

Now, whereas I was in favor of using what I call and must call "sacred funds", rather than put on a new tax, today I am going along with the program. It is my opinion that the children of the future certainly will need education. They will need greater education than we had to cope with the problems and with the tax load that not only we in the State but in our National Government are building up for them. I realize that this unappropriated surplus that we are going to use will leave us and leave our cupboard practically bare, but I do say, ladies and gentlemen, to what better use can it be put than for our elderly teachers, who taught all of us what little we know? I also believe that our State employees should be taken care of, as I stated before, and I feel that above everything we should see that our children have a better education than we have. Therefore, I will endorse using this surplus fund and let the Ninety-fifth Legislature cope with their problem.

The SPEAKER: The question be-

fore the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the House do accept the majority report of the committees.

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

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am dead against raiding and robbing the treasury, taking the last dollar out of the reserve we have been years building up and guarding so jealously. But I am in favor of the public schools and the University of Maine, our great institution that we are so proud of, measuring up to any in the States, and I believe it ought to excel any university in this Union. We should be proud of it—that's where the boys and the girls of the next generation are going to learn how to conduct the affairs of state, how to do business. They should all have the privilege of this higher education which the University affords. I know, I know what the struggle is. I have had three children in college; I have three more there. They are not in Maine colleges, sorry to say, because from the fact that Maine did not offer them employment whereby they could help defray their own expenses. They are in other states, one in Massachusetts, one in New Jersey and one in Virginia, and I notice that my boy, when he writes home from Virginia, likes to tell about the great university in Virginia. We ought to be able to do the same here.

One of the saddest sights I have seen in many a day I saw yesterday in the Senate Chamber when the President of our great University crept in there and crawled in there, asking for a handout to help carry on our University. I will say that he had more of the grace of God in his heart than I have. I couldn't have done it, but he did it. He humiliated himself to beg for a handout for the greatest university in the Union, and we are trying to cripple it.

I am in favor of the schools and especially the University of Maine, but I must go on record as against

robbing the treasury. I thank you.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to oppose my friend, Mr. Bubar; I want to leave this cupboard bare. Why? Because I want you ladies and gentlemen to come back here to the next Legislature and have the guts to put on a tax so that we can run our schools and build our roads and be proud of it. I don't care if there isn't a nickel left in the surplus. Let's spend it so that you and I and everybody else who is coming back here may have the fortitude to do something about that situation. It has been my good fortune to have visited twenty-eight of the forty-eight states in the last two months. I visited states that could point with pride to their roads and their schools and had the courage to put on taxes to build those roads and to run their schools. Do they like their tax program? They said so. When I asked them about it they said: "Look at our roads; look at our schools; of course we like our taxes." "Does it entail a lot of work at the end of the month?" I asked them that question. They said: "Yes, twenty minutes of our time; twenty minutes of our time, but it's worth it." Why their education, ladies and gentlemen, would put us to shame here in the State of Maine. Leave the cupboard bare? Why, of course, that is just exactly what we should do. I hope there is not a nickel left when we get done. I thank you. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order.

The Clerk has called the attention of the Chair to the fact that with regard to the report of the committees, inadvertently it fails to show that Senator Brown of Washington, Senator Leavitt of Cumberland, and Senator Savage of Somerset signed the majority report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time notes the presence in the balcony of the Hall of the House of

a delegation from the Erskine Academy with Mr. Braley, Supervisor. In behalf of the House, we bid you welcome here this morning. (Applause)

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

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say I have not enjoyed the privilege of travelling so extensively as my brother from Ellsworth (Mr. Dunham) for the simple reason that I do not happen to have the reserve in my home treasury that he evidently has, and I would like to know whether or not he conducts his home affairs and family affairs as he wants to run the State of Maine. If he does, he has a different wife than I have. (Laughter) My wife is continually saying: "Now, Ben, don't overdraw, don't spend the last dollar; you don't know what may happen. We have got six children who have to be looked after," and I believe the State of Maine should be run on the same principles as our homes, and there should be a reserve and not trust to luck. Sickness comes and adversity; and, if I exhausted the last reserve, I would not be wearing the good suit of clothes that I am wearing. (Laughter) I would be in rags and tatters and probably my feet would be on the sidewalk instead of in shoes. I thank you.

On motion by Miss Longstaff of Crystal, the House voted to suspend House Rule No. 25 for the remainder of today's session, in order to permit smoking.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't believe, as evidently the gentleman from Blaine (Mr. Bubar) believes, that he has a mortgage on eternity. I think we are just going to live this little life of ours and just go away. We are not going to come back and live it all over again. But

some of you gentlemen, and Mr. Bubar included, act and vote as though they had a mortgage on eternity and I don't believe they do.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, it is barely possible that there may be some here who remember something which I said a year ago; possibly there may be some who remember better than I do. Now, I believe that the record will show that I not only tried to raise money to meet what I deemed to be the demonstrated needs of the State, but that also I did not regard the surplus as a sacred item and that the notion of recurring or non-recurring expenditures as applied to the surplus did not appeal to me very much from the beginning, so that my position is the same now with respect to recurring and non-recurring as it was a year ago.

Now I am a candidate for the Ninety-fifth Legislature and personally, since the matter of the cupboard has been mentioned, I have no ambition to have that Legislature called the "Mother Hubbard Legislature". I hope there may be some money here when the Legislature comes and I hope there may be some here when it leaves.

I have supported the expenditures recommended in these programs. There could have been an argument whether the items selected for attention at this time were more important than other items which have been omitted such as, for example, the needs of the hospitals. But I think, in life, and especially in legislation, we must do the best we can with the situation as it presents itself to us and do the best we can in a spirit of compromise with others to the extent of our means. So, I have signed the majority report.

I also undertook this morning, it appeared to be necessary, to say a word in connection with the appropriation asked for the University of Maine. I am not now connected with the University but I was for eighteen years a trustee,

Chairman of its Finance Committee for most of that period and for some time President of the Board, and I believe I am still familiar, after refreshing the figures, I think I see the problem today because it was fully apparent when I left the the Board of Trustees a year and a half ago.

This House ought not to get the impression that the \$200,000 appropriation recommended here is even approximately adequate to the needs of the University. As I see the financial situation of the University, this is a mere drop in the bucket. Well, a drop is better than nothing and so I support it. It is only one-third of what the last Legislature apparently wanted to appropriate and deemed the need to be, and I did not think then that the Trustees were asking for enough to be sure that they could meet the situation which will arrive when the income sinks by reason of the disappearance of the G. I. tuition. I don't think the money is nearly enough, but since it is all we can give, I hope it will be given in that spirit and that the next Legislature will do what seems to it wise to establish the University on a firm financial basis consistent with what policy the Legislature may see fit to adopt with respect to the University.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not the orator that the worthy gentleman who preceded me is. However, I shall endeavor at this time to get at the meat of this whole affair because I think the members of this House, at the present moment, in general, are somewhat confused about the bill as it has been presented in its three separate drafts.

This document went into committee and it came out with the majority of the committee agreed upon all items just as outlined in the bill with the exception of the appropriation to the University of Maine. The minority committee's

report eliminates the \$200,000 that is supposedly to be appropriated for the University of Maine, and that is the only appropriation that is omitted from the entire bill. The balance of the bill is exactly as it was asked for.

There is a question in the minds of many members of this House whether, of course, we should at this time drain the barrel dry which, without any question of doubt, we are going to do. It seems to be the intention and that we are going to leave here with very little in the surplus. It seems to be a case that the Ninety-fourth Legislature has redeemed itself and the lion has laid down with the lamb but it looks in this instance as though the lamb is inside of the lion.

However, to go on why the minority members disagreed with the appropriation for the University of Maine, they took it merely on the basis of the presentation that was made in the so-called public hearing yesterday morning. The President of the University of Maine—it was stated that he crawled in but he looked quite erect to me—he walked in — but his presentation didn't seem to be clear. They needed \$200,000, but what for? No one seemed to know. It was mentioned that they could, if they had that \$200,000 appropriation, thereby reduce the tuition fees. I may be all wrong. Probably without a question of a doubt this measure is going to pass the House and you are going to appropriate the \$200,000, but it seems that some voice at this time should be raised against all these spending measures. If they reduce the tuition \$75, naturally that is \$75 less that the students have to pay. That's fine, but they are seeking a college education; I think they should be willing to pay for it. It is by far less than any college in the State and it certainly would be worth \$75 extra to me.

Another thing that should be brought out. The University of Maine is the only department in the State that is actually not under any obligation to render to the

State Finance Department any report of its doings, as the State has absolutely no control over the University of Maine. Its control is solely vested in a board of trustees that is answerable alone to the Governor and Council. They came into this regular session of this Legislature and they asked for an appropriation which was denied. If it was deniable then, I see no reason why it should be granted now. It looks as though those who are in favor of the University of Maine are riding in on the gravy train. There is no question about it. There are other departments that need money and they need it just as badly, if not worse, than the University of Maine but they are not in on the bill at all.

Another thing, your education, your public education: In 1950 and 1951, the Department of Education emphatically states it is short \$150,000 which is going to come out of the towns. If the State of Maine wanted to give this \$150,000, why didn't they give it to a department that sorely needs it; needs it more than any other department in the State. The State mill tax thus far has paid for the University of Maine. I grant that it is not as large and hasn't increased over a period of time such as grants to other departments but they have apparently got along very well. No department has all it needs; no department has all it wants. They have what they can get and most of them do very well with it. Now I think, ladies and gentlemen, I have made the whole thing, as near as I can, clear; I think you know what you are voting on but I don't think these measures should be snowballed and skyrocketed through this Legislature without some voice being raised.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the House do accept the majority report of the committee.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and

Members of the House: I am happy that my colleague from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, explained the stand of those members who signed the minority report, 1629 with the emergency clause. We are going along with that. 1630, without the emergency clause, and I am happy at this time to state that the leadership saw fit to remove this emergency clause, before it hit the floor of this House, yesterday afternoon in committee.

1631 is the bill the minority is not going along with—the University of Maine. We felt that there is no emergency existing at this time at the University of Maine; the presentation made by that fine gentleman, President Hauck of the University of Maine, was extremely weak. Reading over the message of the Governor, who states: "It appears to me wise" (not too emphatic on it; it is also partially weak.) I asked Mr. Hauck where the money was going to be expended. He couldn't tell me. There wasn't a member of the Board of Trustees present. I felt they weren't too enthused about it or else weren't too inclined to go along with it or else they would have been there. After all \$200,000 is a substantial sum of money.

It has already been brought out that the tuition at the other Maine colleges is much higher than at the University of Maine. One gentleman told me this morning that other universities were heavily endowed. I believe we endow the University of Maine to some extent when we give them \$762,000 every year besides what we give them when they appear before us at committee hearings during the regular sessions. Coupled with that fact concerning the emergency, if my memory serves me correctly, my last three terms, also the special session in 1945, the University of Maine was here. I am not casting any reflections. I am speaking now for a regular session grant. If we had monthly sessions, special sessions, I am sure the University of Maine would be here.

Speaking on the emergency

clause, if the emergency clause were removed during committee, I am wondering where really the emergency existed, when we were asked to spend this money for the whole of the fiscal year, 1950 and 1951. I was of the opinion, and I still am now, although I am going along with it, that we could have well completed our duties as members of the Ninety-fourth Legislature by going along to the calendar year, leaving something for the Ninety-fifth Members of the Legislature to think about; leaving something in the fund. The whole thing is, the University of Maine,—not because they don't deserve it, no doubt they do; not because they don't need it; no doubt they do; the emergency in my opinion does not exist and that is the part of the bill that we members of the minority objected to.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to assure you it is a happy privilege for me to come back here and sit in deliberations with the members of this House, for I believe that the Legislature as constituted here today are some of the finest men that the State of Maine can possibly produce. They are men who recognize the seriousness of their obligations to the State of Maine. They recognize the serious situation that we are in at the present time. It is a privilege for us, in the last strong democracy on the face of this earth, to meet and decide the problems that beset our people.

I came to this Legislature, in this session, with a feeling that there was a deep responsibility resting upon me, a responsibility that when this Legislature is over I hope the action that I have taken here will be an action that will be acceptable to the majority of the people of the State of Maine. We recognize that there is need all about us. We recognize that there has been need about us ever since this country was constituted, and we have to face these issues at this

time. But I am wondering, and wondering seriously, just where we are headed for in this country. The wheels are continually turning and where they are going to stop no one knows. There must surely be an end to how far local government can expand, how far state government can expand and how far our national government can expand. There must be a limit to the amount of the load that we can tack onto our people. But there seems to be in power those who believe that there is no end to the load that we can tack onto our people, and it is only recently that I was told by a man in authority that when atomic energy is expanded to its full potentiality, they may be able to turn elements into gold. Let's hope that that day is not too far away because we are certainly going to need it.

