

# 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**

Thursday, March 22, 1951.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. J. N. Henriksen of Augusta.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

**From the House**

Bill "An Act Relating to Motor Vehicles Parking in Dangerous Places." (H. P. 95) (L. D. 40)

(In the Senate, on March 17th passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A" and "C" in concurrence.)

Comes from the House, having been recalled by Joint Order from the Engrossing Department; engrossing having been reconsidered and House Amendment "A" reconsidered and indefinitely postponed. House Amendment "D" adopted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "C" and "D" in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, the bill was laid upon the table pending consideration.

**Joint Orders**

Order re Additional telephone service to the number of 25 calls for members and officers. (H. P. 1661)

Which was read and passed in concurrence.

Recalling Joint Order (H. P. 1647) re Study of Feasibility of County Managers for Counties, from Legislative Files to the House. (H. P. 1660)

Which was read and passed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Bulldozing of Streams." (H. P. 1643) (L. D. 1211)

Comes from the House referred to the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game.

In the Senate, referred to the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game in concurrence.

The Committee on Welfare on Bill "An Act Liberalizing Old Age Assistance," (H. P. 173) (L. D. 104) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Comes from the House, recommended to the Committee on Welfare.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis, tabled pending acceptance of the report.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to State Owned Cars for State Fire Marshal and Inspectors", (H. P. 1193) (L. D. 758) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, in Favor of Foxcroft Academy for Building," (H. P. 800) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, in Favor of Monmouth Academy," (H. P. 802) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Highway Rubbish Removal," (H. P. 1072) (L. D. 680) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Education on "Resolve, for the Purchase of One Hundred Copies of 'West Gardiner's Hundred Years'". (H. P. 460) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, for the Purchase of Seventy-Five Copies of 'History and Genealogy of Chester, Maine'," (H. P. 967) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve for the Purchase of One Hundred Copies of 'Highlights of Westbrook History'," (H. P. 819) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on "Resolve Regulating Ice Fishing in Notched Pond in Cumberland County," (H. P. 1163) (L. D. 702) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Non-Resident and Alien Trapping Licenses," (H. P. 730) (L. D. 420) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Wight of Penobscot, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

The same Committee on "Resolve, Relating to Open Season in Waters of York County," (H. P. 1311) (L. D. 864) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Revocation of Fishing, Hunting, Guides' and Trapping Licenses," (H. P. 1006) (L. D. 594) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Municipal Courts Without Judge or Recorder," (H. P. 1425) (L. D. 1032) reported that the same ought not to pass as it is covered by other legislation.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Possession of Lights in Woods While in Possession of Firearms," (H. P. 1344) (L. D. 919) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Operating Motor Vehicles While License Suspended or Revoked," (H. P. 1012) (L. D. 575) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Temporary Judges for Municipal Courts," (H. P. 1421) (L. D. 1029) reported that leave be granted to withdraw.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Repealing Running Horse Racing," (H. P. 649) (L. D. 364) reported that leave be granted to withdraw.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Grant a New Charter to the City of Calais," (H. P. 1120) (L. D. 707) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Auburn," (H. P. 1181) (L. D. 735) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve, Providing for Certain Construction at the Maine State Airport," (H. P. 957) (L. D. 569) reported that the same ought to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Brewer of Aroostook, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Automobile Travel by State Fire Inspectors," (H. P. 1194) (L. D. 759) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, in Favor of the Maine Historical Society," (H. P. 794) (L. D. 1224)

reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Restoring the Frederick Robie Library Fund," (H. P. 801) (L. D. 1226) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, in Favor of Knox Memorial Association, Inc. for Support and Maintenance of 'Montpelier,'" (H. P. 803) (L. D. 1225) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Highways on "Resolve, in Favor of the Town of Hartland," (H. P. 1405) (L. D. 1190) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Judiciary on "Resolve, in Favor of Winifred Malloy, of Hallowell," (H. P. 846) (L. D. 484) reported that the same ought to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Haskell of Cumberland, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Augusta in Regard to Criminal Fee," (H. P. 1109) (L. D. 689) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Rockland," (H. P. 1179) (L. D. 734) reported that the same ought to pass.

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

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to License Fees for Harness Horse Racing," (H. P. 1350) (L. D. 925) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A"

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence, and the bill read once; Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

#### Referred to Committee

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

### Natural Resources

Mr. Reid of Kennebec presented Bill "An Act Creating the Office of State Fire Marshal." (S. P. 514)

(Ordered printed.)

Sent down for concurrence.

### Senate Committee Reports

Mr. Wight from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Hunting of Deer," (S. P. 98) (L. D. 152) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Smart from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Closed Season on Partridge," (S. P. 147) (L. D. 266) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Boyker from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Relating to Anti-Splash Equipment on Certain Vehicles," (S. P. 399) (L. D. 946) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Haskell of Cumberland, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

The same Senator from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Overloaded Trucks," (S. P. 110) (L. D. 165) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President, I would like to say in regard to this bill that we reported it "Ought Not to Pass" because following shortly we have a bill which will take care of the same matter.

The same Senator from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Registration Plates for Junk Dealers," (S. P. 446) (L. D. 1009) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Sleeper of Knox, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Fuller from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Relating to the Number of Trustees of the University of Maine," (S. P. 269) (L. D. 608) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 515) under a new title, Bill "An Act Relating to the Trustees of the University of Maine," and that the same ought to pass.

Which report was read and accepted and the bill in new draft laid upon the table for printing under Joint Rule 10.

Mrs. Kavanagh from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Relating to Counter-signature Fees," (S. P. 426) (L. D. 990) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Ela from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on "Resolve Opening Certain Ponds in Oxford County to Ice Fishing," (S. P. 255) (L. D. 553) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Opening Virginia Lake, Oxford County, to Ice Fishing for White Perch," (S. P. 305) (L. D. 656) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Wight from the same Committee on "Resolve Closing Bartlett Brook, Oxford County, to Dipping of Smelts," (S. P. 256) (L. D. 554) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Closing Kee-waydin Lake, Oxford County, to Ice Fishing for Salmon and Trout," (S. P. 306) (L. D. 657) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Boyker from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Relating to Penalties for Violation of Truck Weight Laws," (S. P. 460) (L. D. 1074) reported that the same ought to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Boyker of Oxford, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

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

### Passed to be Engrossed

"Resolve Closing Chemquasabam-ticook Lake, Piscataquis County, to Ice Fishing." (H. P. 151) (L. D. 134)

"Resolve Regulating Fishing in Fifth Debsconeag Lake, in the County of Piscataquis." (H. P. 564) (L. D. 301)

