

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

Ninety-Fifth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1951

**DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

SENATE

Wednesday, March 21, 1951.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Robert Brackley of Hallowell.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

From the House

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating the Bangor Recreation Center." (H. P. 1320) (L. D. 933) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1656) (L. D. 1217) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence, and the bill in new draft read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Relating to Full-time Supervisors," (H. P. 817) (L. D. 493) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on "Resolve, Closing all Tributaries of Big Spencer Pond to all Fishing," (H. P. 1227) (L. D. 781) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Regulating Fishing in St. Georges and Little Saint Georges Lakes in the County of Waldo," (H. P. 574) (L. D. 381) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Regulating Fishing in Fifth Debsconeag Lake, in the County of Piscataquis," (H. P. 564) (L. D. 301) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Closing Chemquasabamticook Lake, Piscataquis County, to Ice Fishing," (H. P. 151) (L. D. 134) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence, the bill and resolves read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Bill "An Act Relating to Transportation of Fish from Moosehead Lake." (H. P. 1649) (L. D. 1219)

Which was referred to the Committee on Inland Fisheries in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Regulating Closing-Out Sales, So-Called, and Similar Types of Sales." (H. P. 1650) (L. D. 1220)

Bill "An Act Relating to Certain Structures Used by the Public as Spectators." (H. P. 1651) (L. D. 1221) Bill "An Act to Create Town of Owl's Head School District." (H. P. 1652) (L. D. 1222)

Which were severally referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Re-Establishing Prohibition for the Duration of the Emergency." (H. P. 1653) (L. D. 1223)

Which was referred to the Committee on Liquor Control in concurrence.

Referred to Committee

The following resolve was received, and on recommendation by the Committee on Reference of Bills, was referred to the following committee:

Appropriations and Financial Affairs

Mr. Palmer of Lincoln presented "Resolve for Indexing and Filing Old Probate Records." (S. P. 513)

(Ordered printed.)

Sent down for concurrence.

First Reading of a Printed Bill

Bill "An Act Relating to Open Time on Rabbits in Somerset County." (S. P. 507) (L. D. 1218)

Which was read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. Wight from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on "Resolve Relating to Daily Bag Limit of Certain Fish in Portion of Kennebec River, Somerset County," (S. P. 334) (L. D. 750) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Relating to Daily Bag Limit of Certain Fish in Spencer Lake, Somerset County," (S. P. 335) (L. D. 751) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Smart from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Weight of Catch of Certain Fish." (S. P. 232) (L. D. 503) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Barnes from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relat-

ing to Powers of the Housing Authority of Presque Isle," (S. P. 271) (L. D. 610) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted, and the bills and resolves read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Relating to Incurable Inmates in Reformatory for Men." (H. P. 403) (L. D. 247)

Bill "An Act to Authorize Savings Banks to Invest in the Stock of Insurance Companies." (H. P. 1402) (L. D. 1013)

Which were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Clerical Assistance for Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court." (S. P. 154) (L. D. 329)

Bill "An Act Relating to Compensation of Justices of the Supreme Judicial and the Superior Courts Upon Retirement." (S. P. 155) (L. D. 328)

Bill "An Act Authorizing the Trustees of the University of Maine to Operate a College of Medicine." (S. P. 268) (L. D. 607)

Bill "An Act Relating to Interest of Madawaska Territory School Fund." (S. P. 291) (L. D. 650)

"Resolve Appropriating Moneys for Replacement and Conversion of Certain Elevators at the Bangor State Hospital." (S. P. 293) (L. D. 652)

Which were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Anticipated Overdrafts in the Department of Labor and Industry Due to Insufficient Appropriations." (S. P. 266) (L. D. 605)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Superintending School Committee of the Town of Houlton." (S. P. 309) (L. D. 660)

Which were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed, as amended.

Sent down for concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: It has been called to the attention of the Chair

by the Senator from Franklin, Senator Crosby, that we have with us today the senior class of Farmington High School with their instructor and also the Problems of Democracy class from Lincoln Academy and their instructor.

It is always a pleasure to have these classes with us, and we hope that the session this morning will be of interest. In behalf of the Senate, the Chair welcomes these young people.

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Noyes of Hancock, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report "Ought to Pass as amended by Committee Amendment A" from the Committee on Legal Affairs on bill, An Act Relating to Lucerne-in-Maine Village Corporation (H. P. 537) (L. D. 296) tabled by that Senator on February 22 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the report was accepted in concurrence, the bill was given its first reading, Committee Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditure of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1952 and June 30, 1953 (S. P. 495) (L. D. 1196) tabled by that Senator on March 20 pending assignment for second reading.

Mr. CROSBY of Franklin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would suggest as a method of procedure this morning that if there are any further amendments to be attached to this bill, that they be present at this time and then be tabled so that we may take them up together, amendment by amendment, after all have been presented.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President, I present Senate Amendment G which deals with the Department of Labor and Industry and move its passage. In accordance with the suggestion of Sena-

tor Crosby, I further move that it be laid upon the table.

The Secretary read Senate Amendment G. Senate Amendment G to L. D. 1196: "Amend said bill by striking out that part which relates to 'Labor and Industry, Department of' and inserting in place thereof the following: 'Labor and Industry, Department of. Departmental Operations. \$63,200—\$63,071.' "

Thereupon, Senate Amendment G was laid upon the table pending consideration.

Mr. Haskell of Penobscot presented Senate Amendment H and moved its adoption, and further moved that it be laid upon the table. The Secretary read Senate Amendment H: Senate Amendment H to L. D. 1196. "Amend said bill by inserting in proper alphabetical order the following: 'Reclassification of State Employees. \$300,000—\$300,000.' "

Thereupon, Senate Amendment H was laid upon the table pending consideration.

Mr. Palmer of Lincoln presented Senate Amendment I and moved its adoption. The Secretary read Senate Amendment I: Senate Amendment I to L. D. 1196. "Amend said bill by striking out that part which relates to Maine Maritime Academy and inserting in place thereof the following 'Maine Maritime Academy \$75,000—\$75,000.' "

Thereupon, Senate Amendment I was laid upon the table pending consideration.

Mr. CROSBY of Franklin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, if there are no further amendments to be presented at this time, I would move that the Senate take from the table the 35th tabled matter.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment C. to S. P. 495, L. D. 1196 tabled by that Senator on March 20 pending consideration.