I came, as I say, to this session with the sole idea in my mind that something had to be done to give to the different departments additional money and I had a feeling that those in power would come down here with a very conservative request to place upon this Legislature. But to my amazement, they come in here and they ask us to wipe the barrel clean and I am wondering, in the conservative, rock-bound Republican State of Maine, whose record has gone all over this country during the days of the New Deal and the so-called Fair Deal that we were a state that believed in some semblance of economy — and only yesterday we read in our local papers where the policy committee of the Republican Party had met and laid down a declaration of principles to be borne by the voters of this country during the next election and to be told that the Fair Deal administration in Washington to hinder them in any further expansion of the program that is before us and yet we, the exponents of sound financing, low taxation and everything, immediately before the ink is dry on the papers, come in here and try to out-do the New Deal and go even beyond the Fair Deal.

As I said before, this need, and

I recognize that need just as fully as anyone else; there is need of the aged, there is need of the teachers, but there is need of those people in this State who are not covered by Social Security, who are not covered by old age assistance, who are not covered by aid to dependent children. There are people who can't find work; there are people who are not qualified to receive unemployment insurance and, best of all, they are people who would rather starve than apply to our towns for charity or apply to our State for old age assistance or any other assistance that they might receive. We know what this is, members. We know what took place in the 93rd Legislature and we know what took place in the 94th Legislature; the pressure that we must pass some form of taxation. And let me say this: We can pass a sales tax; we can pass an income tax that will bring in millions of dollars to our State government but if we continue on in the program which we are facing, a sales tax won't take care of it, nor an income tax won't take care of it. I have heard it said that in states where they had the sales tax, and where they had the income tax, that they didn't have any problem. Everything was taken care of; everything was rosy; but that isn't so. Now, let's weigh this thing; let's come up with a proper decision, because these are difficult times; these are times when I don't believe anybody, industry, the workers, the retired persons, living on a stipulated income can stand any further taxation, and I say that once we try to practice just a bit of economy, I think we can come pretty near living within the income that is being derived from the taxes we are already paying.

It has been said that if the fair deal administration — and it has been said by the very representatives that we sent to Washington and in whom we have confidence—that if our Federal Government would just cut expenditures fifteen per cent, we wouldn't be operating in red ink, and I think that in our

State Government if we, along the line somewhere, had tried to cut the cloth just a little, I don't think we would be back here in special session today. Members of this House, let's consider this thing seriously and let's come up with a decision which is going to be fair to the people that we represent in the State of Maine. I am not fearful to go back to my people and tell them the stand that I took here. I am a candidate for re-election and I can assure you people that there will be a Brown representing the wildcat district in the next session of this Legislature even if I am defeated. I thank you.

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

Mr. MUSKIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I was very happy to hear the gentleman from Baileyville, Mr. Brown, give expression to one of the worthwhile accomplishments of this session, and that is our opportunity to gather once more, shall I say in fellowship, at least up until this point.

I want to make a statement, not only on my behalf but on behalf of those members of my party in this House. We are going to take an action this morning, or at such time as the oratory drifts away and we arrive at a vote on this matter, we are going to take an action, but we do not want that action to go unexplained.

I want, first of all, to point out that we are not unaware that these appropriations requests have been made in an election year. If we were in any doubt on that score that doubt has been resolved this morning. We are also not unaware that the Governor has expressed his intention of sticking pretty close to his desk during this campaign year and conducting his campaign from the State House. And, being aware of those things, it is not difficult to recall to mind certain facts with regard to our position as a Legislature last winter and certain facts as to the situation of the State today.

It is a fact that almost all, if not all, of the appropriations requested

by the Governor were requested and thoroughly debated at the regular session. I think we all remember the dramatic episode during which the appropriation for old age assistance burials was debated. You will recall as I do, vividly, that the general appropriations bill almost failed of passage on the strength of that episode alone. You will recall, as has been pointed out this morning, that the appropriation for the University of Maine was debated thoroughly last winter. The same can be said of the equalization grants, of elderly teachers' pensions, of the request of the Department of Health and Welfare for appropriations over and above what were granted and of a continuation of the cost-of-living increase for State employees. Each and every one of those items was thoroughly debated.

We can recall another fact: We can recall that many of us—and, if I could check the record I think I would find that most of us—voted for most if not all of these appropriations last winter. You will also recall that while so voting we who voted that way were bitterly criticized for playing politics by voting appropriations for which there were no funds.

In the course of the various debates on these measures and on the tax measures which accompanied them, we in the Democratic party pointed out that funds would be available for many, if not all, of those appropriations if, first, wise economy were practiced in the administration of our State departments, and, secondly, if we could expect, as we had a right to expect from the long-standing practice of greatly underestimated revenue, a surplus.

We were told by the Governor that the situation which would exist at the end of the last fiscal year was pretty accurately estimated at the time of the regular session. I have tried to search that thick volume we all received not too long ago, to get the facts, and I was unable to, but certainly it was not my impression at that time that we were told that there

would be any such amount available to us at this moment as there appears to be available. If I remember, from the only figures I have been able to find, it was predicted that the last fiscal year would end with a deficit of something like eight or nine hundred thousand dollars. As a matter of fact, it ended with a surplus of seven hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, a minor discrepancy of some million six hundred thousand dollars.

I would like to recall to you again that a year ago, in January of 1949, we had a surplus of six million one hundred thousand dollars, approximately. We set aside in a working capital fund two million dollars, which is still intact, leaving a balance of four million. We today have a surplus of three million two hundred thousand, and I was under the impression last spring that we had spent almost all of our surplus, and therefore that I should not vote for these appropriations which we are asked to vote for this morning.

One other fact I would like to point out and that is this: That when we convened a year ago we had laid down for us a fiscal policy which we said should be inviolate, that was the key to sound State finance, and in the light of the fact that the problems which we face in these appropriations measures are not new ones, are not problems of which we were not aware a year ago, we can wonder, legitimately, I think, that that fiscal policy should now be changed. And one other fact, in order that the record may be clear and in order that the public may not be unaware as to why the Legislature has acted in the past the way that it did and why it acts at present the way that it may: We were told a year ago that existing services could be continued on existing revenues.

There is the record. Now we are convened here in special session. In the original call for this session we were told that emergencies had arisen which required the appropriation of some million dollars additional for certain specified pur-

poses. In the few days that elapsed from that original call to the time that we convened here two days ago, that emergency had increased by two million dollars to a total of three million. I cannot help but chuckle, as a member of my party, at the criticism that has been leveled on us over the past sixteen years of the existence of continuing emergencies nationally.

And so, coming to our action as Democrats in this House, we point out that we are aware of this record. We point out also that we hold mental reservations as to whether the funds which we appropriated last winter have been properly administered. I know, for example, in the Welfare Department of hardship cases which should be provided for which have not been provided for by administrative decree. I know of cases in the Welfare Department which have been provided for which should not have been provided for if the program had been soundly and equitably administered. I think all of us in our daily lives know of examples of those two types of cases. We question whether all possible economies have been made in the administration of our State departments. We were told, for example, that extensive investigation would be made into the workings of the Personnel Board with a view that its work might be streamlined and perhaps produce more economical administration for the State. To date we have heard nothing of the results of that work. We are also aware that the political advantages of these requested appropriations have been weighed heavily.

In the face of that record, and in the face of those mental reservations and observations, we still come up to this fact: That the Governor of this State has called us into session because he states that in his opinion an emergency exists. He states that there are people in need in this State who are not receiving aid or who will not receive aid because the funds are not available, and he took the responsibility of imposing upon the taxpayers the expense incurred by

a special session of the Legislature. We must assume that he acted in his capacity as Governor and not in his capacity as head of the Republican Party in this State. We must assume it because humanity requires that we assume it. We cannot take the time to investigate the facts for ourselves, but we want to make clear that we are placing the responsibility for the facts which have been found by the Governor and from which he concludes that an emergency exists, we place that responsibility upon his shoulders, and we reserve to ourselves the right to make such investigation as we deem fit as to whether or not an emergency does exist. But, for the time being we are going to place above the considerations which I have mentioned, we are going to place above the record which has been made, we are going to place above the facts which have been stated, the human rights of the needy citizens of this State. We are going to go along with these appropriations for that reason and that reason alone. And to us in the Democratic Party, historically that has ever been a sufficient reason for such appropriations.

In short, we will not compromise with human need. We will not quibble on consideration of economy. We cannot economize human suffering.

But let us be aware, and let the people of this State be aware, of the implications of the step which we have taken. I need only mention the name of John L. Lewis to suggest to you the tactics which that gentleman uses. We know that before he sits down at the bargaining table it is always his aim to deplete the stock pile of the coal of our ground, and so, whether intentionally or coincidentally, the advocates of new tax measures are here depleting the stock pile of State surplus dollars, in order that their position at the bargaining table next winter will be stronger. We are aware of that, and we say the responsibility is theirs, and we say to the people of Maine that the situation next winter will favor more strongly than

it has favored in years the enactment of a new major tax.

So I call upon you, who are in the Republican party, as I have called upon those in my party, to meet in State Convention in the next few months and to have the courage to adopt a realistic program and platform which will indicate to the people how you feel about these State problems. Let them know the situation of which you are all aware this morning, and let them know what you, as a party, plan to do about it. Let us have no more talk next August, a month before election, that State finances were never in better shape. Let us tell the people what the situation is and what they may expect if they demand certain new services. That is your responsibility, and ours. We have attempted in the past to shoulder that responsibility, and let me assure you that we will continue to do so.

We are going along with your requests this morning. We are going along with your Governor's recommendation that an emergency exists and that certain appropriations must be made, but be in no doubt upon this score: That we know what the issues are, we know what the record is, we know what the facts are, and we are going to act realistically upon them. Thank you for your attention this morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Palmyra, Mr. Millett.

Mr. MILLETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of the funds for the University of Maine because I have had some connection with the University through the Agricultural College, and I know that that money is needed. Last spring, after we adjourned here, all of the different departments were called together at the University, and each department had to make sacrifices to offset the lack of funds that we should have provided here last winter, and the Extension Service was called in and told that they would have to bear a certain part of the burden, and it curtailed their ser-

vices, and in my opinion was an injury to the State of Maine indirectly.

The University of Maine, naturally, should have asked and received \$300,000 a year instead of \$200,000, in my opinion, and in the opinion of a good many that are connected with the University, and I hope, as members of the House here, we will not single out our State educational institution and subject it to an economy that we are not going to subject the other departments to. I am satisfied that they need this money; they sincerely need it, and actually need more, and to say that we should compare our State University with other colleges — if those children are to pay the tuition comparable with other colleges, we defeat the purpose of our university. I supposed the University was established to provide a child with an opportunity to get a college education, and that the cost to the individual would be more than some of the other colleges. I have no children in the University of Maine at the present time, and doubt if I have any again to attend the University, but I think that it was a shame that they were obliged to increase the tuition seventy-five dollars a pupil last year because we failed to provide money enough. That was the part that the public could see, but under cover every department there had to sacrifice other things that I believe the people would have liked to have and needed.

Now are we going to say that we want our University to go down-grade, or are we going to provide funds so that it will keep up with the times? I plead with you, members of the House, not to listen to this opposition on the University of Maine, and all I can say to members of the House is that I feel that we failed to perform the duties that were necessary last winter, and therefore we are faced with this situation now, and, as badly as I feel about using up the surplus, I don't see any other recourse at the present time. I hope you won't single out the University of Maine

and subject it to any such a deal as some of these gentlemen would like to.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It had not been my intention to take part in this debate until my friend, the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Muskie, got out the axe. Is he there? (Laughter) Come back; I want you to hear what I have to say. (Laughter)

I just stated that it was not my intention to debate this matter. I didn't think it was necessary and I don't think so now, but I couldn't let you get away and me not have anything to say about it. (Laughter). I want to say right here that I am glad you are going along with the program—so are most of us—but you throw the responsibility on the Republican party, and I want to assure you that we accept that responsibility because we are doing the right thing.

When some of us tried very hard, last winter, to convince you that we needed more money for these very things, the opposition of your party, Mr. Muskie, and enough Republicans with you, defeated our efforts. Now briefly I just want to make this report, that when I went home from here last winter, in my section of the State, at least, it was generally conceded that this was the worst Legislature that had ever come down the pike.

Now the Governor has called a special session. He has convinced me, and I know the majority, that we need this money for the schools; we need this money for the old age assistance; we need this money for the teachers' pensions, we need this money for the University of Maine, and we need this money for the help of the State. We need every dollar of it; and I am reliably informed that we have a back-log still, if we spend every bit of this, of \$2,000,000 to get us through until next year.

Now it being clear that we need these things, here is an opportunity for this Legislature to redeem

itself and pass these acts and go home and let the people understand that instead of being the worst Legislature that ever came down the pike, that we are the best Legislature.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the House do accept the majority report of the committee.