"Resolve Regulating Fishing in St. Georges and Little Saint Georges Lakes in the County of Waldo." (H. P. 574) (L. D. 381)

Bill "An Act Relating to Full-time Supervisors." (H. P. 817) (L. D. 483)

"Resolve Closing all Tributaries of Big Spencer Pond to all Fishing." (H. P. 1227) (L. D. 781)

Bill "An Act Creating the Bangor Recreational Center." (H. P. 1656) (L. D. 1217)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Lucerne-in-Maine Village Corporation." (H. P. 537) (L. D. 296)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed, as amended, in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Weight of Catch of Certain Fish." (S. P. 232) (L. D. 503)

Bill "An Act Relating to Powers of the Housing Authority of Presque Isle." (S. P. 271) (L. D. 610)

"Resolve Relating to Daily Bag Limit of Certain Fish in Portion of Kennebec River, Somerset County." (S. P. 334) (L. D. 750)

"Resolve Relating to Daily Bag Limit of Certain Fish in Spencer Lake, Somerset County." (S. P. 335) (L. D. 751)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

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

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I understand there is a bill concerning dogs on its way to the Senate and I would like to table this bill. Perhaps we can do something about having the dogs meet the rabbits.

Thereupon, the bill was laid upon the table pending passage to be engrossed.

#### Enactors

Bill "An Act Relating to Markers Certain Waters and Mountains." (H. P. 463) (L. D. 283)

Bill "An Act Relating to Markers for Town Lines." (H. P. 580) (L. D. 350)

Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of Congregational-Christian Conference of Maine." (H. P. 648) (L. D. 388)

Bill "An Act Prohibiting the Procuring of Liquor for Certain Persons." (H. P. 784) (L. D. 465)

Bill "An Act Relating to Sales of Liquor to Minors." (H. P. 848) (L. D. 487)

Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Waterville to Provide an Indefinite Term for the City Engineer." (H. P. 1053) (L. D. 633)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the City of Waterville to Increase the Salary of the Mayor." (H. P. 1056) (L. D. 636)

Bill "An Act to Create the Town of Columbia Falls School District." (H. P. 1122) (L. D. 709)

Bill "An Act Relating to Pensions for Firemen of the City of Bangor." (H. P. 1184) (L. D. 739)

Bill "An Act Relating to Tax Lien Fees." (H. P. 1213) (L. D. 770)

Bill "An Act Relating to Public Burying-Grounds in Unincorporated Places." (H. P. 1240) (L. D. 792)

(On motion by Mr. Ela of Somerset, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

Bill "An Act Relating to Investment of Trust Funds by Towns." (H. P. 1242) (L. D. 794)

Bill "An Act Relating to Transporter Registration for Motor Vehicles." (H. P. 1599) (L. D. 1140)

"Resolve Regulating Fishing in Horne Pond in the Town of Limington, in the County of York." (H. P. 734) (L. D. 423)

"Resolve in Favor of the Town of Southwest Harbor." (H. P. 915) (L. D. 1189)

"Resolve Authorizing the State Tax Assessor to Convey by Sale Certain Interest of the State in Lands in the Unorganized Territory." (H. P. 1503) (L. D. 1060)

Bill "An Act Relating to Adoption of Persons." (S. P. 131) (L. D. 239)

Bill "An Act to Clarify Certain Provisions of the Institutional Service Law." (S. P. 133) (L. D. 238)

Bill "An Act Relating to Eligibility for Liquor Licenses." (S. P. 325) (L. D. 724)

Bill "An Act Relating to Serial Numbers of Motor Vehicles." (S. P. 329) (L. D. 727)

Bill "An Act Changing the Town of Blanchard, Piscataquis County, to a Plantation." (S. P. 348) (L. D. 814)

Bill "An Act to Apportion Representatives to Congress." (S. P. 386) (L. D. 912)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Practice of Optometry." (S. P. 465) (L. D. 1076)

Bill "An Act Relating to Estimates for Taxes by County Commissioners." (S. P. 466) (L. D. 1077)

"Resolve Dividing the State into Executive Councillor Districts." (S. P. 367) (L. D. 866)

(On motion by Mr. Sleeper of Knox, tabled pending final passage.)

Which bills were severally passed to be enacted and resolves finally passed.

#### Emergency Measure

Bill "An Act to Provide Schooling in Brunswick for Tuition Pupils from Certain Other Towns." (H. P. 1050) (L. D. 630)

Which bill being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative vote of 25 members of the Senate, and none opposed, was passed to be enacted.

#### Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1952 and June 30, 1953 (S. P. 495) (L. D. 1196) tabled by that Senator on March 21 pending assignment for second reading.

Mr. CROSBY of Franklin: Mr. President, there seems to be on the part of some of the Senate members, I believe, a desire to take up the items under Senate Amendment D individually. I have talked with the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick, the Senator from York, Senator Dennett and the Senator from Lincoln, Senator Palmer. I believe that these amendments as proposed yesterday will be withdrawn, after which there will be amendments to the items individually, namely, aid to dependent children, private hospitals and state paupers.

At this time I would like to say that the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Leavitt, will not be here today or tomorrow, but rather

than hold this bill he has asked me to take from the table any amendments he might have pertaining to this bill. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take from the table Senate Amendment D to L. D. 1196.

The motion prevailed.

Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis was granted leave to withdraw Senate Amendment D to L. D. 1196.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Dennett of York, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment "a" to Senate Amendment D; and that Senator was granted leave to withdraw the amendment.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Palmer of Lincoln, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment "b" to Senate Amendment D and that Senator was granted leave to withdraw the amendment.

On motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment "c" to Senate Amendment D and leave was granted to withdraw the amendment.

On further motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment "d" to Senate Amendment D and leave was granted to withdraw the amendment.

Thereupon, Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis, presented Senate Amendment K to L. D. 1196 and moved its adoption. The Secretary read the amendment:

"Amend said bill by striking out under that part of said bill which relates to Health and Welfare, Department of, the following: 'Aid to Dependent Children \$720,000—\$756,000' and inserting in place thereof the following 'Aid to Dependent Children \$1,200,000—\$1,260,000.'"

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, in the effort on the part of the Appropriations Committee to find places to reduce the total amount of appropriation for public assistance, it was felt that this was one place where a beginning could be made, for the following reasons: So far as eligibility for ADC is concerned, there are included several categories and among them are divorced persons, legally separated persons and desertions. Insofar as those are concerned, ADC is a mis-

nomer. It is not Aid to Dependent Children, it is Aid to Delinquent Parents and it was felt that a very strong effort should be made to seek out the parents of these children whose mothers are getting aid for them, seek out the fathers, and try to make them pay. It may be an impossible situation but, in my opinion at least, we should make every effort to seek out these people and try to make them pay, maybe by court order or get them into court and get an order that they do pay. In many cases, the amount of money the Court has actually ordered, whether it is paid or not, is not much more than the mother can get under this program. This particular situation points up the underlying trouble with a lot of the public assistance programs. It has degenerated into a "Let George do it" attitude. There are a great many parents today who are absolutely shirking one of the most fundamental responsibilities of a parent, and that is the proper care of the children. These people should be made to assume this responsibility. The easier the state makes it for them not to do so, the larger will become the load.