Mr. CROSBY: Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adopt Senate Amendment C.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, I do not have my bill here this morning. Before voting, I would like a little more information about this amendment. I know nothing about it myself and request that Senator Crosby or some other

Senator inform me what the amendment is and what it does. I understand it is an increase of some five thousand dollars and I would like to know more about it before I vote.

Mr. CROSBY of Franklin: Mr. President, on the Forestry Appropriation bill there was an item set up for twenty thousand dollars for white pine blister rust, which was more than the department asked for. At the same time, the amount asked for the small woodland owner was cut down I believe to \$15,000. This amendment takes from the white pine blister rust, five thousand dollars and takes five thousand dollars in addition to the total appropriation and sets it up under small woodland owners. This is done because of the fact that they are very anxious to carry out the small woodland owner program.

Every dollar is matched by the federal government and up to the present time they have two men assigned to that work which takes in but a small part of the western part of the state. With this change it will enable them to pretty nearly take care of the entire state. It carries an additional five thousand over the entire department.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, this item was presented to the Appropriations Committee and when this legislature starts to deliberate on five thousand dollar items after they have been considered by the Appropriations Committee, we are cutting things pretty fine. This is not a new item. We have had it before the legislature for the past two or three sessions. We have given it consideration and I notice that in the new appropriation bill it is five thousand dollars more than the budget document recommended, and ten thousand more than two years ago. I am not arguing the merits of the bill so much, but I do wish to point out that when this Senate begins to get down into five thousand dollar items in questions which have been considered thoroughly by the proper committee, we are going to become involved in matters which we should not be considering.

Thereupon, a viva voce vote being doubted by the Chair

A division of the Senate was had. Fifteen having voted in the affirmative and thirteen opposed, the motion of the Senator from Franklin, Senator Crosby prevailed, and Senate Amendment C was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Fuller of Oxford, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment B to L. D. 1196 tabled by that Senator on March 20 pending consideration.

Mr. FULLER of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this amendment calls for an additional appropriation of \$1,197,115 for the first year of the biennium and \$1,185,615 for the second year of the biennium and a transfer from the school census figure in the appropriation bill to the item for general purpose educational aid. The adoption of this amendment would provide that the state would pay in full the subsidy provisions of L. D. 551 which is now on the table in the Senate.

It should be understood that it calls for a transfer of a fifth item or a fifth existing law on our state subsidy books, that which pays a three dollar per capita amount to each town for the number of registered pupils in the town and would be in addition to the four subsidy laws relating to tuition, teaching positions, equalization and conveyance which L. D. 551 proposes to repeal.

By making this transfer, in order that all towns be paid a subsidy equal to the 1950 subsidy it would be necessary to amend the proposed subsidy law to the extent that a ceiling be placed upon the amount which the towns that would receive an increased subsidy should be paid.

With this amendment and the proposed amendment to the subsidy bill, plus the provision that no town should receive less than it received in 1950 it would be possible to pay a hundred cents on a dollar.

I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, in support of the motion of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Fuller, I would like to take just a moment to explain L. D. 551 briefly. It seems to me that those of us who are interested in education, if

we are honest with ourselves, believe in equalization. Sometimes through force of circumstances, some of us, come from towns that fortunately have a lot more valuation and L. D. 551 is based entirely upon that. It is definitely an equalization proposition. For example, the formula is figured on the amount of taxable valuation behind each public school student in the municipality.

By looking at the formula we have nine classifications of subsidies. The poor town with fifteen thousand dollar valuation behind each student receives 65% of its educational cost. My own town falls in classification nine which is the least amount of subsidy for its students.

I think, as I said before, we all should be deeply concerned about every student in Maine having the same educational opportunities that other students have. I think this formula certainly supplements our old formula and gives us a better means of determining how much subsidy each town should have and it certainly is very fair. The old formula is antiquated and outdated. It is hard to determine the amount of subsidy a town should receive. Whereas the new formula is simplified.

I don't like repetition but as Senator Noyes told you last week the State of Maine participates in the form of subsidies to the towns for education to the tune of 22% and other states participate 45%. In other words, Maine only subsidizes education to towns by fifty percent of the extent the rest of the nation sees fit to do. Without the amendment we would drop back to 18% subsidy in education while other current legislatures are upping theirs. New York has added thirty million dollars to its subsidy. It is quite safe to say that the other 47 states will reach approximately fifty percent participation whereas in Maine we will be about 18% or a third as much as the rest of the nation. If my good colleague, Senator Fuller's amendment passes, it will raise Maine from 22% to possibly 25 or 26% which is still approximately half what the rest of the nation sees fit to do.

I sincerely hope the motion of Senator Fuller will prevail.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President, in answer to Mr. Fuller's amendment I would say to the Senate that it merely puts back, so to speak, what we felt we were doing to hold the line. There is a limit to what we as individuals can afford for the necessities of life and I submit to you the same is true of Education, Health and Welfare and other things. The state's business is exactly the same as the individual except that there are more people involved and more money.

Now, if you want to compare what the state of Maine is doing, with what New York and other states are doing in education, I think it is a very unfair comparison in that we have a small population. I don't think the time will ever come when we can meet the payrolls other states give, and over and above that, on our ability to pay you will find that Maine is doing much better than other states.

We made this cut by doing just exactly what was suggested in that we turned some of these functions back to the local level. We feel that we are in the financial situation we are in today by first, matching federal dollars in Health and Welfare, and secondly by state subsidization on the local level.

We have no quarrel with plan eight. Personally I think it is a much simpler formula to arrive at what each community will receive but by the same token there are a lot of discrepancies in this method of figures.

For instance, I had occasion to check one plantation in my county who under this—and mind you, this plantation has money in the bank, is very happy in what they are doing and they are doing a good job—yet I think the percentage of increase they got back was 902%. I think that was the highest. We had another of 208% where the same thing existed. What the plan does in many cases is to take from the bigger cities the money and then in turn gives it back to them. I argue to you that there are many places which, if left alone, would take care of their own education problems and do it

on the same or a better level than is being done today. I won't argue that there are places that shouldn't be subsidized. There are. I want to tell you that Plan No. 8 is not the ideal thing. It is an improvement and the thought of the Appropriations Committee was that we were simply trying to hold the line and not let it get built up to the point where we would have to dump the whole thing and nobody would get anything.

When you vote on these recommendations—we don't agree entirely in the committee on what should or should not be done—but with the thought that we are under controlled economy and we don't know just what we are facing, I still feel we should continue in the way that we know what we can carry rather than get top heavy and eventually not have enough money to do even what we are doing today.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I was absolutely floored in trying to understand the psychology of holding the line. Certainly the people of the State of Maine did not hold the line on having the number of children who are going to our schools. The national average and the state average show that we are having more and more children pour into our grammar schools and work through to the higher classes until our high schools and our colleges will be crowded with the influx of children who have arrived because of the second world war.