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

Mr. McCLURE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We need this money. We needed it last year. A great many people here said we needed it last year by new taxes. The fact that today we have the money, and are able to meet these needs, bears out the fact that we were not the worst Legislature because we have the money and we have not had to take an extra penny out of the people's pockets.

I can well understand the thinking of my colleague, who argued with my other colleague, Mr. Bubar, that perhaps we should follow the example of many states in the Union and at our next Legislature come up here and impose new taxes on the people. That is the thinking, generally, of not only most of the states, our National government, but of foreign countries. Now what has that thinking and that program done for Great Britain? Now if they are right, my argument will not hold water and we should follow the practice of Great Britain. If I am wrong, then we should follow the practice of our National government and have deficit spending.

I do not believe that if the voters of the State of Maine understood the problem, understood the number of departments that we have that perhaps could be consolidated—and I have brought that up in the past—perhaps if when we had declared ourselves as candidates for elective office, we would state to them that we were for deficit spending or for the taxes and absolutely let them know how we stood, there might be quite a num-

ber of changes in the faces of the Ninety-fifth Legislature.

Now I am going along with this program. I endorsed it before, the program of taking care of the needs of Welfare, of our children, our educational program and so forth, members, because we have the money to do it with, and we are not going to leave our cupboards bare. We have a revolving fund of \$2,000,000 that we set aside.

Speaking on good roads that these other twenty-eight states have, I believe that we have fairly good roads in the State of Maine, but have we got to tax the automobile owner a greater tax to have more roads? Is that the program that America wants today? Is that the program that our forefathers set for us? I say not. I say that we were told to try and live within our income. If a business concern tries to live within its income, I say that we, the representatives of the people, should also try to live within our income, and I trust that the voters of the State of Maine, if they want to follow along as they have through history,—and I will say, although some may say other states are greater, I still think today that Maine is one of the greatest states in the Union,—and I think the fact that our indebtedness, as we stand today, will show that we are, and I only trust that I will not be a party to further burdening the children of the future with a tax load that we ourselves are not able to pay today.

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

Mr. HILL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It was very evident, last winter, the way that this House and the other branch of the State government were operating, that the shoes would be pinching somebody's feet before a very long period of time. I believe that the shoes are pinching, and I also believe that just as long as this State of Maine has a reasonable surplus, no action will ever be taken as far as improving the tax structure of this State. I therefore move the previous question,

so we can get this thing taken care of.

The SPEAKER: In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it requires the consent of one-third of the members present. As many as are in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: More than one-third of the members present having arisen, the motion is entertained. The question now before the House is shall the main question be put now? In order that there may be no confusion on the point, the Chair will state that that point is debatable.

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

Mr. McCLURE: Mr. Speaker, I move that when the vote is taken, it be taken by a yea and nay vote.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is shall the main question be put now?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We are assembled in a Special Session called by the Governor to consider the matter of the need of our citizens on certain specified items. We have engaged in debate for a short time, comparatively speaking. It seems to me that this question of the need of our citizens and our institutions is important enough so that any man who wishes to speak should have that privilege.

There is also involved, in the matter under consideration, the tax items which inevitably follow the using of surplus, and I, for one, am opposed to limiting debate on this subject, and shall vote "No".

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

Mr. McGLAULIN: Mr. Speaker, I, too, agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams, that we should allow everybody that has got anything to say, to say it. I have had my

chance. I want to give the other fellow a chance too.

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

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker, this is just a lot of fuss about nothing. I just want to find out what the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure, is. I understood him to ask for a yea and nay vote and the question before the House is, in substance, "Shall debate cease?" Is it a fact that the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure, wants us to vote by record on that question? It seems to me that that would be a great waste of time, and it will be enough to take a record vote when we get down to the main question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will answer the gentleman by stating that it is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure, intends to request the yea and nay vote upon the main question when that is reached; not upon the question of whether the main question shall be put now or not.

Mr. WOODWORTH: I thank the Chair. I excuse myself, I hope, to the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is, shall the main question be put now? As many as are in favor of the main question being put now will say aye; those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: Forty-six having voted in the affirmative and seventy-six having voted in the negative, the main question cannot be put at this time. The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the House do accept the majority report of the committee.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to assure you that I will be very brief, and first, may I express to my good friend, Mr. Muskie, and his associ-

ates, that I am proud, but not surprised, in their attitude of fairness. They are to be congratulated. And may I further state that the questions before this House this morning are not Party issues. This Special Session was not called for Party reasons; it was called after continued request of and pressure by the various towns and cities through the State of Maine who have found it impossible to bear the load which is continually being imposed upon them because of the inability of the State to carry out the statutory requirements with regard to Welfare and to its Educational Program.

I do not believe that it is necessary that I should take any of your time to explain, or attempt an explanation, with respect to the Welfare Program, but may I just sum it up briefly by saying to you, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, that every dollar that is requested in this appropriation bill would be one which the towns will be required to assess by property tax if you do not see fit to appropriate it here at this time.

With respect to Education, may I sum that up by saying that the State has, because of necessity, because of lack of funds, short-changed the cities and towns of the State of Maine approximately \$485,000 this year.

As you know, the laws with respect to the educational requirements and as to subsidies to cities and towns will change with the number of pupils in your schools, and with the number of teaching positions which you are required to fill.

With respect to appropriating the funds for one year only, may I point out this: How would any one of us feel, placed at the head of a department, knowing that the Legislature had met in Special Session and failed to give favorable consideration to the second year of the biennium? What would we be naturally expected to do? We would be forced to cut our program to stay within the amount of money provided, so that it is necessary that we give full consideration to

the necessary financial requirements of the second year of the biennium as well as to the present year.

With respect to the surplus, let us thank our good God in Heaven that we have had in the past few years prosperity enough so that a reserve could be accumulated for just such a case. The cities and towns throughout the State of Maine are faced with exactly the same problems on a unit basis that the State is now facing. There is a general decline in employment. The younger man has the job that is available. The older man has applied for relief or for Old Age Assistance, and the number of cases that the State has been asked to accept and must, by Federal requirement, be in a position to accept, has grown to a point beyond the expectation of any person, and is still rising.

And with respect to A. D. C., the same is true. That department, as you all, I hope, know, deals only with a family which has no earning power in it, and for what greater cause could money be appropriated? They are chiefly widows with their children.

I feel certain that every person in the room has his or her mind made up, but I see no need to leave this Hall feeling, in any degree, ashamed or fearful of what we are about to do. We should go home with pride, feeling that we have met the needs of Welfare and Education the best that we could, to the full extent of whatever was available. I, for one, take that position, and I am further convinced that the people throughout Maine want the services which the State is giving them, not only want them, but they must have them. I hope, when the vote is taken, you will have that same feeling inside that I have. I am proud to vote "Yes".

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

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We were sent down here to do a job, and I feel that the job will be only

half done if we don't provide money enough for the second year of the biennium. In my own business I spend thousands of dollars each year to produce a crop, and I do not hesitate to scrape the bottom of the barrel if there is need, to produce that crop or to harvest it. We are under obligation here, to the cities and towns, to pay the subsidies which we are obligated to pay under the existing laws, and I feel, if the need be, that we should take the reserve which we have on hand to pay those obligations. Therefore I am in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown. Thank you.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, there is just one thing that I want to make clear. I was informed, after sitting down a few moments ago, that I did not make my position clear, so I definitely want to make my position clear to the members of this House. I am willing to go along with the program for the remainder of this year, which I think will amply cover the situation, and allow the Ninety-fifth Legislature, which will return here in January, 1951, to handle the problems that rightfully belong to them. I hope you understand my position.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the position of the minority signers of this report clear. The minority signers oppose nothing on this except the University of Maine. They are willing to go along with the whole program for both years, and the only thing that is cut out, whether you want to vote for it or want to vote against it—of course it is entirely up to you—is the University of Maine. The minority report is not against anything but it is right in line with the whole program with that exception.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the House do accept

the majority report of the committee.

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

Mr. WOODWORTH: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown. I hope nobody is surprised. I am very sorry that I do not agree with the position taken by our Governor, a Republican Governor, and I usually stick pretty closely to the party lines. I am also sorry that I do not agree with the majority of the joint committee which considered the matter.

In my remarks I will take the necessary premise that the exhaustion of the unappropriated surplus fund necessarily means a new tax. As a representative from a district which is primarily commercial and industrial, I believe that the people in my district do not want to pay any more taxes, and if that is the ultimate result, I do not see how I can help taking the position right now. I am aware that this program is pretty well placed and I do not expect to accomplish anything, but I would like to have my position made a matter of record.

When this call came out, I understood we were going to be asked to raise some money for State paupers, and I thought the Contingent Fund was big enough to take care of that. We were also asked to raise monies to boost the teacher and education subsidies, and I thought we had thrashed that out in pretty good shape at the regular session. It is my understanding that for many years the subsidies have not been paid in full, and while we may say that the Ninety-fourth Maine Legislature was the worst we ever had,—it is a source of pride to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that it is the worst, and he is one of the outstanding members, as you know—(Laughter) but, when we get down to the matter of this school business, there isn't any question but what our schools will keep going.

The only points raised in the

matter of these school subsidies is: Who pays the bill? It is said that the State should pay it out of the unappropriated surplus, and that is the recommendation of your Governor and the committee. It is said that if we do not pay it this way, there will be a great hardship upon the municipalities because the Constitution obliges them to support the schools. Just how great is this hardship? We are asked to take out of the unappropriated surplus slightly more than one million dollars. That is what the towns will have to raise. The valuation of the several towns and municipalities in our State is approximately something over \$700,000,000. If you take slightly over a million dollars and spread it around in the municipalities of our State, how much are the towns going to pay? Well, they are going to pay at the rate of approximately \$1.60 per thousand of their valuation, and that may be a very great hardship. It might be more in some cases and less in others, but on the average of the State it will be \$1.60 per thousand.

If we continue, say, to pay out of the treasury's exorbitant surplus, then impose a new tax, just where are the taxpayers going to be then? Does anybody think they are going to get out of it for \$1.60 a year or something like that? I don't think so. What you will probably get is a sales tax that will hit them at the rate of about \$20 a thousand for every cent they earn in the course of a year. There is a difference between \$1.60 and \$20.

Now I do not think you are going to be able to sell that program to the people of Maine. The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Muskie, says that we must be realistic. I don't know whether he points at Washington when he says that, or not. That may be the realistic program they have up there, and the question comes: Do you people want it down here? Do you want a big State tax levied so that the towns get back what the State does not use? Or are the people of the towns going to be better off if they tax themselves and pay their own

bills and get one hundred cents from a dollar? If they don't, it is their own fault. I consider that the towns would be a great deal better off if they paid this themselves.

Now for example: There is the problem of aid to dependent children. Nothing is asked to be added to this year's appropriation by the State, but they say "We would like to have a hundred thousand dollars next year." On that aid to dependent children the Federal government pays 54½ percent. The average cost to the town is 11 percent. The net cost to the State is somewhat less than 35 percent. We raise a \$100,000, as your committee recommends. The Department has sole spending power over that, and they get approximately, we will say, \$285,000. How do they know they are going to need \$285,000 next year? That looks to me just like a plain grab. If they would like to have it laying around to spend it, and it is a plain grab, why not call it a plain grab? Take it out of there. I am not particularly prejudiced against any item in this bill. I believe that every cent that is sought in this bill will be wisely spent, and that a great deal of good will be done, but I say we cannot afford it. I could do a lot of good with a great deal of money if I had it to spend. And why, if you cannot afford it, do you ask the State to do it? Won't it be time enough to spend that money when the State taxpayers say you can have it a year from now? That is the basis of my objection.

Now I think that various town officials would say: "Years ago we took care of that aid to dependent children ourselves. Now the State does it, and it costs three times as much money as it should." It is only recently that the State has tried to get money out of the people for delinquent parents, as they are required to by law. I think they have collected something like \$10,000 within the last six months, so I have been told; I could not verify that. But if they need more money, wouldn't it be a good idea, before they come in and ask for

this hand-out that they don't know what they are going to do with yet, for them to dig in a little bit harder and perhaps jail a few of these delinquent parents, start making them pay and use that money? Wouldn't it set a little better with the people of Maine if they knew that something was being done? I think it would. But, this business of turning over to the State the support of dependent children has proved very expensive. The towns asked for it. They got it, and now they don't like it. But I would like to inquire: Are you not advocating the same program for our schools, and putting on a new tax? Are we going to get ahead any faster that way? I don't think so.