No one wants to see a needy child go without the necessities of life but that is not the point involved. There are a lot of parents shirking their responsibilities and to some extent they are being encouraged to do so by the state stepping in and doing what the parent is supposed to do. That is the real issue involved here, I believe.

We all appreciate the fact that if this cut is made we are losing federal money but the decision I think we have to make is whether or not we will take one step to try and go after those parents who ought to be doing something for their children but who are doing nothing. In a great many cases, these checks do not go for the children, the mother spends them for her own pleasure. I know that is so. I don't say it is so in every case or even in a large majority but it is so in many cases. I think the Senators in their own communities must find one or more examples of the misuse of these funds. In voting, I shall vote against the amendment solely because I think we must take a step to force these peo-

ple to assume responsibilities that are their own.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I want to concur with Senator Reid that Aid to Dependent Children is a misnomer and especially in this category we are discussing at the present time. I say it is a misnomer for the reason that I heard somebody suggest that it should be called subsidy for delinquent fathers.

What we are doing is cutting out divorces and desertions, and putting them back where, if we believe what we hear, they should be and that is under local supervision. What you are doing under this amendment of Sentaor McKusick, and I bear no brief for anybody, it is a man's privilege to vote as he sees fit, you are merely putting back what we have taken away.

We do feel that although it involves federal funds, we agree that is one of the things that is putting us in the situation we are in today, matching federal funds, and we ought to get away from this practice. This is merely a suggestion that the Appropriations Committee has offered you, and you in your wisdom may do anything you see fit about it.

I shall certainly vote against the amendment.

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President, I think I discussed this quite fully yesterday and I don't feel it necessary to go over the same ground again. I simply want to call to your attention that this cut in your appropriation for aid to dependent children involves a lot of federal money, \$2,400,000 in the next biennium. I also want to remind you that we will be turning a cost of \$400,000 back to the towns from these 1700 cases of ADC, where at the present time we are only paying 330 of them to take care of 22%.

I would also remind you that at the present time the towns are not paying anything toward the administration of these funds. I would also remind you that the categories of divorce, desertion and legal separation involve a category where it is necessary to spend money in investigation, lawyers



fees, court fees and so forth to bring them into court.

That is another expense to go on the towns. My purpose in presenting this amendment is to protect the towns. I think it should be argued on a dollars and cents basis.

When the vote is taken, Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I rise in support of the amendment of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick. I truly hope the Senate will not think I am taking an inconsistent attitude on this Appropriations Bill, particularly where it affects the Department of Health and Welfare, but in this particular phase, I agree with Senator McKusick. I, too, believe that a terrific load will be thrown back upon the towns. I have in mind particularly the relief of state paupers.

In my experience, many of these cases that involved divorced persons, were not settlement cases. This load would be thrown directly back upon the state, upon the very state that is trying to dispose of it, particularly in the phase that they now receive some federal money, and if it is thrown back upon the state they will assume the entire burden.

Again I wish to reiterate that I support the amendment offered by Senator McKusick.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, again I find myself in sympathy with both positions in this debate. I shall vote for the amendment until both branches of this legislature are willing to amend the basic statutes that determine who shall be eligible for ADC. I take that position in that we believe we administer by the executive department a rather specific statutory provision which, as I read that statute, makes eligible the people that the proponents of the amendment seek to take out. I think it is entirely consistent that we should leave the dollars here to take care of laws we have on the books. If we do this thing I think we want to have an amendment to change the law. By leaving the law as it is and by changing that statute by failure of the appropri-

ations bill to provide the dollars, I don't think is the right approach.

Mr. BREWER of Arcoostook: Mr. President, it is my thinking as we go along with these various appropriations that some of the laws now in effect will make considerable difference as to how each member votes upon the various amendments.

I would suggest that we work along and put in what we feel are the minimum needs and then in the final analysis the various committees, Welfare, Appropriations, Education, etc., and any others interested, can get together and then cut the cloth to fit the pattern.

In fact I think that has been the feeling that it is what will be done before we leave here. Your Governor has told you he will not sign any bill that has not the appropriation to carry it along. It has been my hope and I think is the feeling of the legislature as well that in the final analysis the various committees would get together and ask permission from the legislature to submit a bill that would cut the cloth according to the pattern we have. I offer this as a suggestion.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, in regard to the comments of the Senator from Penobscot, I might point out that this item is probably, or has been in the past, a matter of regulation in the department. It is only in recent years that they have so broadened the interpretation of the statutes that widowed mothers and their children were brought under the law. However, at its inception and for the earlier years of its existence, these families did not receive money under this law. I think they could probably back up a little and go back to the former regulations. I have no objection to changing the statutes but I would not hang my vote on that item. When I vote, I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, it seems to me that the main issue to be voted upon is so important that no one vote should be cast on a partial basis. I heartily agree with Senator Haskell that in every case eventually, the law should fit the appropriation pattern and vice versa. I think he is abso-

lutely right. It is just a question of whether before a vote is taken we should have the law accompany the case, or whether Senator Haskell is willing to go along with Senator Brewer in the thought that as these things are voted upon, if anything is voted upon which requires change in the law, the Committee on Appropriations or some other committee, will set about to amend the law accordingly.

I think we should decide that before any vote is taken. If the opinion is that change of law should come first, then I think we should hold this matter in abeyance until the law is amended.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I think a very simple solution to that problem is for us to amend the appropriation bill. I see nothing in the rules of procedure that prevents us from amending the appropriation bill. I see no objection to amending Section 226, Chapter 424 any more than I see objection to amending the appropriation bill to provide that the general relief payments that go back to cities and towns shall go pro rata in relation to the appropriation made for general relief and then I believe that those who vote on the appropriations measure are at the same time voting a revision of the statutes. They go together and that takes from us the opportunity which many of us like to vote for the expenditure but at the same time hesitate about changing the laws for which we appropriate money.

If it is consistent with the procedure I would suggest placing an amendment on the Appropriations Bill and that would indicate the majority believe that they should be cut and a majority agree in the belief that the statutes should be amended to fit whatever dollars the majority believe should go in.

A division of the Senate was had.