To "hold the line" is completely unrealistic. Furthermore I think that if we will really analyze it in our own hearts, get away from the dollars and cents, probably we will realize that there is no money, not one dollar spent which gives the return to the state or to the nation as the money that is spent in education.

Maine, for years, has been backward in the amount of money she has given to education. Although Maine has turned out thousands of wonderful people, people who have been leaders in the country, still we have a reputation outside of the state as being a bunch of hicks. In

New York, just let one of us get into a traffic jam and they say "Go back to Maine—go back to the sticks" and they let us go. We have the reputation of being hicks because of the fact that we in this state are not educating the rank and file of our children in a way which will make them cosmopolitan people. We are not giving them the education here in Maine that they could get in other states. In appropriating the money that will go along with this bill 551 as called for in this amendment we are taking simply a short step toward giving the children of Maine the educational opportunity that they could have if they lived in another state.

I certainly hope that when the vote is taken Senator Fuller's motion will be supported.

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, as a junior member of the Appropriations Committee, it seems to me that the vote on this particular question may settle the vote on many others. Personally I would like to see the amount of money now being spent for the public assistance program, spent for education, and the amount spent for education spent on the public assistance program, if that were possible. It seems an indictment on a democratic, sovereign community to find it necessary to spend almost half of its available funds for a public assistance program with or without federal support.

The appropriation bill was a good bill. The appropriation report was a good report. I think we make no mistake about that. There was some philosophy behind it, some real fortitude behind the report whether or not you agree with it. The thinking of the committee or at least a majority of its members, —naturally we did not all agree— but I think every member who signed that report realized that it would never survive in the form in which it was brought into the Senate, but the thinking of a majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee as I listened to them, was the thinking of a large number of people in Maine and in the rest of the country, who have the honest feeling that the Government of the United States

and to some extent perhaps the Government of Maine is headed in the wrong direction.

We cannot solve in the state of Maine all of our problems independent of the federal government. The federal government has a financial straight jacket on the State of Maine and many other states.

I have received some figures from the Budget Commissioner and the Finance Commissioner, the total number of dollars, year by year, which the federal government extracts from the taxpayers of Maine. In 1949 the figure was \$117,543,000. Bear in mind that during the same year, for general fund purposes at least, or expenditures, the State of Maine was having difficulty in getting along with a figure of thirty million.

In 1948 the number of dollars extracted from the taxpayers by the federal government was \$130,747,000. In 1947 it was \$124,220,000. In 1946 it was \$135,159,000. In 1945, \$150 million. In 1944, \$147,000,000. Beyond those years it was less. That is the more recent period. In 1941 the general fund of the state of Maine was 17 million dollars and in 1950 it was 32 million—almost double.

Now, to me, what this all adds up to is this: We are reaching a point in this country where the government is getting so big that necessarily the people are getting smaller because I am firmly convinced that the bigger the government, the smaller the people and the smaller the government, the bigger the people. And it is only a question of how far we can go before we quietly pass away from the democratic form of government which we know in a constitutional and traditional sense. We face in this country what we call hardships. Our whole Health and Welfare program is directed at the alleviation of hardship. We anticipate that we will all have to go through hardships in the next decade, government and people alike.

Let me give you, if you will permit me for just a moment, a little history and see where we really are and how far we can afford to go.

I hope you will bear with me if I seem to leave the gist of the argu-

ment for just a moment, but I assure you I intend to make a point. According to scientists, the world in which we live is about two billion years old. Quite a long time. That is not particularly a material fact, except that civilization began only about six or eight thousand years ago and that civilization was a very primitive one. From that time until a few hundred years ago, civilizations of various sorts were springing throughout the world. They became prosperous and then they faded away. 330 years ago a small group of people landed on Plymouth Rock and that small group of people have grown to 150 million people. In the rest of the world there are 2150 million people as against 150 million in the United States of America. Those 2150 millions of people have lived thousands of years, not just 330. This small group of people who grew to 150 million and now represent the United States of America, produce now more than one half of all goods produced in the entire world, and we started only 330 years ago.

We did not do that merely because we happened to have a lot of fine natural resources. There are just as many natural resources in China, Russia, and middle Europe, and they have had centuries in which to develop while we have had 330 years. The reason we got so far ahead was because our forefathers devised a strong form of government which protected the individual and allowed for free enterprise and freedom to go ahead and to profit by going ahead. In my humble judgment, the large factor, what I just got through saying, is namely that we are producing with our 150 million people, more than half what the other 2150 million people are producing and they have had centuries to develop, but have failed to do so.

Even today, we have a pretty good object lesson in England as to what can happen to a society of people who begin to regulate and regiment to such an extent that there is a discouragement of individual initiative and a corresponding depreciation of freedom. We are beginning to feel the pinch now by the federal government. There have been many remarks by the Senators in the course of these

debates that indicate a rancor because the federal government has strings tied to the money which it dangled before us. Actually it isn't federal government money at all. It came from Maine, went to the federal government and was sent back to us with strings.

Our difficulty in Maine today is not primarily through any bad government here in the State of Maine, it is because of bad government in Washington and the necessity for Washington to make these extraordinary demands on a poor state and take this money out of the state. What should be done is that this \$130,000,000 extracted from the people of Maine in 1948 ought to be the amount of money that the state of Maine has to spend for itself the way it wants to spend it and the 3 million dollars we struggle with ought to be the amount going to the federal government. As a matter of fact if the government of the United States would act as a collection agent for just ten percent of what it takes from the State of Maine and give it back to us we wouldn't have to pass any new taxes.

I think that as we go along here we are bound to divide ourselves up into two separate camps, those who believe that although hardships will result, we have got to put a stop to expanding government, whether it be federal or state and the only reason for putting a stop on state government expansion is because we are so harassed by the federal government that we have no alternative. I think the camps will be divided into those who think that at the state level we can afford to continue a subsidy program whether it is for education or health and welfare which add up to a large percentage of the total available funds, can continue this program that imposes upon the people of Maine more taxes than they already pay. Our state taxes certainly are not excessive but if you combine them with the amount of taxes imposed by the federal government, and you have got to consider both from the point of view of the taxpayer, they are quite oppressive.