I am not opposed to all of this program. I think the employees should have their salaries continued at the present level. I think that elderly teachers' pension bill, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Crystal, Miss Longstaff, is the most meritorious bill that we have before the Legislature, but on the estimate of education and this welfare stuff, and this University of Maine, I think that same money can all be well spent and used to very good advantage. I think we thrashed that all out once at the regular session and I think we should let the thing lay to the next session. The only hardship that has been mentioned is that on the towns. I think they will be worse off if you adopt this committee report and enact this bill.

I think probably all our minds are made up, but I still feel that we will not succeed in unloading a new tax on the people. The Hoover Commission, in its report, said that people are now overtaxed, that the great states of New Jersey and New York have declined to use their unappropriated surplus to pay current bills. You will remember that in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts one Democratic Governor was defeated after his first term because he dissipated the surplus left to him by his Republican predecessor. His successor, by advocating an unwise budget, likewise served only one term. When the

Massachusetts Legislature convened a little over a month ago, both the Republican President of the Senate and the Democratic Governor of Massachusetts agreed on admonishing the people and the Legislature that there must be no new taxes. Are we out of step? The fact is quite clear that the taxes strike here as well as anywhere else.

Why do we assume that the people are going to pass a new tax? You haven't the slightest evidence of it. You have the opinion that a lot of people are telling you they would like to have one but when they go to vote, you don't get it. And is it wise to spend all of your money in the treasury before you find out what results you are going to get? That is the burden of my objection to the bill. I would be delighted to see everybody, every institution, every department and everybody you can think of get all the money they need for any laudable purpose, but I don't think we are proceeding about this in the orderly way. I cannot see where that money is coming back, and if it doesn't come back, where are we?

I would like to refer briefly to the remarks of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Muskie, and I don't mind whether he is here or not. (Laughter). The fact is that he has said in effect: "We are going along with the Governor, but we are doing it because we love the people. We reserve the right to say anything we want to about him after we get out of here."

Now this business of taxing the people is all right, but the lesson of those Massachusetts elections ought not to have been lost on the gentleman from Waterville, (Mr. Muskie). I think that he addressed the Maine Bar Association at Belgrade last summer. One of the things he told them was that the trouble with our tax system just now is that the Federal Government takes too large a bite out of the taxpayers' pockets. That is true. Possibly if they would not take such big bites, we might have more left, but the bite is being taken and there is nothing we can

do about the Federal Government taxing. Our Congressional delegation which is Republican, as you know, is doing everything they can to send back more of our money to us, to spend. It seems that it will be only a short time, perhaps during the present session, that the Federal Aid to Education Bill will be passed, and I think that we can well afford to wait a while longer before we dissipate our surplus. I will not feel a bit badly if this bill passes—I am not going to lose a bit of sleep over it—but I have wanted to make my position clear, that I feel that I must vote against it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER: Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is getting late and that many of us are hungry, so I will refrain from taking up too much time. However, there have been a few things mentioned here this morning thus far in this debate with which I would like to take issue, and a few things which I think need to have a bit of clarification. The opposition, for the most part, stems from the fact that there is within this appropriation bill an item calling for money for the University of Maine. The opposition has said that they oppose this appropriation on the ground that Dr. Hauck did not make a fine presentation or did not, in any way, tell them what the money was to be used for.

If you will refer to the Research Committee report, you will find that Dr. Hauck appeared before that committee and made a statement that should \$200,000 be appropriated for the University of Maine, certain things could be done. Among those things were these: First of all, a substantial reduction in the \$75 increase in tuition, which was put into effect because of the failure at our regular session of providing enough funds for the University to operate on.

The second thing was that with what other money was available, slight but necessary salary adjustments could be made and neces-

sary maintenance carried on in the plant itself.

Now I think it is impossible for the President of the University to break down in nickels and dimes how this \$200,000 will be allocated. We have had, in this Legislature, and in all the other Legislatures in the history of this State, men who have been trusted with the right to disburse money to the best of their administrative ability. I don't think there are any members in this House who question the ability of Dr. Hauck or the Trustees of the University of Maine, and I think it is just what we might call a slap in the face to say that we must know where every nickel and dime is to be expended, in which way it must be expended, or we will not grant it. We certainly did not do that during the regular session and we, I am sure, are not going to do it in regard to some of the appropriations which we are going to make in this session.

Now with regard to the deficiencies in the Departments of Health and Welfare and Education, I think it is impossible for anyone in this House, or was impossible during our regular session, to tell exactly what the economic condition of this country would be, or of this State, any more than I think it is possible for us to project into the future now and try to see what condition our State will be in six months from now, or a year from now; but the fact remains that due to a slump in economic conditions we have had increased services in the Department of Health and Welfare.

The same ones who, during the regular session last winter, decried the idea of a new tax and the original appropriation bill as sent out, used as one of their arguments that we were entering a period of recession. The facts bear this out, because our Department of Health and Welfare has had an increased load, especially in Old Age Assistance, due, no doubt, in part, to the fact that many people sixty-five and over lost their jobs, part time though they may have been, and have been compelled to call upon

the State for assistance, and so at this time we are called to make up that deficiency.

Then there, too, is the argument that we have on the statute books of Maine laws which request and require that we make certain allocations to cities and towns for services which they render. Now if we are to do as the gentleman from Fairfield (Mr. Woodworth) would like to have us do, we should first of all repeal all of these laws which require the State of Maine to make certain commitments to the cities and towns. If we are not going to repeal the laws, then we should therefore make the appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of the law. These things the cities and towns of Maine are waiting to hear about. They are going to have their town meetings shortly; they are going to have to base their appropriations on what they think the State of Maine is going to kick back. I think it is unfair for us to carry on a policy such as we have been carrying on which would leave them to no other recourse than to doubt every step of the way as to how much the State is going to give regardless of the laws which are on the books at the present time.

Now in regard to the unappropriated surplus, this sacred fund, the fact remains that it is money which the State of Maine derived from its taxpayers. It is here, idle. Services are being requested by those same people who paid the taxes, and I don't think it is a time for us to quibble about whether or not we should give their unappropriated surplus back to the people from whom it came for services which they are requesting, especially in the field of Education and Health and Welfare.

Now I think that the gentleman from Fairfield (Mr. Woodworth) said that we could carry on as we are, and the towns could take care of this burden and thus avoid draining the surplus and opening the door to a new tax bill for the Ninety-fifth Legislature. It would seem to me that this reasoning is a little bit inconsistent, for if you

force back on the towns these duties which the State is supposed to perform, you merely tell the towns that they must increase their tax rate and, if you do not get the increase on one end, you are bound to get it on the other, and it is going to be on the property tax which so many agree is burdensome today, whereas if we meet this emergency now and take from the State Treasury this unappropriated surplus, we are not requiring the new taxation, at least for the present, which the gentleman would have us believe .

Now these are just a few of the things, but during the past regular session of the Legislature we had an appropriation bill which was sufficient to take care of all of the needs which we have before us now, and a great many people refused to go along with the report, and I think it is borne out pretty well now that that original bill was fairly good because we are asked to make up the difference between what we actually did give and what now we must give, to make the record straight.

I, too, am proud to take the responsibility which the Minority Party places upon me for these expenditures. I am proud at any time to take the responsibilities which they thrust upon us, responsibilities which mean for us simply carrying out the welfare of the people of this State, and I think it is a sad thing for us to quibble over this money when actually we are quibbling with the education of our youth and the care of our needy and aged. Because of these things I shall go along with the acceptance of the majority report.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: My good friend, the gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Palmer, states that we do not ask the University of Maine where they are going to spend the money that we give them at a regular session. I take issue with that very definitely. By law we give

them one mill of our tax money. By law we cannot even ask them what they will do with the money. But when they present legislation before the Appropriations Committee—and as I remember I attended, as a member, the hearing, and they want \$830,000 for a lab, and they want \$60,000 for this or \$80,000 for that, they tell us what they are going to do with the money. And so the point is this: I take no issue with any members of this group joint committee that heard these bills. Now if congratulations are in order here, both by the minority to the majority and the majority to the minority, very good. I will pass the bouquet around myself for a couple of minutes. The gentlemen who served on this committee in great part are personal friends of mine; all of them are personal friends of mine, I should say. I want them as friends. Two-thirds of them have told me individually that they did not belong on that committee. I must congratulate the majority for having packed it. Since when, in any Legislature, are appropriation measures heard before the Appropriations Committee, the Welfare Committee and the Education Committee? I will give you the answer.

“Let’s vote boys. In numbers there is strength.” That is true. Twenty-seven members on a committee, twenty-four for, three against. If we bear this in mind and look at this report, if this bill had been heard before the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, a member of the Appropriations Committee, another gentleman in the body that we cannot mention who would not have gone along with the grant to the University of Maine; a gentleman I spoke to a moment ago who told me he would not have gone along because he wanted to hear much more about what was going on, with the ultimate result that the vote of the committee and the report of the committee that would have been laid before you people to vote upon would have been either six to four for the \$200,000 for the University of Maine or five for and

five against. And that sounds and looks better for us who signed the minority report than twenty-three to three or twenty-four to three.

So far as my bouquet to the Republican Party, outside of the \$200,000 for the University of Maine, I, as a member of the Democratic Party, am very happy to congratulate the majority; I helped the majority by going along with this well drawn-up plan, and I thank them further for writing part of our Democratic Platform for the next year's election.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the House do accept the majority report of the committee.

The gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure, has requested that when the vote is taken, it be by the yeas and nays. In order for the vote to be taken by the yeas and nays requires consent of one-fifth of the members present. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure, that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Forty-nine members arose.

The **SPEAKER**: More than one-fifth of the members present having signified that the vote shall be by yeas and nays, a yeas and nays vote is now ordered.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Brown, that the House do now accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee. Those in favor of the motion for the acceptance of the majority "Ought to pass" report will answer yeas as their names are called; those opposed will answer nay. The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Albee, Ames, Arthur, Bates, Bearce, Benn, Bennett, Berry, Boothby, Boulier, Brown, Bangor; Brown, Durham; Brown, Robbinston; Brown, Unity; Brown, Wayne; Bubar, Bucknam, Burgess, Limestone; Campbell, Garland; Campbell, Guilford; Carle, Carter, Carville, Castonguay, Chaples, Chapman, Chute, Clapp, Clements, Cobb, Cole, Cook, Cormier, Cyr, De-

Sanctis, Dorsey, Dostie, Lewiston; Dostie, Winslow; Du, Dudley, Dufresne, Dunham, Duquette, Eastman, Faas, Farley, Fay, Foley, Fuller, Gates, Gauthier, Gauvin, Gerrish, Grant, Gray, Hall, Hanson, Hayes, Hayward, Hill, Hobbs, Acton; House, Jamieson, Jennings, Johnson, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kent, Knapp, Labbe, Lacharite, Lackee, Latno, Loughton, Leavitt, Letourneau, Littlefield, Longstaff, Ludwig, Malenfant, Martin, Augusta; Martin, Eagle Lake; Martin, Frenchville; Maxell, Maxwell, McClure, McEnery, McGlauffin, McGown, McKeen, Merrill, Merritt, Millett, Muskie, Nadeau, O'Connell, O'Dell, Paine, Palmer, Parker, Patterson, Payson, Philbrick, Plummer, Prince, Pullen, Ricker, Roudy, Sanborn, Sanderson, Sargent, Sharpe, Silsby, Spear, Stanley, Stevens, St. Pierre, Taylor, Thompson, Brewer; Tyler, Webber, Wight, Bangor; Williams, Auburn; Williams, Topsham; Winchenpaw, Wormwood.—127.

NAY—Atherton, Brown, Baileyville; Dennett, Jacobs, Jalbert, Woodworth.—6.

ABSENT — Bird, Chase, Fitch, Hobbs, So. Berwick; Jewett, Larrabee, Westbrook; Lessard, Marble, Marsans, Phillips, Robbins, Spring, Thomas, White, Auburn.—14.

The **SPEAKER**: One hundred and twenty-seven having voted in the affirmative and six having voted in the negative, fourteen being absent, the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee has been accepted.

Thereupon, the bill having already been printed, the rules were suspended and New Draft "A" of H. P. 2126, L. D. 1626 was given its three several readings, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

The **SPEAKER**: Is it now the pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended and that New Draft "B" of House Paper 2126, Legislative Document 1626, be brought up at this time?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. **JACOBS**: Mr. Speaker, I move that New Draft "C", House Paper 2131, L. D. 1631, be substituted for the bill now under consideration. I was willing to go along, Mr. Speaker, with the first part of the program; as I said before, I was not in favor of the second part, New Draft "B", and I

ask that this "C" be substituted for "B".

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inquire if the gentleman would care to defer his motion until the bill has been given its first two readings and then the motion of the gentleman will be presented to the House?