Seventeen having voted in the affirmative and eleven opposed, the motion prevailed and Senate Amendment K was adopted.

Thereupon, Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis presented Senate Amendment L and moved its adoption. The Secretary read the amendment: "Amend said bill by striking out under the part of said bill

which relates to Health and Welfare, Department of, the following: 'Aid to Public and Private Hospitals \$750,000 — \$750,000' and inserting in place thereof the following 'Aid to Public and Private Hospitals \$1,000,000 — \$1,000,000.' "

Mr. McKUSICK: Mr. President, I ask for a division when the vote is taken.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President, I merely point out to the Senate that you are putting back \$250,000 that was in your Governor's budget recommendation but was taken out in the Appropriation Committee's recommendation. They asked for \$1,100,000 which was put in the Governor's budget as \$1,000,000 and in our recommendation was \$750,000.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I am sure it is of minor interest to the other members of the Senate but I shall vote against this amendment and my thinking is this: Four years ago, I think it was, we were on a level of \$411,000 for private hospitals. Two years ago it was put at \$578,000. The appropriation bill stepped it up to \$750,000. I like to think of each of these appropriation measures in relation to their comparison with other appropriation measures we have got to pass. Going from \$411,000 \$578,000 to \$750,000 seems to me to be about as well for private hospitals as we can possibly do. I join the Appropriations Committee in its position of holding the amount to \$750,000.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of Senator McKusick to adopt Senate Amendment L, and that Senator has asked for a division.

A division of the Senate was had.

Six having voted in the affirmative and twenty-one opposed the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis presented Senate Amendment M and moved its adoption. The Secretary read Senate Amendment M.

"Amend said bill by striking out under the part of said bill which relates to Health and Welfare, Department of, the following: 'Support of State Paupers \$600,000 - \$600,000' and inserting in place thereof the following: 'Support of

State Paupers. \$1,000,000 - \$1,000,000."

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President, I simply want to call to your attention what I said yesterday in regard to this category, that the state law puts the obligation for the care of these paupers on the town. As I understand the state law, the towns and the municipal officers have no choice in the matter. It also provides that in the case of state paupers in a plantation, the oldest adjoining incorporated town must assume the obligation. The law also provides that the towns shall be reimbursed. Notice that word 'shall'. If this item in the Appropriation Bill is passed without amendment, it will mean that the towns will be called upon to make enforced loans to the state and, as I said yesterday, you may expect in the next session of the legislature a flock of claims coming in to reimburse the towns for expenses they have incurred in the care of these paupers.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I will not again repeat the remarks I made in the Senate yesterday because I believe everyone very well understands the situation and understands the reason why my remarks were made. I am opposed to the amendment offered by Senator McKusick for the reasons which I stated yesterday and will strictly adhere to the amount set forth by the Appropriations Committee.

If this Senate will vote against the amendment, I will at that time offer an amendment to the appropriations bill along the line of the thinking of the Senator from Piscataquis to provide a vehicle with which to carry and administer this act so there will be no embarrassment to the Department of Health and Welfare or to the Governor.

Mr. BREWER or Aroostook: Mr. President, I hope sincerely that the members of the Senate do not get tired of one popping up but it is only with a desire to try to explain what is taking place, if they have not followed along. A million dollars was asked for. The Appropriations Committee cut it back to \$600,000. I don't believe even the million asked for would take care of it, but it is one of those situations

that is a guess, and as soon as the money plays out, the state is through paying. I just would remind you that this restores the \$400,000 that we took out.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President, I understand by this last amendment that the state is saying to the towns in effect, "We will take care of your neglected children, or if not, we will compel you to take care of the children and we will pay the bill." We will pay you whatever expenses you have incurred." Who knows how many children in the town the selectmen are going to send bills to the state for?

Mr. BREWER of Arroostook: Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator is confused. This item is state aid to the poor and not neglected children. It is merely people who have no legal standing in any community.

Mr. McKUSICK: Mr. President when the vote is taken, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick that the Senate adopt Senate Amendment M. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A division of the Senate was had

Nine having voted in the affirmative and eighteen opposed, the motion did not prevail.

Mr. Dennett of York presented Senate Amendment N to L. D. 1196 and moved its adoption.

The Secretary read the amendment: Senate Amendment N to L. D. 1196. "Amend said bill by adding at the end thereof before the Emergency Clause, the following: 'Revised Statutes, Chapter 82, Section 21 amended. The third sentence of Section 21 of Chapter 82 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows: When such paupers have no legal settlement in the state, the state at the end of each fiscal year shall reimburse the several cities, town and plantations to the amount of legislative appropriation in proportion to the amount each has paid for the relief furnished and the reasonable expenses and services of said overseers relative to such paupers shall be included in the amount to be so reimbursed by the state.'

"R. S. C., 82, Sec. 24 amended. Section 24 of Chapter 82 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Sec. 24. State to reimburse for relief furnished persons having no legal settlement. Whenever persons having no legal settlement within the state and needing immediate relief are found in any town or in unincorporated places and are brought into the adjoining town obliged by law to care for and furnish relief to such persons and relief is so furnished the state at the end of each fiscal year shall reimburse the several cities, towns and plantations to the amount of legislative appropriations in proportion to the amount each has paid for such relief so furnished although the overseers of the poor of said town have no permit in writing from the Department of Health and Welfare to remove the same into their town.'"

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would not feel that I was serving my own community and the County of Piscataquis if I didn't explain just what this amendment will do. The towns care for state paupers and at the end of three months submit their bills to the state and are reimbursed. This amendment would require that they advance the money to take care of state paupers through the entire year, wait until the end of the year and are then reimbursed on a percentage basis. We don't know how big that percentage will be. We must take our chances. When we go into our March town meeting we don't know how much money we will need to provide.

This is a serious matter for the little towns. I notice in our own town report one case involving quite a large family having to do with a hospital case amounting to fourteen hundred odd dollars. Now our town valuation is under \$260,000 and \$260 means a mill on our tax rate. That case means a matter of an added five mills plus. This amendment will also cut off the possibility of our coming to the next legislature with a claim for reimbursement. And here, perhaps, is the prize package: The oldest adjoining incorporated town is required to care for the paupers of a

plantation. We happen to be the oldest adjoining incorporated town adjoining the Plantation of Kingsbury. It isn't the fault of the town. We have taken care of them for years. And this amendment simply means that we will tax the people of the town of Parkman to bear part of the expense of the paupers in that vicinity, and if that isn't a prize package to hand any town I would like to know what is.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I find myself again in disagreement with the Senator from Piscataquis. This amendment is designed—yes—to prevent the town and cities coming back onto the state with claims. You have by your vote accepted the appropriation as set forth by the Appropriations Committee and by this amendment that has just been offered and is now under consideration you close the door to any future claims. In other words, you say to the towns and cities, "Administer this money well and we will reward you with a hundred cents on the dollar; spend it unwisely and you yourselves will have to bear part of the burden."