If you think that with the combination of federal and state taxes, that the taxpayers of the state of

Maine can afford to pay another five, ten or fifteen million dollars a year depending on how extensively you believe this program should be followed, I would not quarrel with you but I have grave doubts that we can afford it. I think the accusatory finger should be directed where it belongs and that is Washington.

I paid a substantial tax to the federal government on March 15th and I didn't mind the amount of it at all. What I objected to was the recipient. I would even have been glad if I could have paid the same amount of tax or even more, if I could pay 25% to the federal government, 25% to the state and 50% to the community where I live. We are not allowed to do that. We are compelled to pay 90% of our taxes to the federal government and sit back and watch them spend it in a way of which we do not approve, no matter whether it is spent in another state or comes back here to be spent through their design in the state of Maine. In Health and Welfare, as in Education, we always are confronted with the fact that if we lack one dollar we lose at least one and maybe two of federal money. We are hamstrung. We know that if we do this and lose three dollars for one, the burden goes back to the cities and towns who are already broke and they will have less money to comply with the program.

I think to add it all up I would have signed either one of the two reports if they had been sent from the appropriations committee, simply to get this matter on the floor of the Senate. I think the Appropriations bill is a good one because it stands for a proposition that we cannot afford to go any further in government control than we have now gone. That is a good point to make. We complained about hardships in this country and in one breath tell the world we have the highest standard of living in the world, and we do. I don't believe we can legislate Utopia. In fact, I am sure we can't. I don't think there will ever be a Utopia on earth. The danger of trying to reach it by the nearest road and with all possible speed is doing it by centralized government. In the effort to reach this Utopia by such means we will find that we

will lose from our democracy that which makes it grow so fast.

If we need an object lesson, we need only look at Washington. If any government with a constitutional and traditional sense of democracy took the same path that Washington seems to have taken the last 15 years, certainly no one would call it a democratic government in a historical or constitutional sense. As many hardships as we feel we are now suffering throughout the land, they are not hardships at all in comparison to what is going on in almost every other country in the world. There are millions of Chinese people starving, millions of Russians starving to death who have nothing. There are hundreds of thousands of English people who have only a pound of meat a week. Many of the formerly well to do English people are no better off today than many of our citizens who are almost in the pauper class. The hardships we know in this country today are hardships only in comparison with conditions in our own country, they are not hardships in comparison with conditions as they exist in every other country in the world which doesn't have a democratic form of government.

The only danger that we have is that from those of us who are idealistic and sincere in a desire that everyone shall have as much as the country can possibly offer, not only in necessities of life but in luxuries, because the means of producing that result is via a huge patronizing government, it is all wrong. That government will become something like the government in England and France or Italy with the corresponding fatal result. The one thing we are trying to get by that means we will not only lose but will lose what we have along with it. So I say that the Appropriation bill was a good bill because it gave some of us the opportunity to bring up this one question of how big in a democracy we can afford to let government get. I don't know the answer but I have a very strong, deep and abiding belief that a serious condition exists and we ought to realize it. As I said before, so far as education is concerned the whole future depends on the coming gen-

eration in this country and I personally would like to reverse the amounts of money being spent now, 46 odd percent for public assistance, as in 1949-50, and only 20 odd percent for education. I would like to see them reversed. We are all for spending money for education but the question is, where is the money coming from and how long will the middle group of people who are taxpayers produce it; how long can they stand alone to defray the expenses of the youth on one side of them, the elderly on the other side and ever growing and ever increasing number of people on government payrolls on still another side?

The producing class is narrowing all the time and the non-producing class is growing. There must be a limit to what the traffic can bear.

Mr. President and members of the Senate, these remarks have been rather extended and perhaps ill chosen at this time. I felt they had to be said at some time. I signed the Appropriations committee report with the feelings I have expressed in mind and I hope before we vote for an expenditure of five, ten, or fifteen million dollars, that everyone will give pause and see if under all circumstances we can afford it.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I agree with much that the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Reid, has said and I think that most of the members of this Senate and the people of the State of Maine would also agree with the same sort of philosophy. However, in this particular bill under discussion and this particular amendment which has been offered, I cannot see wherein the people of the State of Maine are going to be taxed any additional dollar or the debt reduced an additional dollar, no matter what action this Senate may take. It is purely a question of the level of government that applies that tax to get that dollar. In other words, as I said here off the record last week, I sincerely believe that the cost of education is a real cost which we cannot dodge.

If we fail to produce the dollars at the state level they must be

made up at the local level. Therefore as individual taxpayers of the State of Maine we are forced to pay the bill, unless we want to go to the point of reducing or lowering our present standard of education, and I feel that few people would agree to that.

It has been said here today that Maine is a poor state. The figures, however, would indicate that Maine is an average state, figuring the income of the State of Maine per capita. The ability to pay today in the State of Maine is as great as the average throughout the nation. It has already been pointed out what is being done nationally for education in the cities and towns from the state level. Senator Reid has certainly put his finger on the trouble. It is with the federal government in Washington. Too many of our tax dollars are being taken out of the State to Washington. I would supplement his figure, however, when he says a hundred and seventeen millions of dollars are being paid to the federal government. If we consider the indirect taxes that Maine pays to Washington we would need to add some forty million dollars to that total.

However, I think we should all realize that a large part of the tax burden we are bearing today is due to the cost of past wars and appropriations for future wars. The figures on the increased cost of federal government since 1939 show that eighty-five percent of the increased cost has been due to war. And that, if you follow history down through the ages, will show that all civilizations, all great nations that have risen and have fallen, and it has been due to war. And war is something over which this Senate has no control.

The amendment we are discussing today is simply a question of whether we choose to pay these costs at the state level or whether we choose to pay at the local level. In the end it makes no real difference from a taxation angle. The difference lies mainly in that your municipalities in Maine, under our tax structure, must derive from property taxation ninety percent of their tax burden. The State has other sources of income, other taxation fields which it may enter, and

the question now is whether or not we are to enter a new field or whether we are to continue the old obsolete form and increase the property tax, whether it be at the state or local level. Thank you very much.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I hesitate to bring the Senate down from the high level of this interesting debate but the amendment we are considering is really an amendment that finances L. D. 551, and with some reluctance I shall vote against the amendment.

My reasons for voting against the amendment are not a dislike of L. D. 551 but are due to my belief in the general theory of the Appropriations Committee that they should not attempt to recommend appropriations substantially above the existing level. I equally oppose the theory of the Appropriations Committee that they will appropriate dollars insufficient by fourteen or fifteen percent to pay to the communities the dollars they have every reason to believe they are going to receive because of existing statutes. I think that is the position taken by the Governor in his inaugural address and budget message, when he indicated that we should either supply the dollars to back up existing statutes or we should repeal or change the statutes.