Mr. JACOBS: All right, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the bill having already been printed, New Draft "B" of the original bill was given its two several readings.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, now moves that the House substitute New Draft "C" of House Paper 2126, Legislative Document 1626, in place of New Draft "B" of House Paper 2126, Legislative Document 1626.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, Item "C" eliminates from "B" the \$200,000 appropriation for the University of Maine. My position in this matter is that I feel it is not the proper time to give to the University of Maine this \$200,000 from the fact that we refused—the Legislature did last January—a year ago—last winter, at the regular session, the amount they asked for. I think that the State, as a whole, the Educational Department and the Health and Welfare Department, needs our attention more than the University of Maine at this time. If you vote against this, you will have \$200,000 more in the Treasury. I feel that they are not in straitened circumstances at the University of Maine. They have, I understand, \$200,000 of their own money which, in an emergency, they can use. Why deplete our treasury in the State of Maine for this particular phase of the question?

That is why I vote against this; I am opposed to it at least, because I feel that at the next session of the Legislature, the Ninety-fifth Legislature, the problems of the State University of Maine will be taken care of, in my opinion, by an

increase in the mill tax to take care of all of their needs. I was here in the Legislature when that mill tax was authorized by the Legislature which it was said at that time would take care of all of their future needs. Of course we never realized that the dollar then was not worth a dollar now. But I do feel that at the regular session in January, next, they will take care of the situation very nicely and they are not suffering for this \$200,000.

In answer to the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Palmer, he did not specify in his talk what they wanted to do with it. "They might use it" to take care of those students for their expenses at the University of Maine. I feel that they are not explicit enough. Not a member of the trustees appeared or was present yesterday, only Mr. Hauck himself. I feel that at this time we should not go along with this \$200,000 appropriation, for the reasons outlined.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that we accepted the majority report of the committee. Am I wrong now, Mr. Speaker, in believing that these gentlemen can pick it up again, item by item?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the motion before the House is that made by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, to substitute New Draft "C" for New Draft "B". In answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Dunham, the Chair will rule that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, is in order.

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

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Just in order that there will be no confusion on this, I would like to point out that there are two drafts to this bill, the one that we just passed, which does include the University of Maine for an appropriation of \$200,000. That is Draft

"B". Draft "C" is identically the same except the appropriation for the University of Maine is left out, a matter of \$200,000. Now those of you who want to support the University of Maine, by giving this appropriation, should vote "No" on the substituting of Draft "C" for Draft "B".

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, to substitute Draft "C" for Draft "B". Is the House ready for the question?

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, to substitute Draft "C" for Draft "B" will say aye; those opposed to the motion will say no.

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

The SPEAKER: Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and ninety-one having voted in the negative, the motion to substitute does not prevail.

Is it now the pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended and that New Draft "B" be now given its third reading?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Paris, Mr. Eastman.

Mr. EASTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I realize I have picked up a hot potato, but since I have picked it up, I am going through with it, and I present House Amendment "A" to House Paper 2130, Legislative Document 1630, and move its passage.

The SPEAKER: The amendment not having been reproduced, the matter will lie upon the table until it has been reproduced.

Mr. EASTMAN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. EASTMAN: To ask a question. Will this delay the session? If so, I will withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER: For the information of the members, the amendment as proposed can be reproduced and on the desks in fifteen to seventeen minutes. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. EASTMAN: I don't think it

has much chance of passing, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter).

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman withdraws his amendment?

Mr. EASTMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: Thank you. (Laughter)

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, New Draft "B" was given its third reading and was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence,

House Committee Report Ought to Pass

Miss Longstaff from the Committees on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, Welfare and Education Jointly reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Elderly Teachers' Pensions" (H. P. 2125) (L. D. 1625)

Report was read and accepted, and the Bill, having already been printed, was given its three several readings under suspension of the rules, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reconsideration be considered as having been moved and lost on each of the matters acted upon during the day, today, and requiring concurrence with the Senate, and that they be sent forthwith to the Senate when the House shall have taken action requiring concurrence by the Senate.

The SPEAKER: Is this the pleasure of the House? Is there objections? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House recess until 3:30 P.M. today.

The SPEAKER: Before placing before the House the motion just made by the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, the Chair would like to state that there will be

emergency legislation in order for enactment at the hour of reconvening. It will therefore be necessary for the members to be present and in their seats.

The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, moves that the House do now recess until 3:30 P.M. this afternoon. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House so recessed.

AFTER RECESS

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Passed to be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Payment of Benefits Under Employment Security Law (H. P. 2127) (L. D. 1627)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of the entire elected membership of the House being necessary, a division was had. 124 voted in favor of same and none against, and accordingly, the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to be Enacted

An Act Providing for the Reallocation of Part of the Betterment Appropriation in Favor of State Aid Highways (S. P. 713) (L. D. 1624)

Was 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.

The SPEAKER: The House now has in its possession an additional paper from the Senate, which may be taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules, if this be the pleasure of the House. The item in question appears on the second supplement of the House Advance Journal of today. Is it the pleasure of the House that out of order and under suspension of

the rules the item now be taken up?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the Memorial.

MEMORIAL TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES STATE OF MAINE

In the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty
MEMORIAL

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the Ninety-fourth legislative (Special) Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your Honorable Body as follows:

Whereas, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 1949 regular session of the Legislature submitted a Memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the members of the said Senate and the House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures in the several states approving the principles of World Federation; and

Whereas, due to changing conditions it is deemed best that Maine be not considered as one of the states seeking World Government; and

Whereas, the principles enunciated in the Memorial of World Federation as set out in said 1949 Memorial are not now approved by the Legislature of the State of Maine in Special Session; and

Whereas, a copy of said 1949 Memorial was sent to each of the Senators and members of the House of Representatives in Congress, to each member of the State of Maine Congressional delegation and to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures in the several states; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That we, your Memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress that said Memorial of 1949 be repudiated and that the

Legislature of the State of Maine go on record as opposing the principles of World Federation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State, by registered mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this state, and to the presiding officers for each of the legislatures in the several states. (S. P. 715)

Came from the Senate, the Memorial read and adopted.

In the House:

The **SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

Mr. **DENNETT:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It appears that in the regular session of the 94th Legislature a Memorial was approved and sent to Congress, sustaining the principles of this so-called World Federation. It now appears that this is something that actually passed by this House and Senate while they were sleeping. They did not realize the implications contained in this Memorial. The rescinding of this Memorial to Congress, passed in the regular session is favored by all patriotic organizations in this State, particularly the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Daughters of the American Revolution, and all other organizations who place the love of country above the thought of socialism and communism which is evidently behind this thought of World Federation, which apparently, again, is an offshoot that worked through the old Fabian Society which brought socialism to England, working, as it did, through the so-called intellectuals to bear upon the people and gradually bring on this insidious thought that would wipe out the independence of our country. Ever so slowly, it has worked its way into high and influential places. Its adoption would mean the end of the American Republic

and the independence and freedom of action of the American people.

I do not believe that it was the intent of this Legislature nor of the people of Maine to be a party to the surrender of this nation to a World Federation, and therefore I strongly urge that you vote to concur with the Senate in this Memorial to the Congress of the United States opposing the principles of World Federation.

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

Mr. **CHAPMAN:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Without going into the detailed argument pro and con as to what this particular proposition is all about, I rise initially and principally to a point of procedure and I hope a point of procedure only.

In the regular session of the 94th Legislature a Memorial resolution was introduced relating to the subject now before you. It was referred to the Judiciary Committee, it was properly advertised, a sufficient amount of time expired and a hearing was ultimately held. It was quite an effective hearing, a detailed one; it took most of the afternoon, and many sincere and intelligent persons came there and appeared on this Memorial resolution, that is, the original one. The committee took the resolution under executive advisement, pondered it, and reported it out unanimously "Ought to pass." It came into both branches of the House consecutively in the normal course of business and was passed unanimously with no objections in either branch. It then, of course, became a matter of record in the usual course.

Now in this particular Special Session we have peculiar circumstances and a rather odd situation of a very small specialized lobby, a package lobby, if you want to call it that, running up and down the corridor between the two branches, buttonholing some of the people who perhaps may be familiar with this and have some sincere notions on this, buttonholing them to come in and plug this

thing for all. It is worth. It is a detailed matter, it is one on which many persons have very sincere thoughts; it is one which, if it were to be rescinded, and I hope it is not, should be considered as fully and as fairly as when originally passed. And I want to put myself on record as saying that I object strenuously, very strenuously, to the tactics adopted here in plugging this thing, slipping it in, if you please, this afternoon. If the merits of the original resolution—and again I do not want to go into the merits of it, because we could be here all the afternoon, and we know we do not want to do that—but if we want to go into the merits of it, why do we not do it in the proper way? We were here to conduct our business with regard to emergency legislation, and I believe we have done it. This matter, if it is to be reconsidered, should be considered in the same slow, careful, leisurely and fair manner that it was originally considered.

I stand on that point, and, for the time being, I will stand on that point alone, but I can say, perhaps off the record, that there are many sincere persons right here in this body who are willing to debate it all the afternoon, and I hope that we do not have to go that far. So, on the basis of what I have said now, I will move the indefinite postponement of the Memorial, and I hope that you will go along with me on it.

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

Mr. **McGLAUFFLIN**: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this proposed Memorial pass unchallenged. To me it seems utterly ridiculous to even waste our time on the matter at all, and I am certainly surprised that it got through the other body without apparent opposition.

Let me call your attention to a few things, and, before I make my argument, I ask you not to let your patriotism run away with your judgment.

Last year, when everywhere in the country and in the world we

were trying to get cooperation to see if it was not possible to get world peace in some way or another, this matter came up in this Legislature, to see whether or not we were willing to have the United States cooperate in an attempt to get world peace through world federation or otherwise. There was no more thought of trying to dissolve the government of the United States than there was of a flight to the moon.

That harmless resolution has been brought up, and, on the papers that you have on your desks, you would get the idea that we were going to dissolve the government of the United States and turn it all over to some world federation, and I was told that there are one hundred and fifty, more or less, Senators and Representatives who favored that idea. That is too absurd for words. If there is anybody in Congress or out that proposes to dissolve the United States of America, he is guilty of treason, and he ought to be tried, and, if he is found guilty, he ought to be shot.

Now we are not in any danger of World Federation, none whatever, and are we going to hell tomorrow because we stick by our guns of last year and think it was a good thing to try to get friendly cooperation in what we did throughout the world?

Now what do they ask us to do? The gentleman who spoke up here said we made a mistake, in other words we did not know what we were doing. We had a hearing and we heard all sides of it. It came before my committee, I listened to the remarks on both sides; I didn't think I was crazy when I voted for that measure; but it seems we made a mistake, we did not know what we were talking about, we made darned fools of ourselves, and now they want us to come up here and admit it. (Laughter)

What does this fool Memorial propose? We sent a copy of the other Memorial to each member of Congress, each member of the Senate, to the head of the House of Representatives and to the head of the Senate. Now we come crawl-

ing on our knees, saying, "Gentlemen, we were poor, benighted darned fools; we did not know what we were doing. Give us those papers back so we can go on record on the right side."

I do not want to take up too much of your time, but I cannot help thinking of a show that I went to at the theater. I think perhaps I have told this story before, but, whether I have or not, it is in point. It was "The Man from Home." Some of you saw that play. And in that play the man from home was the guardian of a girl who was travelling in Italy whom he had never seen, but he had seen her photograph and he had fallen in love with the girl through the photograph. He got word from Italy that there was a certain lord—it turned out later that he was a fake lord, but he did not know about that at the time—who wanted to marry this girl. Before she could do so she had to get the consent of the guardian. So the man from home went to Italy and he talked with this fake lord and he wasn't greatly impressed with him, and naturally he refused to agree to the wedding. He had taken over his automobile, and while he was there near his machine—some of you remember the story—there was a certain Italian prisoner who escaped, and he came running along and asked the American to help him. The American told him to get down under the car, but, on his life, not touch anything. And so, a moment or two later, the police came along and wanted to know if he had seen any escaped convict. He said, "The only one I have seen is my chauffeur under the car. Take him if you want to." They went on. But the fake lord was listening all the time, and, after the officers went away, he came down, rubbing his hands and he said, "Supposing that there was a certain man who wanted the consent of a certain American to a marriage, and supposing that he was watching when an Italian prisoner escaped, and he aided and abetted him to escape, and supposing that the penalty is four years imprison-

ment in Italy for assisting a prisoner to escape, and then let us suppose that a certain man said, 'I will keep my mouth shut if you consent to a certain marriage,' what do you think that man would say?" The man from home said, "That depends upon the man. If it is that man that I know best, he would say, 'I would see you in hell first.'"

The point is we have done no wrong. I won't retract one single inch. I do not want to say that I will see anybody in hell, but I want you to get the point, that I don't retract my position on that matter, and I hope that you don't either.