I believe this is a progressive step, a step forward in the matter of the administration of Health and Welfare. Now, bear in mind that these are not our own; these are floaters, paupers who have no settlement anywhere in the State of Maine. My experience as an overseer of the poor in my town and in our state has taught me many lessons. I have seen people come into the state with four or five children and not be in the state twenty-four hours when they have come into the town for aid. And when they are asked why they came into the state they would say because it was such a good state, it provided relief right off.

I still maintain that it is not the obligation of the State of Maine to support these people. They should be supported where they belong, where they have a settlement, and as we go along, the harder we make it for these people to obtain money the less they will be coming into the state just for the purpose of obtaining welfare. It is really a

step in the right direction and it is a step that saves the State of Maine money and puts us on a good administrative basis, and I believe the Senate should adopt this amendment.

I believe there are other explanations but I think the Senator from Penobscot can go right into the job of explaining them perfectly.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I deeply appreciate the compliment which apparently is based on a suspicion that I have something to do with this amendment. And I plead guilty to it.

As I see the amendment it simply makes for consistency in that we have voted eighteen to nine to cut general relief from a million to six hundred thousand dollars. Now if two-thirds of this Senate believe that the state should spend \$600,000 it seems to me that a hundred percent of this Senate ought to do the thing that will permit the Executive Department and the Welfare Department to administer that \$600,000. I am in sympathy with the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator McKusick because he has told you exactly what is going to happen, for example, in the City of Ellsworth and the City of Gardiner, and the town of Parkman. They are going to get a share in proportion to what they spend just as the private hospitals get their share proportionately of what the legislature appropriates to the hospitals.

Now I voted for the million dollar proposition and I was in a small minority but if those who believe it should be \$600,000 — and I do not say this to show that those who do believe it should be are wrong — the majority should prevail — if we should accept the million dollar figure we should not be in the situation which we were in on the 6th of February, 1949, when Governor Payne called us into special session and said the 94th legislature did not appropriate enough money to meet our commitments under general relief, and we did appropriate that money so as to meet those needs.

Now, if it is our considered judgment that there should be a cut of forty percent I think in fairness to the people who have to administer it we ought to change the content

of the law so that there will be provision for proportionate payments. That is all it does. The many words read by the Secretary were simply words appearing in the statute and the only words added thereto are those words that carry out the proposition that there should be proportionate payment. If you don't vote that way and since under the code we have general statutory provisions that put the department head in jail if he spends more money than his appropriation, then for towns that have these unfortunate cases there will come a time when the department is going to find that the money is all gone and the 96th legislature will be filled up with claims, and I don't think any of us want to liberally build up claim appropriations for the next legislature. I think we want to stand up and say, "If the majority want to cut it that is the way we will leave it." So I shall vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from York, Senator Dennett.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I find myself in a peculiar position on this matter. I recognize absolutely the conditions of which Senator Dennett speaks. The state pauper account is handled atrociously in many cities and towns. A great saving could be made if an administration could bring to the attention of the cities and towns what they are doing.

Now it is my considered thought that six hundred thousand dollars, under conditions as they will exist in the next year, is enough to do the job. Business conditions are better. More social security money is coming to those who are eligible. Six hundred thousand dollars was enough all through the war. But that is rather beside the point. You are going to run into a tremendous amount of difficulty with this amendment. It is hasty legislation and if this amendment should pass I would certainly move for reconsideration so that those municipalities who have to take care of recipients who do not reside in those communities, who may reside thirty of forty or fifty miles away sometimes, who would become a burden on a community which has

no responsibility for them whatsoever except that they are the nearest and oldest organized community, would not have to administer the fund.

I can realize that some communities might think that if they did a good job it would help them and they would not be penalized but they have no control over the other 499 communities and they would be penalized for what happened in other sections of the state.

I shall vote against the amendment and with Senator McKusick's position.

Mr. SLEEPER: of Knox: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I too am a little perplexed and bothered and I would like to ask through the Chair of the man who apparently is well versed and knows all, if these payments are going to be returned to the towns on a pro-rata basis. I would like to know. It does so happen that in the town from which I come we have a very thrifty and energetic and business-like overseer of the poor. He isn't cruel or vicious but he doesn't coddle them. If our overseer finds he can feed one of these state paupers, we will say for example, for ten dollars a week and we have another overseer in another town who is socially minded and he finds he can feed his for eighteen or twenty dollars a week, is Rockland paid on the percentage of ten dollars or on the percentage of eighteen, or are we going to have the same payments throughout the state? And if you know all, Senator, I wish you would tell me.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, may answer if he wishes.

Mr. HASKELL: Mr. President, I am a little confused as to whom he may be referring but if by chance he is referring to me I will try to answer that the adoption of that amendment would put the efficiency of the City of Rockland in the same position as the inefficiency of some community which is more generous, just as a hospital that may keep a state case longer than is necessary gets exactly the same reimbursement as the one that keeps a case a short time. There can be no question about that. It is a question of apportion-

ment according to the bills legally audited and approved by each community.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I am very glad that this amendment was offered because I am sure that what was confused in our minds when we voted a little while ago on the appropriation now becomes crystal clear.

It seems to me almost ridiculous to say that towns which are paid back on a pro rata basis and not in full have obligations to state paupers which are no obligation of theirs in the first place. If we were talking about aid to education that is the place where the state would step in and assist the towns in meeting obligations which were originally theirs, but as I see it these state paupers, at least for many years, have never constituted an obligation to the towns; they have always been repaid by the state.

I for one refuse to be led down this blind alley. I think there is no other solution to it. I shall vote against the amendment and if the Senator from Somerset doesn't move to reconsider our previous action I certainly shall, to defeat this amendment. It seems to me that this amendment should be defeated and that we should go back and say to the cities and towns that we represent, "You shall be paid in full for those obligations that were never yours in the first place."

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President, I would like to ask through the Chair, if in the case of these state paupers who come in from out of the state there is any agreement between our state and any other state as to repayment.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Boyker, it is my understanding that the State of Maine is not reimbursed by other states.