So, Mr. President and members of the Senate, I find myself in the difficult position of opposing the million, four hundred thousand dollar cut imposed by the bill and opposing the two million, three hundred and eighty-two thousand dollar amendment that would go back into the bill, but I would be equally pleased to vote for an amendment that would put back into the budget the dollars necessary to back up existing laws. Then if those of you who are acquainted with the problems of the towns and the problems of education think that this same number of dollars can be distributed more equitably by a new formula, or new formulae, let's do it a new way.

I think the position of the Appropriations Committee is generally sound in opposing a substantial advance over the present level of

spending. I think this legislature will do a commendable though almost impossible job if we find the dollars to finance existing laws.

Those will be my reasons for voting against the amendment and also for hoping that we have an opportunity to consider an amendment, not for the two million three hundred eighty-two thousand but, if my figures are correct, a million four hundred and eighty-two thousand to bring us up to where we want to be to meet existing laws. I think that is as far as we should go. On the other hand, I do not think we should go below the level that we in the special session found essential to finance a hundred cents on the dollar. That would make sense while this new venture I do not think does.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, to supplement what the Senator from Penobscot has told you I would like to give you my interpretation of this proposed amendment, if it goes through, and what you would be voting for. I will say to the Senator from Penobscot that we are already three hundred thousand dollars short of paying a hundred cents on the dollar of the money we appropriated at the special session to fulfill our contracts.

Under this proposed amendment you would vote for that three hundred thousand dollars and in addition you would vote for the one million and four hundred thousand as the Senator from Penobscot said, or if my figures are correct one million six hundred thousand which we need to hold the line. Under your old laws your subsidies increase each year. Then over and above this one million and six hundred thousand you are also voting one million and seven hundred thousand new subsidies, so in the aggregate when you vote for this amendment remember that you are voting one million and six hundred thousand to put back what your current laws would ask for if we were to pay a hundred cents on the dollar today and you would also put back three hundred thousand that we are already short by existing laws to fulfill our commitments of a hundred cents on the dollar, and over and above that you are

putting in one million and seven hundred thousand additional subsidies to carry on the so-called Plan Eight.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, as the Democratic Party and the administration in Washington have been brought up here yesterday and this morning on the floor of this Senate, I feel as the only Democrat present here this morning, someone ought to answer some of the charges.

Apparently all the financial woes of the State of Maine are due to the Democratic administration for the last 18 years in Washington. It is the apparent thinking of most of the Republican senators in this Senate. I beg to differ with that opinion. I will admit that possibly the woes of the State of Maine are due to the fact that it has remained Republican all these 18 years. There are two schools of thought on that matter. You have expressed one and I am entitled to express the other.

I am glad my very good friend, the Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes was kind enough and truthful enough to bring out the point that if Washington takes a good lot of our money it has done so in preparing for war and preparing defense for future wars, and I want to thank the Senator from Hancock for saying so. If he had not, I would have brought it up.

We are accusing Washington of putting us in a financial strait-jacket, but we are proceeding to do the same thing for the towns and cities of Maine by subsidizing them. I say to you that we are not realistic about this matter. What we are accusing Washington of doing to the State of Maine we are doing and have been doing to our towns and cities of Maine.

You know and I know if we should throw out this whole system, Plan 8, 10, 12, 1, or 2—I don't care what you call it—subsidy to the educational program of Maine, half of your schools in the towns of Maine would be closed shortly. Let's not kid ourselves about these matters. Let's be honest with ourselves. We have got to meet these expenses, and I wish as you do that it was not Washington or the State of

Maine but that they could be brought back home to our local level where they belong. If you want economy, bring it back home. It is where you have economy. If you let the other fellow spend your dollars and cents he will be quite free with them, Mr. President and members of the Senate, but if it is your own money you are spending and you are limited in your earnings you are going to be very, very careful how you spend that money.

I say to you that I am for education all the way down the line but I am not for subsidy. I am against that. I say to you in certain cases we must subsidize small towns; I realize that, but it is a poor principle to do it on a uniform basis throughout the State.

I say to you that most of our towns and certainly all of our cities are able and they should be willing to pay for proper education of their children and they should not ask subsidy from the State of Maine because again they are fooling themselves. I will agree with the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Reid, who says we don't get back all the money we sent to the federal government. Neither will the towns get back all the money they send to the State of Maine for education. I repeat and maintain that we should have education at the local level, and let's pay for it at the local level, if possible, except in extreme cases of small towns who are unable to raise the proper amount of money to keep their schools open.

I therefore think it is very unwise at this time when we are already facing a deficit, to ask for millions of dollars of increased subsidy for our educational system in the State of Maine.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Fuller, that Senate Amendment "B" be adopted.

Mr. FULLER: Mr. President, I ask for a division.

A division of the Senate was had.

Nine having voted in the affirmative and twenty opposed, the amendment was not adopted.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President, is it in order at this time to offer an amendment?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state it is.

Mr. BROGGI: Mr. President, when a general advances he looks in back to see if there is room to retreat in. At this time I propose Senate Amendment "J" to the Educational Program and move its adoption:

The Secretary read Senate Amendment "J":

"Amend said bill by striking out under the part of said bill which relates to 'Education, Department of' the following: 'Subsidies to Cities and Towns: For General Purpose Educational Aid to Cities, Towns, Plantations and Community School Districts 4,570,611 4,570,611. For School Census 555,030 566,530' and inserting in place thereof the following: 'Subsidies to Cities and Towns: For General Purpose Educational Aid to Cities, Towns, Plantations and Community School Districts 5,767,726 5,756,226'."

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President, in explanation of the amendment which was just offered, I would like to say that it gives us status quo on approximately what money is being spent now for education. In spite of the fact that there are 3800 new students now in the public schools of Maine, plus the necessary teachers and the necessary facilities needed to house the students, the Appropriations Committee has recommended a million six hundred thousand dollar cut in the educational subsidy program based on the taxable valuation of each municipality behind each student. The present amendment would merely give a percentage across the board cut of the subsidy proposed in the original L. D. 551. Unless there is objection, and since this is a new amendment, I move that it lie on the table.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, in speaking to the time involved in this question, I would remind the Senator that there would be great merit in deciding this educational issue along with the others. Again on the time, I remind him it would be timely to make quite clear, that we are not judging the merits or demerits of L. D. 551.