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

Mr. McCLURE: Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly as a member of the 93rd Legislature, the gentlemen of the press referred to us in many instances as "the House of reconsideration." I believe, members, that during the past two terms that I have been a member of this House we have made mistakes and we have reconsidered them. I feel that we made a mistake in this particular bill. I also feel that we should concur with the Senate and rescind our vote made at the regular session of the 94th Legislature in submitting a joint resolution to Congress to allow America to help create a World Federation of governments patterned after the United States government.

Majority rules in our form of government, therefore the majority would rule in a world federation of governments. Our voting strength would be nil compared with the voting strength of other powers in a world government. I do not want to gamble my or my children's rightful heritage of freedom by endorsing a world federation at this time. I am neither what is called an intellectual nor a Rhodes scholar, but I do feel that those teachers that we voted an increase in pension to taught me ideals more in step for free men and women than foreign "isms" in many instances that are being taught today. I would rather die on my feet and be free than to be shackled

with what some people would have us believe in is security. I trust this House will concur with the Senate on this matter.

In closing, I wish to say that there has been left on the desks of each member of the House this article: "To the Members of the 94th Legislature in Special Session,"—you have all, most likely, read it. I would like to have this also inserted in my remarks. It was signed by Ralph W. Farris, Jr., Legislative Chairman, Veterans of Foreign Wars; and I believe, members, if anyone should be listened to it should be those men who had to fight the battles to preserve our freedom.

The following document, without objection, was included in the remarks of Mr. McClure:

"To Members of the 94th Legislature in Special Session:—

The 94th Legislature submitted a joint resolution to the Congress of the United States and forwarded copies to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures in the several states regarding a Constitutional Convention in order that amendments might be made to allow America to participate in a World Federal Government.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is of the opinion that any proposals to create a World Government are in effect advocating the complete abolishment of the United States of America. The Veterans of Foreign Wars strongly feels that any such proposals are un-AMERICAN.

The Maine Veterans News, official publication of the Department of Maine, Veterans of Foreign Wars, was perhaps the first newspaper to attack the various schemes of World Government. Newspapers throughout the country are now awakening to the fact that these proposals are detrimental to the United States of America and are editorially attacking World Government.

The Los Angeles Examiner on November 8, 1949 wrote up a very concise editorial directing the at-

tention of the public to the menace of World Government as follows:

'A PROPOSAL TO ABOLISH THE UNITED STATES'

PROPOSALS that America join a world government — proposals which, surprisingly, were given respectful consideration in recent hearings before the foreign affairs committee of the House of Representatives—actually are suggestions that we **ABOLISH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.**

This is made clear by the specifications for the world super-state as set down by its advocates.

Among a variety of extreme internationalist organizations enlisted in the scheme, the principal leaders are United World Federalists, Inc., and Union Now, and each has prepared pamphlets outlining its ideas of how world government should operate.

One of these, issued by the World Federalists, says:

'World law shall be enforceable **DIRECTLY UPON INDIVIDUALS.**

That means the American people would give up their right to **MAKE THEIR OWN LAWS.**

They would obey laws made for them by foreign politicians who do not understand and who have no regard for our American ideals of individual liberty.

The World Federalist booklet also says:

'The world federal government should have authority to raise dependable revenue under a . . . **DIRECT TAXING POWER INDEPENDENT OF NATIONAL TAXATION.**

That means foreign politicians envious of American prosperity and unshakably convinced that America is possessed of unlimited wealth, would **DECIDE HOW MUCH TAXES WE AMERICANS SHOULD PAY** without even having to **CONSULT OUR OWN Government** in the matter.

If you imagine we would not pay the **BULK** of the taxes to support a world government, consider the fact that we are **ALREADY** paying the bulk of the cost of the United Nations.

The World Federalist program continues:

'Such a world government should possess provisions PROHIBITING POSSESSION BY ANY NATION OF ARMAMENT AND FORCES BEYOND AN APPROVED LEVEL REQUIRED FOR ITS INTERNAL POLICING', and it adds that there would be 'armed forces as may be necessary TO ENFORCE WORLD LAW'.

America, that is, would strip itself of all power of self defense and would be thereafter at the mercy of a well-armed international mercenary force responsible to whatever clique of European politicians gained control of the world government — quite possibly a COMMUNIST clique, and certainly at the very least a SOCIALIST clique, since virtually all Europe is either Communist or Socialist.

On top of all this, a proposal to make America's ruination final and complete is put forward by Union Now. Its pamphlet says:

'The Union (world government) would take over the . . . GOLD RESERVES of member nations, and their currencies and present NATIONAL DEBT obligations'.

THAT means the gold hoard at Fort Knox would be seized by the European politicians in charge of the world government and spent by them for the enrichment of their own countries and themselves.

It means also that they could, and of course would, CANCEL any debts owing to the United States by other nations, thus CONFISCATING the billions of dollars the people of America have lent abroad.

Clearly, then, if the United States joined a world state, our Government would be stripped of ALL its essential powers.

It would cease to BE a government. The United States would CEASE TO EXIST AS A FREE NATION, and the American people, their divinely inspired Constitution abrogated and destroyed, WOULD LOSE THEIR PRECIOUS LIBERTIES AND BECOME SLAVES OF A WORLD SUPER-STATE FOUNDED ON THE SOCIALIST TOTALITARIAN PHILOSOPHY

THAT THE INDIVIDUAL IS NOT THE MASTER OF HIS GOVERNMENT BUT ITS SERVANT.

How can ANY American—however bemused by wishful dreams or obsessed by baseless terror—advocate this monstrous act of national self destruction?

How can members of the United States Congress, sworn to defend the American Constitution, listen with respectful complacency to these outrageous proposals that they enact laws for America's destruction?

AND HOW, ESPECIALLY, CAN LOYAL AMERICANS SIT SILENT AND LET THIS DANGEROUS AND DISLOYAL MOVEMENT GO UNCHALLENGED?

It is time for THE AMERICAN PEOPLE to intervene and make it plain that THEY still cherish the free America their forefathers created for them, and that they have no intention of permitting it to be BETRAYED AND DESTROYED.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has for many years been eternally vigilant in opposing Communism. However, there can be no question in the mind of any American but what Communism has made great inroads into American thought and education. Although the Veterans of Foreign Wars does not accuse the backers of these World Government schemes as being Communists, we do point out that all of these proposals fall in line with the plan for International Communism.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars understand by personal experience, the horrors of war, and no group more earnestly desires to preserve world peace; however, they reject the theory of 'peace at any price'. We believe that there are some things more precious than an abject surrender to obtain physical peace; freedom, human dignity and the right to govern our own lives are most precious to men who have fought all over the world to maintain those rights. If necessary, we would prefer to die on our feet than to live on our knees.

Thus, the Department of Maine, Veterans of Foreign Wars urges the

94th Legislature in Special Session to remove the State of Maine from the roll of the minority states which have gone on record as favoring World Government. We feel it only fitting and proper that the same Legislature which was duped into memorializing Congress now let its true sentiment be known and join with the State of Georgia which only last week rescinded a similar Memorial passed by its General Assembly in 1946.

RALPH W. FARRIS, Jr.
Legislative Chairman"

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Paris, Mr. Eastman.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Chapman, that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Paris, Mr. Eastman, has requested when the vote is taken that it be taken by the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. MALENFANT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am a little bashful about getting up because I am only a little boy compared with all of the rich men and rich women of this House. But this is a free country. I take this opportunity to get up and try to keep this country free. Now I hope we all vote to redeem the mistake that we made at the last session. It is unwise to be too friendly with some countries. We were friendly with Russia once; we sent them ships and food and money. What has happened? Today we have got to spend millions and millions of dollars in case they should try to come down and destroy our country. Now are you going to be friendly with those countries? I hope we all vote to repeal this mistake.

The SPEAKER: The Chair notes that during the course of the remarks of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure, on the current de-

bate that he did make a request that there be included in the record a certain document addressed to the members of the 94th Legislature in Special Session, signed by Ralph W. Farris, Jr., Legislative Chairman. Is there objection to the inclusion of this document in the remarks made by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McClure? The Chair hears none and it will be included.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Members, I am very sorry to oppose the honorable and venerable gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) because I do not want to be consigned to the hot place. Evidently, if I do, that is where I am going.

Now the gentleman from Portland has asked us at the beginning to separate patriotism from judgment. In my opinion, you might just as well try to separate romance from marriage. I never could do it. (Laughter) And we cannot separate patriotism from judgment or we will have a very poor and biased judgment. If I understand this correctly—and I must go on record because they have asked us to go on record—if I understand this correctly, and I have listened to all the commentators and I have read all of the comment that came to my notice in the press and over the radio, this simply means that if we let the old memorial go by we eventually subscribe to a World Constitution which will eventually supersede the American Constitution, because it demands a vote, and a majority vote will stand in any contest.

Now then, we have one Constitution. I have lived under it, and I want my children to live under it, and my grandchildren, if the hydrogen bomb is not perfected so they blow us up before that time. One Constitution is enough.

Now then, gentlemen, let us be careful. I have made mistakes, oh, so many, and whenever I made a mistake I wanted to correct it, and if anyone showed me I had made a

mistake I appreciated it and I did my best to correct it. Now I believe that the former Legislature made a mistake: they made it so far as I am concerned; and I believe that this Memorial should pass. Why hook up in a United States of Europe with a crowd that is always sitting astride a powder keg, and who are blowing up all the time? Why hook up with a ripping, roaring, snarling, fighting Europe and Asia? I do not want to do it. The United States suits me and its Constitution suits me. I believe this Memorial should pass.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Chapman, that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There are some things about the record in connection with these memorials that I think should be made a little clearer.

The original memorial was advertised, a hearing was held. If my memory serves me correctly, no member of the Judiciary Committee was in favor of the memorial in its original form. Because of the intense interest of some members of the House in the bill, it was watered down, diluted and modified so that it merely suggested that Congress should give serious consideration to calling a convention. If I am now correctly informed, this more or less innocuous memorial that we passed is being used in about the same fashion it would have been used had it been passed in its original form. The proposition has been submitted to some twenty-two states; I think we are one of five who now have such a memorial in Washington.

I believe sincerely that the human race cannot survive without cooperation throughout the world. At the same time, I am not willing to surrender my independence nor that of my country with the world in its present condition.

If the documents that I have seen are authentic and we entered

into such an agreement, Russia, which is now communist, and China, which is largely communist, could out-vote us about seven to one.

I have no fear that our present Congress would seriously entertain such a proposal as a World Federalist Government. However, I do not like to have our State of Maine on record as favoring the principles that are being put forward by the group in possession of the memorial. I was opposed to the memorial in its original form last winter; I was opposed to it in the form in which it was reported unanimously. I am sorry I made the mistake of not going on a minority report. I have made that mistake. I am willing to admit it at this time, and I think we should pass this memorial.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Chapman, that the memorial be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. MUSKIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I certainly have no desire to prolong this session by even so long as the time I am to speak this afternoon. However, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have been put on the spot by some of the remarks that have been made.

I want to endorse the statement of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams, in so far as he recalls that this memorial does not advocate the principles of World Federation. We did not recommend to Congress in that memorial that the United States should now join a World Federal Government. It was not the intention of the sponsors of the legislation to recommend any such step, and the Committee on Judiciary in passing out the memorial certainly did not intend to endorse any such step. I hope this House gives the committee credit for enough common sense to know that we would not look around the world as it is today and recommend that any such step be taken now.

I have no suicidal tendencies in me, nor do I find any in my background. I have found the United States a wonderful country in which to live, and I have wanted to fight for it and I have.

Our only intention in the Committee on Judiciary in passing out that memorial was this: As we looked around the world and saw conditions as they then existed, we thought something should be done in the way of investigating all possible avenues to world peace. We were not convinced that that particular memorial suggested the answer to that. We do not now think that it does, but we do and we did then think that Congress had the facilities with which to seriously investigate the proposal so that it might decide whether or not that was the answer. All we asked Congress to do was to seriously consider the proposal and, in its own considered judgment, decide whether or not a Convention of the World should be called to consider a World Federal Government.

Now when it is suggested that I should here today say that I was wrong in making that judgment, I cannot admit that I was wrong, because I was not. If the thing should come up in committee again today, I would vote the same way.

Now I appreciate the motives of the people who are sponsoring this memorial today and I know their motives are the same as mine. They are fearful of any movement that would tend to destroy the government of the United States until a better alternative is proposed. I feel the same way, and in voting in support of the motion to indefinitely postpone I am not fighting at odds with them, I am merely saying, as I said last winter: Here is a possibility. With disaster threatening us in the form of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb, is it incumbent upon us to overlook any possibility in our power toward world peace?

World federation! We are a federation in this country; our United States is a federation; and the prospect of federation to the original thirteen colonies seemed just

as disastrous to many people then as the prospect of world federation seems to the people who are sponsoring this memorial this afternoon.