Mr. President and members of the Senate, I think it is rather inconsistent to cut down, or to cut back, this appropriation to the level that was first suggested by the Appropriations Committee and not provide a vehicle to properly administer it. I think if the Senate is not willing to go along with

the amendment to administer it, it should be reconsidered and enough funds provided to properly administer it so the situation will not arise. And because we are apparently going to give the towns license to go right ahead and spend everything they care to spend and tell them they will be reimbursed. And I will say at this time I will be happy to go along with the suggestion of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Ela, because I really believe his suggestion has much merit.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Dennett that Senate Amendment N to L. D. 1196 be adopted.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, during my political life I have had occasion to serve the city of Lewiston as overseer of the poor. I well remember that local cases were screened very thoroughly and were taken care of as economically as possible but when the so-called state cases of state paupers came into the picture the thing was quite different. The reason for it at that time—it was back some 15 or 20 years ago—was the fact the State did allow about 50% more for fuel, for clothing, for food, for rents, than the city of Lewiston did, so that it was mighty fine when a pauper asked for aid and we found out he belonged to the state or was called a state pauper. We preferred that very much more than a pauper of another town or a pauper of our own. I believe that the cutting back from \$1,000,000 to \$600,000 in this pauper aid is proper action at this time and I believe it will have no effect as far as saving money for the State of Maine is concerned unless the amendment offered now has passage. If this amendment doesn't have passage then your claims of next session will wipe out this \$400,000 we are trying to save. If this amendment is defeated at this time, Mr. President, and members of the Senate, I for one will vote for the million dollars because I think it is the only logical thing to do. The only way you can control the expense of the pauper account in the state of Maine is put it back into the laps of the cities and towns and say "Here is the money the state of Maine has ap-

propriated for that purpose. If you are flush and spend readily you will only recoup a pro rata portion of your expense but if you are very careful you will get a hundred cents on a dollar."

This was back, as I say, Mr. President and members of the Senate, to the years 1933 to 1937 when I served as alderman for the city of Lewiston and also as overseer of the poor. My experience was gained in those four years and came at the time there were a lot of paupers. It came at depression time when things were really hard and tough and we had to pick them out and screen them and be very careful about the money we spent.

It is quite gratifying for the State of Maine to act like the federal government, as you people claimed, and be the good white father and be bountiful to those people who have not citizenship in Maine, but drift here, and it seems that Maine may be a second Washington in granting freely of money.

Mr. SLEEPER of Knox: Mr. President, again I hesitate to arise a second time. I agree for the most part with the sentiments of the previous speaker, but he made a statement I thought I had had clarified. The Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher, said if the overseer of the poor was thrifty and didn't give too much he would get a hundred percent for the money spent. I understand that no matter how thrifty he might be he would still get pro rata payment from the state. I would like to have that question answered before I vote, if possible.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Dennett, that the Senate adopt Senate Amendment "N".

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

The PRESIDENT: Fourteen having voted in the affirmative and fourteen opposed, the motion is lost.

Mr. WARD of Penobscot: Mr. President, I believe there was one vote not counted on this side.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state in his opinion the vote was counted.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, I now move we reconsider our previous action whereby we adopted the last amendment relative to aid to state paupers.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state the amendment failed of adoption. The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes, moves the Senate reconsider its action whereby it failed to adopt Senate Amendment "M". Would the Senator like the amendment read?

Mr. BARNES: Yes, I would, Mr. President.

The Secretary read the amendment.

Mr. BARNES: Mr. President and members of the Senate, there is certainly no need for continued debate on this proposition because we have debated it thoroughly. The only reason for voting against the pro rata amendment, my only reason for doing it is it was leading us down an alley I don't think we should be in. I believe the towns and cities should be reimbursed in full for furnishing supplies to paupers who do not have pauper residence in that town, and I therefore believe that this figure of a million dollars each year which was arrived at after careful study by the Budget Committee should be adopted so the state can fulfill obligations to the cities, towns and plantations and repay them the money they have had to pay out.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, although the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes, may not be confused, I think he misunderstood my action when I mentioned reconsideration of Senator Dennett's amendment, and not the amendment he is speaking of. My thought was if his amendment should pass it then should be amended. I am in thorough agreement with our action in not adopting Senator McKusick's amendment which you now propose to reconsider. I think the \$600,000 ought to be enough for the job. It could be enough for the job, and I oppose the motion to reconsider.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President, I move when the vote to reconsider is taken it be by division.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Barnes,

that the Senate reconsider its action whereby Senate Amendment "M" failed of adoption.

A division of the Senate was had.

Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and twelve opposed, the motion to reconsider prevailed.

Mr. BARNES: Mr. President, I now move the adoption of Senate Amendment "M".

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

Seventeen having voted in the affirmative and ten opposed, Senate Amendment "M" was adopted.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, knowing that there is at least one member of the Senate who has an appointment at twelve o'clock, and knowing that Senator would like to be here during the discussion of the Appropriation bill, it is my hope that the floor leader of the Senate will now move to table the bill and move to adjourn.

Mr. CROSBY of Franklin: Mr. President, we have a few more amendments here. I realize it is twelve o'clock but I think if we table this bill today we will have to take it up again in the morning, and I would like to have a show of hands of those who would like to table the bill at this time.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that obviously a majority is not in favor of tabling the bill at this time.

On motion by Mr. Collins of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment "F", to S. P. 495, L. D. 1196.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this is the amendment that refers to the expenditures of the University of Maine for the next biennium. In the legislative document that is before you the amount recommended was \$818,000 which was the equivalent of the mill tax. The recommendation by the trustees of the University to the Budget Committee and later to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs asked for an increase of \$500,000 for each of the next two fiscal years.

Appropriations for the support of the University have not been in line with economic trends of the past decade. The average annual



appropriations for operation and maintenance for the past ten years was \$770,194, an amount which is only \$26,500 more than the mill tax produced in 1930. The highest amount received from the Orono campus in the ten year period from 1941 to 1951 was appropriated for the current year, \$962,175.

Now rising prices, the imperative necessity for increase of salaries and wages, the decline in enrollment of veterans for whom the federal government paid a higher tuition rate than that charged to students residing in Maine, and larger expenditures for heat, electricity, janitor service, and repairs have made it impossible to operate on a balanced budget during the current year. Operational expenditures for 1950-51 will exceed the annual income by \$165,000. Reserve funds urgently needed for plant improvement and for the purchase of badly needed equipment in research and teaching are being used to cover this deficit.

The financial report of the University will show that as of December 31st there was an unappropriated surplus of only some \$17,000. The University has got to get this money either from appropriations by the State or by student fees. Student fees cannot be further increased without denying opportunity for a higher education to many well qualified youths of Maine. Charges for tuition and fees for State residents have been and probably still are higher than in any other land-grant college or university. The average of tuition and fee charges made for state residents by the other New England land-grant institutions was \$175 in 1949. Maine students attending the University pay \$295 per academic year.