Mr. BROGGI: Mr. President, my motion was based on the fact that it was a new amendment and if the Senate is ready for the question, I will withdraw my motion to table.

Thereupon, the motion to table was withdrawn.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President on the spur of the moment I have prepared an amendment to Amendment J and move its adoption:

The Secretary read Senate Amendment A to Senate Amendment J: "Make any increases in section of L. D. 1196 applicable to line 'Total, Department of Education,' rather than to any specific section of the educational appropriation.

Mr. ELA: Mr. President in support of Senate Amendment A to Senate Amendment J I would call to the attention of the Senate that L. D. 551 has not been acted upon by the legislature. There is no reason to say that it will or will not be adopted. I think it is presumption for this Senate to indicate in advance of the acceptance or rejection of legislation, that money should be applied to a specific bill which is at best controversial.

This amendment will apply any change which the Senators suggest to the total available to the department, if it is the proper agency. Then they can later allocate to each section of the requirements of the Department of Education, the proper amount.

Mr. BROGGI: Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the Senator from Somerset if I inferred that the appropriation of the subsidy plan would affect any document that has not passed this body. Obviously under existing statutes if L. D. 551 does not pass this legislature it would be distributed by the old vehicle, the old McKinnon Law.

Mr. MCKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President, I rise for information. I would like to ask Senator Brewer if that particular item in the appropriation bill does not specifically state that it is to finance four certain subsidies as provided in the present law?

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: In reply to Senator Ela, I would say it was with that thought in mind but there was a little confusion, as

I stated the other day. There was quite a lot of discussion when we discovered we did not have the Plan 8 bill which was in Education so there was nothing we could do about it. Those figures we submitted would be our recommendation as to the amount to be spent provided plan 8, L. D. 551 was recommended by the appropriations committee.

The PRESIDENT: For the information of the Senate, there is a footnote on the back page of the appropriations report which relates to the particular item in discussion and to the appropriation committee's feeling in the matter.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, now I am confused. As I have understood the committee report, specific recommendations were made for various purposes and we are dealing with the one for general purpose aid to cities, towns, plantations and community school districts. As I understand Senator Broggi's amendment it would change the figure to up it about a million two hundred thousand dollars to take care of existing commitments. The Senator from Somerset has introduced an amendment to say that item shall float around among the various other 12 or 15 other items in Education and I don't see any sense to it. I think to keep it clear and try to keep us all from getting confused, we had better deal with each item as it appears and not adopt that amendment.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, I am not trying to confuse the issue, I am trying to simplify it. If we have to, one after another consider thirty or forty legislative documents which are each in themselves a subject for considerable debate and come to some conclusion on this appropriations bill, it seems to me we would prolong the debate tremendously.

If my amendment prevails it would not change the amount at all, but in case L. D. 551, we will say, should not pass, the amount could be allocated to the subsidy program which we now have or to some other subsidy program which by amendment or otherwise might become a law of this state.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion

of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Ela, that the Senate adopt Senate Amendment A to Senate Amendment J.

A viva voce vote being doubted by the Chair

A division of the Senate was had.

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

The PRESIDENT: The question now before the Senate is on the adoption of Senate Amendment J.

A viva voce vote being had, Senate Amendment J was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Greeley of Waldo, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment "D" to Bill, An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditure of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1952, and June 30, 1953 (S. P. 495) (L. D. 1196), tabled by that Senator on March 20th pending consideration.

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, we are debating an appropriation bill, so I will try to confine my remarks entirely to dollars and cents. This amendment applies to three items in the Appropriation bill, the item in regard to State hospital aid, the item in regard to general relief—support of paupers, and the item in regard to aid for dependent children.

I'd like to speak first in regard to Aid to Hospitals. The expenses in hospitals have been increasing. I believe the figure reported is \$12 a day on the average. Under the appropriation we had in the last biennium or in the year that ended July 1st, 1950 the State was able to pay only \$4.53 a day. Because of that two of the larger hospitals in the State refused to accept any but emergency patients. One cut cases down 22% and the other 14%. This amendment replaces or restores one million dollars for each year of the biennium. This would make possible the payment of \$8.25 a day to the hospitals. It would still leave them short \$3.75 of their actual cost as they estimated it. The amount of \$750,000 contained in the Appropriation bill would make possible the payment of \$5.75 which is less than half of what the hospitals claim is their actual cost. The result would inevitably be that

hospitals would continue to accept nothing but emergency cases and the expense of other cases would immediately come back on the towns.

You have heard in recent legislatures the expression "I come from a little town." That applies to my case exactly and I am speaking in favor of the small towns. These hospital cases usually involve a considerable amount of money. In the case of a town where there is only \$250,000 valuation a bill of \$250 means a mill on the tax rate. These cases are something a town cannot anticipate. They come unexpectedly. Many of them are emergency cases and if there is no State hospital aid for them it seriously affects the financial condition of our little towns. That is the sole reason for offering the amendment and it is a matter of dollars and cents for our little towns.

In regard to direct relief or what we call Support of State Paupers, our State law places upon municipal officers of a town the responsibility of relieving the distress of anyone who finds himself in need. Under our present law a person who has remained in a town, or who has not remained in a town five years without aid is supposed to have a settlement in some other town or falls back upon the State. That is our present law and I am speaking in terms of the present law and I think we should consider our appropriation in terms of the present law. There has been talk in various quarters and perhaps you may have heard it proposed that the term of settlement be changed from five years to one year, but as far as I know, there is no bill before this legislature providing for any such change as that. For that reason I think we must continue our discussion in the light of the present law.

The Appropriation bill cuts the appropriation practically \$400,000 less than has actually been expended in the year ending July 1st, 1950. Approximately \$1,000,000 has been spent. The Appropriations bill calls for \$600,000.

I would also remind you that our State law places upon municipal officers the obligation of taking care of the State paupers from the

town treasury. It also provides that the town shall be reimbursed. Notice it says "shall be reimbursed", by the State. I know of no reason for estimating that our cost for State paupers will decrease almost a half in the next biennium. Possibly a few may go back to work but we will still have the defectives, the mentally defectives. We will still have aliens over 80 years of age who are not eligible for old age assistance. You must remember the cost of living is increasing. If the town buys food, clothing and fuel it is going to cost more. I can assure you if this Appropriation bill goes through the money will be exhausted before the year is over and you will find that towns will have to come to the next legislature, two years hence, with claims and you will have a flock of claims coming into the legislature at that time. So let's consider the facts as they exist and not kid ourselves by wishful thinking.