Have we seen disaster as the result of the United States federation? Perhaps world federation is not the answer. I am not convinced yet that it is. I am not convinced that it is. But is it so criminal to discuss it, to consider it, to look into the possibilities? And are we so afraid of opinion that may be generated by those who are moved by emotion and not by reason that we are willing to admit that we were wrong in suggesting intelligent discussion and consideration. We made no mistake, gentlemen; we recommended no specific program; we merely asked Congress to consider whether or not the answer to the world peace problem lay in this proposal. Now, if that is treason, I stand convicted of it today.

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

Mr. PAINE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I came here a few days ago and saw these three mimeographed sheets on my desk and read them over, I certainly, if I were a red-blooded American, would have reacted the way that every one of you here would probably have reacted to it. It charges a communistic movement; it charges giving up the United States government. However, it is very misleading and does not present all the facts.

You have heard here this afternoon on the floor, by the proponents of the memorial, the statement that all patriotic organizations in Maine support this V.F.W. Memorial. For example, all I have to do is turn to the proceedings of the American Legion. I am a Legionnaire; I was one of the original sponsors of the memorial to strengthen the United Nations; I served in Europe with the 86th Infantry Division; I also served in the Pacific after the war was over. I do not think anyone will question my patriotic motives.

Referring back to the fact that no patriotic organizations are behind or working to try to solve this world crisis: Every day we look in the paper and see something about the H-Bomb. We all should urge our congressmen to try to solve this.

I read from the platform of the American Legion Convention:

"We support the United Nations. We urge its charter be so strengthened that it can effectively stop aggression. We again restate the Legion plan to strengthen the United Nations by limitation of the use of the veto in matters of aggression, international control of scientific weapons, and the establishment of an effective international police force."

Further: "As any foreign police is dependent upon the economic and military strength of the United States, we propose that our economy remain free and our armed forces strong."

No sponsor of this original memorial would even suggest that we do not continue to remain strong in this country. But while we are going ahead and maintaining our strength, and in view of the world situation and the way that Russia is today, we must remain strong. We certainly can hope to try to work it out through arbitration and strengthening the United Nations, giving it a police force, strengthening it, working through personal means to bring about some kind of world law in this present-day world of anarchy.

The V. F. W., the sponsor of this present Memorial right here today, originally started to attack strengthening of the United Nations and many of these resolutions to form a united World Government, and their National Commander, Mr. Lewis, threw out these charges that we were trying to overthrow our own United States. Since then he has been under bitter attack. The same thing that is going on here today was done in Georgia and in California. In Georgia a limited World Government resolution was rescinded, as they would urge you to do here to-

day. I will be frank; I will give you the facts; I will not try to mislead you. In Georgia it was rescinded. In California it was defeated and the original resolution stood.

I read from an editorial referring to this Mr. Lewis, who was the National Commander of the V.F.W. This countercharge of guilt by association—and I mean this kind of a pamphlet that we have had on our desks during these three days—"this kind of charge of guilt by association is the worst kind of dirty attack. We find it hard to believe that the Lewis vendetta against the United World Federalists came from anywhere within the ranks of the V.F.W. It seems to have been the brainstorm of a free-wheeling individual whose arrival at eminence has gone to his head."

Since that original attack by the National Commander, he undoubtedly has sent down material and pamphlets and things of that nature in order to sustain his views.

They mention communism. Oh, I just wish they would say, "You are a communist," because we would be so darned quick to bring them to court and challenge them. These innuendoes! If I were Joe Stalin, I would hate to lower myself to the tactics that are being used on you people at this session. If I were Joe Stalin and I wanted to defeat this World Government movement or a strong United Nations, or some kind of World Law, I would certainly try to impress my ideas upon some patriotic organization, dupe them, as it were, dupe them into defeating what right-thinking and responsible people are trying to attempt.

It has been mentioned that there was no support for this bill. I hate, at this Special Session, to take up your time. I cannot, in this short time, reach every one of you. I am not a lobbyist. I have been busy with another bill here in regard to unemployment compensation. I have not had the opportunity to go around and sit down and talk with you. I do not have the funds to have things mimeographed and distributed. How-

ever, I do have some typewritten sheets that were in the hands of the Judiciary Committee last winter.

"No support," they say! This is from the platform of the Republican Party of Maine, and I quote: "The Republican Party of Maine urges initiative and leadership by the American Government toward the strengthening of the United Nations as an effective agency for the enactment and enforcement of world law to prevent war."

No support! I quote from the platform of the Democratic Party of Maine: "In our struggle to strengthen the forces of freedom throughout the world we support continuation of a firm foreign policy, backed by adequate strength, the European Recovery Program, and a reorganization of the United Nations to make it an effective force for peace."

No support! I quote from the National Republican Party Platform: "The United Nations should progressively establish international law — and be provided with the armed forces contemplated by the Charter."

Yes, they are giving it serious consideration. I am glad and happy to inform my colleague, Mr. Muskie, that Congress is delving into this problem.

Here is a statement from our own Senator, Margaret Chase Smith: "There is not any question but what ultimately the nations of the world must advance to a world form of government — in other words to World Federalism." And, again, she says: "If there is no eventual monopoly and no physical defense of the atomic bomb, the most obvious answer is world government predicated upon the United Nations and enforced by an international police force."

No support! I will read a letter from the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, addressed to the former president of the United World Federalists:

"Dear Mr. Meyer:

I am happy to extend greetings to the members of the United World Federalists, Inc., on the oc-

casation of their Second Annual General Assembly.

From time to time, the increasing activities of your organization have come to my attention and I must congratulate you on the patriotism and high sense of historical destiny that inspires your work.

The American people lead the world in its great hunger for a just and lasting peace, and I feel confident that the honest efforts of all of us toward this end will ultimately be successful."

And I will read a letter from a senior Senator and one of the leaders of the Republican Party, Senator Robert A. Taft:

"Dear Mr. Meyer:

I have talked with your directors regarding the work of the United World Federalists, Inc. I hope very much that you will continue that work. I am convinced that the American people must take the lead to discover a better method by which world peace can be assured and the nations of the world subjected to a reign of justice and law.

I wish to commend you and all of your organization for the efforts you are making in this direction and on the high sense of patriotism which inspires every member of your group with whom I have talked. There are many other organizations having the same general purpose. I hope that all of them may coordinate their work in order to more quickly achieve a hope of peace."

That is what I wish the V.F.W. would do. They should be a great help in defining how this police force should be set up. They could sit down at the council tables and work with them, making sure that we do not surrender too much sovereignty. All that is asked in this Federalist type of resolution — that Federalist resolution which was the one that was introduced here in the Maine Legislature—all that that Federalist resolution urges is some kind of control within the United Nations. The United Nations charter already has provisions in it to set up a police

force and calling upon the member nations. They have not done it. Why? Because we have not taken the lead. We cannot expect Russia to do it; we have got to take the lead.

Communist-inspired? No support? Here are just a few of the people in Maine who are giving of their time voluntarily to achieve this end: The president of the Maine group—he must be a communist—is William E. Clark, President of the Bancroft-Martin Rolling Mills in Portland. On the Board of Advisors: Claude Allen, Headmaster of Hebron Academy; Wallace W. Anderson, Minister, State Street Congregational Church, Portland. I hate like the devil to go on and enumerate these things, but I think it goes to the very essence of our democracy, and if we should pass this Memorial we will regret it in days to come. Edward E. Chase, who had to go to a meeting this afternoon, is on the board; Horace E. Howe, President of the Portland Central Labor Union; Rev. Bernard M. Hanninger, Pastor, Chestnut St. Church, Portland; the Catholic Bishop of Portland—he must be a communist! Kenneth Roberts, author, Kennebunkport. Hon. Sumner Sewall, former Governor of Maine. I am just taking the highlights here. Who else is behind it? William T. Holliday, President of the Standard Oil Company of Ohio. Here is how he looks at it. He looks at it as a business man should look at it. He looks at it as if it were insurance. If we cannot solve this problem his business will be wiped out.

When we presented our views before that committee—and this was some of the material that was used—we had people from Bangor, people from Portland, there were people from all walks of life in all parts of the State—we said: There is no such thing as a secret; we cannot keep the secret of the atomic bomb. That is why we urge this. I do not think conditions have changed. I think we still should seek to solve this problem; I think our government should still seek to solve it.

I am quoting again. You will recall that recently it was announced that we had the power to develop the hydrogen bomb. At that hearing, the Judiciary Committee last winter heard this from John J. McCloy, former Assistant Secretary of War:

"I have been told that, given the same intensive effort which was employed during the war toward the production of that bomb of the hydrogen helium type, i.e., a bomb of approximately 1000 times the power of the present bombs; in other words, we felt and we were certain at that time that a helium bomb would ultimately be produced, and Russia will certainly be able to do the other.

In closing, I should add—I want to take my time here, I am a little excited, a little emotional, I know, because I feel so strongly about it—another group—maybe they are communists, I don't know—a veterans' organization, the Amvets, they have sponsored a similar resolution at their national convention. So not all veterans are opposed. I would say the majority of the veterans are in favor of investigating this problem.

Finally, I want to read a statement from His Excellency, Governor Frederick G. Payne, endorsing World Government Week last year. He said:

"Recent advances made by modern science in the production of death-dealing implements have reached such a point that the most apparent method of achieving world peace is by world law and world government backed with effective means of curbing individual members.

"As the basis for a durable peace," Payne said, "every possibility of strengthening the United Nations into a true federation should be explored and the most feasible method of minimizing the possibility of another major war should receive the support of every thinking person.

"This universal and most vital problem is one of the most serious which confronts the civilized world today and with the advent of the

atom bomb and its refinement into more effective implements brings a very real possibility that civilization can eliminate itself."

We maintain that we are the realists. In other words, we do not want to go on and put ourselves in a position whereby we will have a third World War.

One point that was mentioned by my opponents, shall I say was: "Do we want to be outvoted by China and India? Wouldn't we in such a situation?" We are not outvoted in the United Nations because we have the Security Council. We will have the same set-up in some type of strong United Nations to go right along with that. In other words, France, Great Britain and the United States would be given greater voting powers, based on our economic strength and industrial know-how and education. That could be worked out and would be worked out. Do not think for a minute that our Congress is going to throw away our heritage here.

I close with these remarks. I just hope and pray that you are not duped by this insidious attack. I have not had a chance to get around and discuss it individually with you. I think if I could you would say that this was a reasonable thing.

If you pass this Memorial today, you are voting for isolationism; you are telling Congress not to try to solve this atomic question. If you vote for this today you deny the people of Maine who are interested in this the opportunity to be heard again on it — and that is fundamental to our legislative process and our democratic way of life, that a person is given an opportunity to be heard and to defend himself.

It is very difficult in the few moments we have here in this Hall to really get to the heart of the issue. All that original Memorial was was that we have Congress strengthen and investigate the United Nations, and Congress is looking into that. There is not one resolution before Congress, but there are dozens of resolutions before Congress for different means of try-

ing to solve this problem. There is the Baruch proposal, there is the Culbertson plan, a million plans that they are investigating. So I urge that you vote to indefinitely postpone this Memorial.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief. I want to call the attention of my Brother McClure to the fact that I had a father and forty-four relatives who fought in the Civil War for freedom before he was born. He states that you should give consideration to this because it comes from the American Legion, or some Legion. Notice the boys who were in this late World War and who belong to the Legion that are not for this resolution.

I want to again call your attention to the fact that the resolution that was passed last winter was passed after careful consideration in committee where every opportunity was given to discuss the matter.

This measure has been lobbied in this House and Senate with no opportunity for hearing, and you are taking a one-sided view of a conclusion that is so utterly absurd that I feel it is beneath our dignity to even consider such an asinine proposition as that this country is going to give up its sovereignty for some world federation.

In final conclusion, I must say that while I have greatly admired my Democratic opponent, as you know, and we have fought against each other many times, God bless his heart, he is with me in this move, and I thank him from the bottom of my heart. (Laughter and applause)

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

Mr. McCLURE: Mr. Speaker, I might say I would like to know on what side his forty-four forebears fought during the Civil War. I won't go into that at this time.

Can we, members, make America strong by making the weaker countries stronger? The fact has

been alluded to that this is a program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I would like to state now that I am not a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I am, however, a member of the American Legion, also a duly-appointed legislative agent for the State Department of the American Legion. It is not the Veterans of Foreign Wars alone that are opposed to this. We have in the House at the present time our former Past State Commander of Maine of the American Legion, Col. Lester Blake, who is well known by Legionnaires and veterans throughout Maine. He also is opposed to this and would concur with this Memorial.