That further increases in tuition and fees would deny an opportunity for a higher education to many worthy youth of Maine is apparent from figures taken from the 1949-50 report on the University's student aid program. During the academic year \$194,000 was made available to 1,254 students through scholarships, loans, and work on the campus.

The University's request is based on minimum needs. It includes no provision for capital expenditures,

nor for the replacement of obsolete equipment. It provides for no increase in services in education, research, or extension.

The mobilization of manpower to meet the country's emergency presents difficult and, as yet, unpredictable problems for colleges and universities. Enrollments will probably decline appreciably in 1951 and 1952 with a resultant loss of revenue from student fees. Operating costs for salaries, wages, supplies and materials cannot be reduced proportionately to enrollment. A smaller class still requires a teacher, a classroom, heat, light, janitor service, supplies and equipment.

I think that the little pamphlet that was put on the desks of the members of the legislature yesterday shows very emphatically the situation, the financial situation at the University of Maine. It indicates on one of the pages that in 1949 and 1950 48% of the income came from student fees, 23% of the income came from state appropriation, 15% from federal appropriation, 1% from endowment and 13% came from other sources which include the sale of some services and things like that. In the items of expenditures 43% was required for instruction and library, 11% for the operation and maintenance of the plant, 7% for administration and general expenses, 25% for agricultural extension and research, and 9% for other research services and retirement.

So you can see, in making the appropriation for the University that you not only have to consider the education of the youth but you also should consider the services that the University of Maine renders. 25% is taken up for agricultural extension and research, and when you ask the trustees of the University to increase tuition fees as an alternative to adequate state support you are asking them to help pay for research at the University, research that the people of Maine want and demand.

I know that the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs are in sympathy with the needs of the University. I feel sure that they would have perhaps thought it wise to include it in the

Appropriations bill, but the fact that there is a separate legislative document calling for this amount perhaps made them hesitate to put it in, but it seems very logical to me that an item of this size, \$500,000 a year for the next two years should indeed be a part of the regular Appropriations bill, and for that reason, Mr. President and members of the Senate, I hope the Senate will adopt Senate Amendment "F".

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, in view of the fact that there is a resolve before a legislative committee covering the exact matter proposed by this amendment and in view of the fact that that committee at their leisure should consider this thing thoroughly and at length to determine just what the amount should be, it would seem to me that this Senate now should, without prejudice, fail to adopt this amendment and let the matter take its normal course in committee, and then the Senate in due course could properly act after a recommendation of a committee on the matter. It seems that we here now are taking away from committees matters which are properly theirs and should have their consideration. I have no argument for or against any of the matters suggested but I do think the proper and logical procedure, inasmuch as there is a document before a committee, is to let that matter be handled under that resolve.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. President, I recognize the argument of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Ela, and the fact that it has some merit, but at the same time I think that you are considering your complete budget and are considering one of the major items of your Appropriations bill.

If when the Appropriations bill is finally ironed out and a tax measure is proposed, then certainly I think it would be easier for the people who are trying to get a tax measure that will meet the budget appropriation, to have the amount for the University of Maine known definitely. It is my thinking that this is the proper place for it. The legislative document that is before the committee undoubtedly will have consideration and will come

out with a recommendation in some amount, but I feel that this is the place where the increased amount for the University should be considered.

Mr. SAVAGE of Somerset: Mr. President, in support of this amendment I'd like to say that for years we have asked the University of Maine to come before us like an orphaned child and take a certain amount of money, this mill tax. We have told them to live on it for years, and I think it is time the legislature upped it so that the board of trustees and the people running the University can know what they will have from year to year and not have to come back in special session or some other time and ask the legislature for money.

If we in the legislature do not believe the University is doing a good job let's say so here and cut them back, but I think we should up it to a half million dollars and tell them we know they are doing a good job. Then the trustees and the president of the University can have something they can depend on year after year.

Mr. ELA: Mr. President, I might point out that under this amendment you are not doing what the Senator from Somerset, Senator Savage suggests. You are simply setting a figure for this university. In fact, if you do as the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Collins suggests, you should carry through and finally dispose of four or five sheets full of other bills in the legislature which all carry appropriations. We recognize that later other bills which require money will be acted upon, but I can see here a sheet with two or three million dollars worth of bills on it, and we might say if we follow his reasoning that we should dispose of all of those.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I will speak very briefly. I intend to support the amendment, and the reasons are these: We did, in disposing of the Educational amendment, recognize there were other bills in the legislature. This is a major item and when this bill leaves this Senate I would be hopeful that it would give a reasonably good picture of the problem we face

this session. For that reason, I believe it is perfectly proper to consider the University of Maine appropriation.

With respect to the amount we should have, I think the Senate should remember that from 1931 to date we have held the University of Maine to this one mill. During the war we made a minor exception by allowing the borrowing of money and carried through an additional resolve for building a building. So far as operating goes, we have held the University back to pre-depression levels. Let's consider 1940-50 decade for instance. In 1940 we satisfied the needs of general fund expenditures by an appropriation of about \$15,000,000. We know today it will require something in excess of \$30,000,000. What does it mean? It means goods and services the State University must buy, just as the goods and services that every one of us must buy, have gone up very substantially. As one I think of a nearly unanimously Maine-minded citizenry, I have pride in the job the University is doing. I have pride in its advanced opportunities to Maine boys and girls who would not have the opportunity unless it were for that institution.

I happen to be one who under no conditions could have acquired a college education had it not been for the University of Maine and the education it offers Maine boys and girls. The University has no other source of money except tuition fees. I believe if I were voting against this amendment I would be voting to preclude hundreds or thousands of Maine boys and girls from the privilege that ought to be theirs. To me that is an argument for the amendment. Those Maine boys and girls deserve it and the institution deserves it, and I think this is one of the most deserving amendments that can be offered to this appropriation measure.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Collins, that Senate Amendment "F" be adopted.

A viva voce vote being had, the amendment was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Ela of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from

the table Senate Amendment "E" to S. P. 495, L. D. 1196.

Mr. ELA of Somerset: Mr. President, I will be very brief. I will say to the members of the Senate that I think most of you know the arguments for and against the amendment. It will change the Budget Report from \$3,200,000 in the first year of the biennium to \$2,900,000. In the second it will change it from \$3,400,000 to \$2,800,000.

The arguments which I have, in brief, are these: The grants, under proper administration, need not be cut if this amendment passes. The relatives can be checked closely enough under the present formulae to cut down the number of recipients to hold it to that figure. The formulae, if properly administered, in my opinion, could be cut a little so that some of those now on should not be on. It is fantastic for me to believe a family of four with a \$4,000 income should not care for one parent. General business conditions are better. For that reason there should be fewer applicants. The social security change last November provided more money to recipients and the need should be reduced by that amount.