The third item is the item in regard to dependent children. The Appropriation bill as presented makes a considerable cut in the request of the department. The amendment restores the amount \$1,200,000 for the first year of the biennium and \$1,260,000 for the second year of the biennium. The cut made by the Appropriation Committee was based on the premise that the Department could cut out all aid to children where there was a desertion involved or divorce involved or legal separation. It also was based on the premise that we could give up federal funds to the amount of \$1,200,000 for the biennium. I would remind you that we have been told here today that \$1,200,000 is our money. Our state taxes are coming out of our towns. This is simply a little of the money that might come back.

Now, remembering the figure of 1700 cases, I would like to have you follow me in a few figures. These figures do not come from the Department. They are based somewhat on estimates for the Department. The figure of 1700 cases was an estimate made by the Commissioner. I know of no one in the State who would be in a position to question that estimate. This little leaflet, the report of the Department of Health and Welfare,

gives the number of cases in December, last December. It gives the grant, the average grant, and gives the amount per person. We had 4311 Aid to Dependent Children cases. I call to your attention that 1700 cases is approximately 40%. The average amount per family was \$73.91. The average amount per person was \$21.12. I wonder if people who consider those grants too large would consider feeding and clothing a 14 year old growing boy on less than five dollars a week—\$260 a year.

Here are the figures I would like to have you follow with me. I hope you will follow them as carefully as you can. Of the 1700 cases I took the average grant and multiplied by the 12 months in a year. You notice I said the 1700 cases was 40%. I consider it only a fair estimate to say the average grant for 4311 cases would apply to the 1700 cases. Multiplying \$73.91 by 1700 and multiplying that result by 12 you have a cost of \$1,507,764 per year, approximately a million and a half dollars, and a little over three million dollars for the biennium.

Now, here is something that is an important thing to remember. The Commissioner estimates that inside of three months if these cases were stricken off the rolls they would be applying for direct relief through the municipal officers and the burden would be coming back on the towns and the state. He also goes on and estimates that one third of those will become state paupers and two thirds will become town paupers.

Suppose of the \$1,500,000 we take 80%, we will have \$1,206,216—practically a million two hundred thousand dollars. Now, under our present grant, Aid for Dependent Children, the town pays 18%. There is a bill before the legislature which would cut it to 15%. The State pays 22% and the balance is paid by the federal government. Now, take that approximately \$1,500,000, the cost of those 1700 cases at the present time and multiply it by 18% and you will get a figure of \$271,397 which it is costing the towns at the present time to care for 1700 cases. Multiply that million and a half plus by 22% and you will get \$331,708, what it is costing the State to care

for those people. Now, follow this: of the 80% to be returned to the towns and state, \$1,200,000 - one third on the state would be \$402,070, and two thirds on the town or \$804,140. Now you see what will happen. By putting \$402,000 back on the state they will become state paupers. I am trying to say that the appropriation of \$600,00 is entirely inadequate to take care of the requirements in this field.

I would also call to your attention that those children under Aid to Dependent Children are costing the State now \$331,000. If they go on direct relief it will cost the State \$402,070 more.

In cutting this appropriation you are not saving the State money because there is a very strong possibility—I will make it stronger than that and say there is a very strong probability that it will cost the State more money, and at the same time you are putting back an additional burden of \$542,795 on the towns. That is the thought I want to leave with you. If you cut this Aid to Dependent Children grant you are not saving anything for the State. You are putting a million dollars expense on the towns a biennium. \$200,000 in federal money would be going back to our towns, to our grocery stores and to pay rent. I think that is something to be considered.

Don't take my figures. Follow them through yourselves. I think we should consider the facts as they are and not make it necessary for our towns to be coming in here to the legislature two years from now with a flock of claims for paupers. I am afraid if we don't do this, when the towns realize the impact of this matter on them we will need to be prepared with a lot of explanations when we go home.

I hope you will give this matter consideration. It is a matter of dollars and cents.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President, after listening to the pros and cons of this matter before us I want to make one observation: The cost of \$12.00 per day of our hospitals for patients is out of reason. It shows the money is not going for the care of our unfortunate citizens. There is not a member of our present legislature, with

the opportunities we have of spending money, our moral obligations to spend a few dollars, who is under the expense of \$12 per day. As far as old age assistance and aid to dependent children go, as increasing in the next two years, I certainly think it will if the State has its say about it.

Mr. PALMER of Lincoln: Mr. President, I just arise for a little information. I am wondering when the vote is taken on this particular amendment if we are going to vote for the three as one, or can we vote separately on these items?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that Senate Amendment "D" goes to the entire appropriation for the Health and Welfare Department.

Mr. PALMER: Mr. President, is there any way of breaking it down?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that amendments to the amendment are in order before adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick, and to the other Senators, the history of spiraling costs in some of these accounts is very interesting. We will take for instance your hospital fund, State Aid for Hospitals. Four years ago I sat on the Appropriations Committee. This amount was \$228,000. Being especially interested in the problem and feeling that possibly the State wasn't doing her share as regards the people committed to these institutions, this sum of \$228,000 was increased to \$578,000, but we find it still isn't enough. There still is a crying need for more. The question might be asked why aren't we willing to pay the full cost? I can only say we must be realistic. We realize the hospitals are in a serious condition, and to my knowledge there isn't a hospital in the United States, at any rate on the Atlantic seaboard, that is self supporting. I think that Cornell Medical Center, a new hospital, is about \$8,000,000 behind. But if we paid the full cost—I hate to use the expression—but I can think of no account that would be a more difficult rat hole to try to block than this particular account. If the hospitals could receive their full amount for these patients, and I

say it is a pathetic situation, but I don't think there would be room for the average person to get into such a hospital. In fact, the situation is arising that unless you are a state ward or a wealthy person you cannot afford the services you should have today. I may be brutal in my explanation but I am only trying to be realistic and point out to you that this is one—what shall we call it—abuse, and we cannot hope to pay the total cost. They asked for a million dollars and the Governor recommended a million dollars, but we cut it to \$750,000.

I feel the answer to the hospital problem, as I have told many people, it has always seemed to me to be pitiful that a few people in the community had to bump themselves against a stone wall trying to maintain a hospital. But I do feel the hospitals, the doctors, and the Health and Welfare Department have not had the full cooperation they should have had, and if they did they would not be in the financial condition they are today.