I do not want to bring anything in here. We have not referred to you as communists, those of you who are supporting this, in any way. I believe that it is in the best interests of the people of Maine to concur with the Senate on this matter. We say it has been lobbied; we say we should not reconsider it. I believe the other body is as capable as we are. They have already been presented with this and have given it due deliberation. In fact, I believe that more of us now understand both sides of this question than we ever did before. It is ignorance when I say that I don't recall when the measure was before the committee or when it passed the House. Perhaps I was too interested in presenting taxes. Nevertheless, members, I do trust that you will vote against sending this to Congress and to concur with the Senate.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would just like to take a minute of your time. I have a paper here but I won't take time to read it. As you all know, I am supposed to stand up when Judge McGlauffin does, but I think this time I will be sitting down.

It makes me think of a story about Pat and Mike. Pat's backyard backed up against Mike's backyard, and Pat's wife and Mike's

wife were hanging out clothes, and Mike's wife said to Pat's wife: "What is Pat's political following?" "Well," she said, "I don't know." "Well, Mike is a Democrat." "Well," she says, "all I know about Pat is that he is agin the government."

I feel that this United World Federalist thing is against our government, and I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland does not prevail.

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

Mr. FARLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There has been something read here by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Paine. It has been my good fortune, and, although a financial loss a good education, to have been to twenty-five National Conventions of the American Legion in this country as a delegate to those National Conventions.

The gentleman has read to you a resolution that was passed in Philadelphia and which received the whole 27 votes from the State of Maine, including men like Frank Lowe, our State Commander, James Boyle, Col. Quinn and many others. I am simply saying that what Comrade Paine has read is what we have stood for in the last National Convention. It does seem to me to be too bad to see some of us who are in the Legion standing here and taking sides on one thing and another. We had a very good opportunity at the last session to thrash this out. I know you all want to go home, and I want to go home because I am looking for Frank Carpenter, and I am going to stay with the gentleman from Portland in voting to postpone it indefinitely.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Chapman, that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Paris, Mr. Eastman, has requested that when the vote is taken that it be taken by the yeas and nays. In order for the yeas and nays to be ordered it

requires the consent of one-fifth of the members present.

As many as desire the vote to be taken by the yeas and nays will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously, less than one-fifth of the members present having arisen, the yeas and nays are not in order.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Chapman, that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I ask that when the vote is taken it be taken by a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, moves that when the vote is taken it be taken by a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Chapman, that the memorial be indefinitely postponed will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-eight having voted in the affirmative and fifty-seven having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

Mr. PAINE of Portland: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PAINE: To make a motion, Mr. Speaker, out of order and under suspension of the rules.

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

Mr. PAINE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion that we refer this same memorial to the next session, where it will be given opportunity for further public hearings and can be taken up with due deliberation.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the motion to indefinitely postpone having prevailed, the memorial is no longer before the House.

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

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, I would ask, under suspension of the rules, that I may present an order.

The SPEAKER: Out of order and under suspension of the rules, the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar, requests permission to introduce a memorial. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the memorial.

The memorial was then read by the Clerk as follows:

MEMORIAL TO THE CONGRESS
OF THE UNITED STATES
STATE OF MAINE

In the Year of Our Lord One
Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty.

MEMORIAL

To the Honorable Senate and
House of Representatives of the
United States of America in
Congress Assembled

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the Ninety-fourth Legislative (Special Session) assembled, most respectfully present and petition your Honorable Body as follows:

Whereas, the Secretary of State of these United States, Dean Acheson, in proclaiming his continued friendship for and his confidence in Alger Hiss, a man convicted of crime in the courts of our country; and

Whereas, this unprecedented action on the part of the Secretary of State has lowered dignity of the office which he represents; and

Whereas, the citizens of these United States have lost their confidence in the Secretary of State; and

Whereas, the Secretary of State places his friendship for a convicted person above his duties of these United States; and

Whereas, the Secretary of State has shown he is impudent, incompetent, inept, contemptuously haughty, arrogantly indifferent to the rights of others, and a complete failure in the office he holds; and

Whereas, the Secretary of State indicates an attitude which is with-

out parallel in all the history of our Country; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to investigate the State Department and remove thereby all undesirables from office; and be it further

Resolved: That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully request the President of these United States to request the resignation of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State; and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State, by registered mail, to the proper officers and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress.

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

Mr. **BUBAR:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You have heard the memorial, and this is all I wish to say. Mississippi, Maryland, Louisiana, Texas and New York have already passed this memorial. California is not in session, but you heard over the radio last night that they had their memorial drawn to present whenever they went into session. So now I leave that with you.

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

Mr. **McGLAUFFLIN:** Mr. Speaker, I heard a story the other day that an aunt of Col. Spaulding Bisbee was asking him if he had heard about the Boston robbery where they had stolen a million and a half dollars; and, according to the story as I heard it, the Colonel said: "You ought to go to Washington, if you want to find the robbers."

Now here is the point: I think the memorial we had a few moments ago was about as absurd as

anything I could think of, but you would have to go to Washington if you are going to equal this one. And let me tell you why. Can't you see how utterly absurd it is for us to try to get the President to remove the Secretary of State because we do not happen to agree.

We don't like it because he likes Mr. Hiss. Now the Secretary of State may have been very unwise in his remark. That is not in point. The question is: Here is an attempt on the part of some states, and apparently here, to say, no matter what his capabilities may be in other respects—he may be the best man we can have in the foreign office, he may know more about world affairs than any other man available—but that does not count if he happens to be friendly to a man who has been, in the first instance, adjudged guilty. There is an appeal pending; he is not guilty until he is finally convicted.

Now I have no defense for Mr. Acheson on the attitude that he took towards Mr. Hiss, but I do say most emphatically, Members of this Legislature, that it is utterly absurd for us to make ourselves ridiculous before the whole world by telling the President of the United States that he should remove his Secretary. Of course he would not pay the slightest attention to it, and it just simply makes us ridiculous. I cannot believe for a moment that this can prevail, and I move for the indefinite postponement of this memorial.

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

Mr. **BUBAR:** Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This man Hiss was convicted of one of the blackest crimes in the history of this country; he was convicted by the courts, and he was also convicted at the hearing. Now then, I am going along with these other states that have passed a similar memorial. You may call it ridiculous or childish or anything else, but I contend that this House should go on record as against the Secretary of State who stands and

proclaims his friendship for the man who has been convicted by the courts of the United States and by the investigating committee of Congress, and I leave it with you, ladies and gentlemen.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the memorial be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. SHARPE: Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House do not permit me to use appropriate language to express my hatred for communism and the people who sympathize with communists. Now I sense from the attitude of this House that Mr. Bubar's proposed order seems like a stupendous thing to be made by the Maine Legislature; but let me assure you right now, ladies and gentlemen, that there is nothing ridiculous about it, it is not ridiculous. I expect, possibly, that Mr. Bubar and I are the only two in the House that will support it, but I certainly will support it.

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

Mr. DUNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I find myself aligned with my friend, the gentleman from Blaine, Mr. Bubar. I have asked myself so many times, as I have read the papers and magazines, just how much we have got to take from our public servants without calling them to task — without calling them to task — I repeat that. It may sound ridiculous to the good Judge from Portland, but it is not ridiculous to me. I think that Mr. Bubar is in order and I support him.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed, and the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, requests that when the vote is taken, it be by a division. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the memorial be indefinitely postponed will kindly

rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Forty-seven having voted in the affirmative and fifty-six having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail. Is it now the pleasure of the House that the Memorial be adopted?

The motion prevailed and the Memorial was adopted and sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that at the present time it is proposed to recess until five-thirty. The time is specifically called to the attention of the members because the bills for enactment will be here at that hour, and we do want the members present.

The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, moves that the House do now recess until 5:30 this date. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the House so recessed.

AFTER RECESS—5:45 P. M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. House, requests unanimous consent to address the House. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Yesterday I tried to introduce a bill of very great importance to my community, and unfortunately, as far as I am concerned, I was unable to do so. I am sorry, but I realize that the need for so doing may have been present. Today, however, there is a bill of importance, not just to my own community but to the whole State of Maine, from Kittery to Fort Kent. It is a bill to amend the charter of the Development Credit Corporation, which was passed at the last session, so that this corporation will be able to take the money that is coming in, in order to help bring industries into the State. I believe that this meas-

ure is of great benefit to the whole State, its prosperity and future. Another gentleman will explain the bill and introduce it. Thank you.

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

Mr. **WILLIAMS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I regret very much, at this late hour, to bring up a matter of this kind. However, it is something that our Maine Development Commission and others interested in our State are greatly interested in. We created the Development Credit Corporation of Maine at the last session of the Legislature, with a capital stock of \$50,000. That is the most that this corporation can accept. At the moment their stock is over-subscribed. The business men have responded in such a manner that they have money that will have to be returned if something is not done. There are other business men willing to purchase stock which would increase the capital. The purpose of the corporation is to loan money to new enterprises that would settle in this State, that would help the people, particularly in that locality, and thus help all of us throughout the State.

That is the bill. It is a simple bill of about three lines. The copy is ready to go to the printer immediately; the preparation and printing would probably consume the time so that we would have to come back after eating and could act upon this finally around seven-thirty to eight o'clock. The bill requests an increase in capital stock from \$50,000 to \$150,000. I now offer the bill.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Williams, presents a bill and requests unanimous consent for its introduction. The Clerk will read the title.

The **CLERK**: Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Maine Development Credit Corporation of Maine."

The **SPEAKER**: Is there objection to the introduction of the bill? The Chair hears none and the bill has been received.

The gentleman from Auburn, Mr.

Williams, moves now that the rules be suspended in order that the bill may be given its first reading at this time without reference to a committee. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the bill was given its two several readings; and on motion by the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. House, under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its third reading and was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

The following bills on their passage to be enacted were taken up out of order.

**Passed to be Enacted
Emergency Measure**

An Act relating to Elderly Teachers' Pensions (H. P. 2125) (L. D. 1625)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of the entire elected membership of the House being necessary, a division was had. One hundred thirty-three 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.

Emergency Measure

An Act to Appropriate Monies to Supplement Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and to Appropriate Monies for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1950. (H. P. 2129) (L. D. 1629)

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

Passed to be Enacted

An Act to Appropriate Monies to Supplement Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Govern-

ment and to Appropriate Monies for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1951 (H. P. 2130) (L. D. 1630)

Was 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.

At this point, the House voted to take up out of order three papers just received from the Senate.

From the Senate: The following Orders:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that there be paid to the clerks and clerical assistants of committees the amounts included in lists certified to the State Controller by the several Committee Chairmen and bearing the approval of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. (S. P. 716)

Came from the Senate, in that body read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

ORDERED, the House concurring, that there be paid to the officers of the Senate and House of Representatives for salaries for this Special Session, the amounts included in lists certified to the State Controller by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, respectively, subject to the approval of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. (S. P. 717)

Came from the Senate, in that body read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

ORDERED, the House concurring, that there be paid to the Chaplains of the Senate and House of Representatives, for this Special Session, the sum of five dollars per diem, in lists certified to the State Controller by the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House, respectively. (S. P. 718)

Came from the Senate, in that body read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

House at Ease

Called to order by the Speaker.

On motion by Mr. Burgess of Limestone, recessed until 7:30 P. M.

After Recess—7:30 P. M.

Called to order by the Speaker.

At this point, out of order and under suspension of the rules, the House voted to take up a bill on its passage to be enacted.

Bill on Its Passage to be Enacted

An Act to Amend the Charter of the Development Credit Corporation of Maine (H. P. 2133)

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

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Palmyra, Mr. Millett.

Mr. **MILLETT**: Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be tabled until later in the day.

The **SPEAKER**: The motion before the House is that of the gentleman from Palmyra, Mr. Millett, that Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Development Credit Corporation of Maine" lie upon the table until later in the day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Paris, Mr. Eastman.

Mr. **EASTMAN**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I move that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning. The reason for my making this motion is that—

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair will state for the benefit of the member that the motion is not debatable at this time. The gentleman from Paris, Mr. Eastman, moves that the House do adjourn until Thursday, February 9th, at 10:00 A. M.

Mr. **CHAPMAN**: Mr. Speaker—

The **SPEAKER**: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. **CHAPMAN**: For unanimous consent to address the House, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair will state the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. **CHAPMAN**: Mr. Speaker, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may if he cares to.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire as to whether or not it is not in order to address the House if unanimous consent is given even though the gentleman's motion is pending.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that it is the understanding of the Chair the motion to adjourn must be put without debate. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. CHAPMAN: It does, Mr. Speaker, except that debate was not intended. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The motion be-

fore the House is that of the gentleman from Paris, Mr. Eastman, that the House do now adjourn until 10:00 A. M., Thursday, February 9, 1950.

As many as are in favor of the motion to adjourn until Thursday, February 9th, at 10:00 A. M., will kindly rise and remain standing until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Eighty-five having voted in the affirmative and eighteen having voted in the negative, the House stands adjourned until Thursday, February 9th, at 10:00 A. M.