In many cases the Health and Welfare Department will find a patient has been committed—I know one hospital had a bill of \$1500 and another \$4000 before it was discovered the patient was in there. So I say to you, as painful as it is, the hospitals are everybody's business, not only the town that maintains the hospital, but also the surrounding towns that use the facilities of these institutions. The sooner they decide it is their business and contribute their proportionate share and the sooner the hospitals take a stand and say it must be done, I think the better off everyone will be. I don't think it is necessarily up to the State to finance it.

As regards divorces and desertions—we cut \$300,000 on divorces and \$180,000 on desertions. The thought was that this was matching federal funds. In the history of the Health and Welfare Department I like to cite 1918 and start with the appropriation of \$35,000. Today they are expending at the rate of \$18,000,000 with federal funds and projected in two years to \$20,000,000, but gentlemen, we have not been able to raise funds to match federal funds to do this

work. We feel this is one of the reasons we are in the financial crisis we have arrived at today. Naturally, we want to take care of widows and orphans, but by the same token there isn't anybody here who doesn't know that this has been built up to such an attractive figure that today in many cases there is no incentive for a man with a family to live with them and take care of them or even attempt to. There is nothing to prevent him living with them and our taking care of him at the same time.

So in order to stop those abuses, as has been suggested, your Appropriations Committee feel that these things should be turned back to where they belong, to the local level. We feel it may hurt for a while but we still feel the racket it has become won't be so promiscuous anyway, or so vivid as it is today. The town officials will take great pains to see that those people who can call on the State now, are deserving and whether they shall or shall not have the amounts they now want.

For this reason I say they are worthy causes but they are situations that we, as majority members of the committee, pass back to you and your wisdom as to how to turn some of them back to the localities where we feel those people should have a say as to how it should be administered. As you know, with federal funds your local authorities have little to say as to who it shall pay or how it shall be administered. I think Senator Reid said that we didn't expect to get away with it, but it is food for thought. With that spirit we offer it to you and it is a chance to stop matching federal funds and turn it back to the local authorities where we feel it can be better administered than it is today.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I find myself this morning in a rather strange position, and that is concurring with the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick, of the first and third items of his amendment, but thoroughly in disagreement on the second amendment. This second item of the amendment which would restore to the Appropriation bill, I believe,

one million dollars for relief of state paupers I will offer an amendment on when I conclude my remarks.

I speak on this particular phase of the amendment, I think, with the voice of experience. I have held town office in one of the larger towns of our state for a period of five years. Of course, as you are all aware, generally speaking, the town officers are all rolled into one. You are selectman, overseer of the poor, and assessor of taxes. As a result of the experience in that particular phase of town municipal government, that of overseer of the poor, I wish at this moment to bring this particular item out. We are approached by those seeking pauper aid and assistance from the town in cases where they are settled and are the responsibility of the town. In most cases we are pretty hard. We investigate very carefully. We go to all means to find out and ascertain if these people are actually worthy. Now, here is the other phase. A party comes in seeking relief and in this case we find they are non-settled. They have not resided within our town for a period of five years. What happens? Secretly we are rubbing our hands with glee. This is a state case. The state is going to reimburse our town. We are not going to be answerable for this to our people. I assure you this happened in my town. It happened when I was a member of the board, and I am not proud of it but I was a party to it. We have given those people far more than we have given our own because we knew the state was going to reimburse us.

I feel with proper administration of the pauper relief the towns can cut down on it. It could be cut down considerably if the municipal officers would administer it in the same manner they administer their own settled cases and the amount originally set up by the Appropriations Committee would be sufficient to take care of the needs. If the Department of Health and Welfare would notify the towns they were going to receive only a certain percentage of what they received in prior years I feel reasonably certain the officials administering relief in the towns would certainly cut the cloth to fit.

Therefore, Mr. President, I offer at this time, very hurriedly prepared, Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "D" and move its adoption.

The Secretary read the amendment:

"Senate Amendment 'A' to Senate Amendment 'D': Amend said amendment by inserting in the column relative to Support of State Paupers the figures '1951-52 600,000. 1952-53 600,000.'"

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President, I am neither speaking for nor against this amendment. I simply would like to say this, that the way the department operates on the pauper claims, they pay them as long as they have money. If in August or September or October they run out of money then they stop payment. There will be no pro rata proposition, no percentage basis. They will pay every case that comes up from the towns and cities up to the time the money is gone. When it is gone the program ends. Senator Dennett's suggestion that the money be spread over the period will not work out, but if you people want to stop at \$600,000 it is all right with me.

Mr. PALMER of Lincoln: Mr. President and members of the Senate, these amendments I am about to present are strictly for clarification but not pro or con on this measure at all. I feel where this amendment before us takes in three different categories under the Department of Health and Welfare it would be helpful to many—I know to me personally—if we could vote on them separately. Many might vote affirmatively on the amendment regarding aid to public and private hospitals and against the amendment regarding the support of paupers and the amendment regarding the care of neglected children, or vice versa. This amendment I hope is drafted so we can vote on each individually rather than vote on the amendment as a whole. Therefore, I offer Senate Amendments B, C and D to Senate Amendment D and I hope they are in order.

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President, in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from York, Senator Dennett, I simply want to say we are opera-

ting under the present law and it would seem his amendment would imply a change in the law to make it operative. You will remember the Governor in one of his messages stated that the State is a good collector as far as the town is concerned, but somewhat dilatory in payments to towns. I still maintain if it remains in the Appropriation bill as \$600,000 you will have a flock of claims before the next legislature and it will cost the state a lot of money.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "D".

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

Fifteen having voted in the affirmative and thirteen opposed, Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "D" was adopted:

The Secretary read Senate Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "D". Amend said bill by striking out under the heading 'Health and Welfare, Department of' the words 'Aid to Public and Private Hospitals 750,000 750,000' and substitute therefor the words and figures 'Aid to Public and Private Hospitals 1,000,000 1,000,000.'

On motion by Mr. Palmer of Lincoln, Senate Amendments "B", "C" and "D" to Senate Amendment "D" were laid upon the table pending consideration.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President, I move we reconsider our action taken a few minutes ago whereby we adopted Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "D". In the way of slight explanation, this amendment was not correctly prepared and did not strike out the former wording, and therefore, it would give some trouble if this amendment passed in the form it was presented.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby it adopted Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "D".

On motion by Mr. Dennett of York, Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "D" was laid upon the table pending consideration.

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, Senate Amendment "D" was laid upon the table pending consideration.

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, Bill, An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditure of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1952 and June 30, 1953, (S. P. 495) (L. D. 1196) was laid

upon the table pending assignment for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.