It is wrong to let this category of public assistance drift and coast into an increasing amount year after year. We received from our forefathers a wonderful heritage but we are frittering it away for reasons which will produce no ultimate good. Let's be realistic. This is not a cut. It is trying to hold the line somewhere near where we have been. We should reduce it. The cut has to be modest, but I realize there has to be some co-operation in order to pass anything in legislature. I sincerely hope my brevity won't be considered a lack of sincerity in this matter. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President, I will also try to be brief. This represents a cut in the old age assistance fund. I do not see how it would be possible to administer this without a cut in the size of the grants. Of course, a cut in the size of grants means supplemental aid from towns. Mention has been made of a \$4,000 income

family that were not able to help their parents. According to the formula used the family must have been a father, mother and two children. The \$4,000 is accounted for before federal income tax is taken out, before social security is taken out and before retirement, is taken out. It is another case where you are toying with the idea of turning the burden back to the towns. I remind you that of a \$50 grant \$30 is paid by the federal government and \$20 by the town.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Ela, that Senate Amendment "E" be adopted.

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

The PRESIDENT: Twelve having voted in the affirmative and thirteen opposed, the motion is lost.

Mr. ELA: Mr. President, I question the vote.

A division of the Senate was had.

Twelve having voted in the affirmative and fourteen opposed, the motion to adopt Senate Amendment "E" did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table, Senate Amendment "A" to L. D. 1196.

Mr. CROSBY: Mr. President, I will say to the Senators that Senator Leavitt authorized me to take this amendment from the table, and I suppose his motion would be for adoption. I therefore move the Senate adopt Senate Amendment "A", and ask that the Secretary read the amendment.

The Secretary read the amendment:

"Amend said bill by striking out that part which relates to Maine Development Commission and insert in place thereof the following: 'Maine Development Commission, Departmental Operations 500,000 500,000.'"

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: I shall vote against this amendment and my reasoning is this: The Development Commission, on which I have had the pleasure of serving for a period of some seven or eight years, does splendid work for the State of Maine and I am among those who are convinced that the dollars we appropriate for the Development Commission are spent as

wisely and as well as any appropriation we make. On the other hand, as in the case of the hospitals, we have recognized their fine work, but in the last two sessions we have stepped from \$200,000 up to \$300,000. I would be among the first of those to arise and get it up to \$500,000 if that sum were reasonably available, but it seems to me until sometime later in the session when we have taken care of the essential needs, the statutory needs, we ought to be about as hesitant in this case as we were in the case of the hospitals. There is no question that the money would be well spent. The extra \$200,000 a year would bring great gain to the State, but it doesn't seem to me until we solve the more pressing questions that we ought to increase it to a half million dollars. For that reason I shall vote against the amendment.

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

A viva voce vote being had, the motion to adopt Senate Amendment "A" did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Broggi of York, the Senate voted to take from the table, Senate Amendment "G" to S. P. 495, L. D. 1196, tabled by that Senator on March 21st pending consideration.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, following our discussion this morning of hundreds of thousands of dollars and millions of dollars, this amendment I can assure you is a very inoffensive one. It deals with \$3,000 each year of the biennium for the Department of Labor.

To be brief, and I know brevity will help in my cause because the hour is late and everyone is hungry. The Department of Labor asks this additional amount for their Statistical Division. The Statistical Division of the Department of Labor has as a function the answering of letters, requests; and the compilation of statistics is necessary in order to answer letters and requests intelligently. I know that members of the Senate are aware that in the last couple of years several major industries have moved into our State. The general practice prior to this

was to contact the Labor Department and find out various details relative to certain localities in the state, details as to transportation, wage scales, availability of labor, etc. The department is behind in this phase of its activity. The total personnel handling this work is one man and one secretary. The mail is several weeks behind because of the necessity of compiling statistics prior to answering requests.

As I say, the amount asked is relatively inoffensive and I hope the Senate will see fit to go along with this amendment.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the Senator from York, Senator Broggi, or the Labor Department, but I do want to call your attention to exactly what you are voting on. If you will take your budget book you will find their actual expense last year was \$42,430. They requested \$93,201. The recommendation in the Governor's budget and by the Committee was \$60,200. Now, there is a differential of about \$18,000 there and if my analysis is correct the amendment which has been offered includes about \$6,000 more. We did take into consideration, I believe, this particular employee. I do feel, in view of what was actually spent and what is actually given, I would question the justification of this amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Broggi, that Senate Amendment "G" be adopted.

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

Nine having voted in the affirmative and fourteen opposed, the motion to adopt Senate Amendment "G" did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Amendment "H" to S. P. 495 L. D. 1196, tabled by that Senator on March 21st pending consideration.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, this amendment would add \$300,000 each year of the biennium to provide for implementing certain of the recommendations of the Public Administration Service

in their reclassification study of general fund salaries and wages.

The history of wage changes in recent years is generally this: In the legislative session of 1945 we had an across-the-board increase of \$2.20, I think. In 1947 it was increased to \$7.20, I think; and the last general wage increase granted to State employees was by action of the Governor and Council in November, 1948, and the dollars were found in the contingency fund to carry a five per cent increase from January 1, 1949 to June 30, 1949. I well remember standing in this same spot in the final hours of the last session, pleading with the Senate to keep from appropriating out of surplus the last five percent. A substantial majority insisted the five per cent be continued. It was continued out of Surplus, and I think correctly.

Now, we have the proposition, shall we provide any dollars in the budget document for a wage increase to state employees? I think the arguments for it are, first, private employment by and large has received at least one round of wage increases since November, 1948—about two and a half years ago. I think probably a more compelling reason is that the last session of the legislature appropriated up to \$35,000 for a reclassification survey of all state employees. I am one who believes they did a splendid job.

I think at least the adoption of the basic recommendation of \$300,000 will serve to iron out many of the inequities the employees honestly believe exist in the state structure. For that reason, I think the recommendation of the Governor in his Budget Message should be adopted. I will read, because it is brief, his comment: "For years we have been trying to bring the compensation of our loyal employees in line with prevailing economic requirements. The recommendation of the Public Administration Service does just this. The required \$300,000 merely brings salaries in line with going rates in private business as of last October. It makes no allowance for increasing costs of living."

As you know, there is another bill supported by the Employees Association that will go well be-

yond this \$300,000. It may be that would have majority support. It seems to me in fairness we might follow the thinking of the budget recommendations and at least provide the money for the basic recommendations.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President, by way of explanation and with what the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, has already told you, I will say that I will go along with this amendment due to the fact that in our budget estimates this was not included.

I would like to point out to you that we do have approximately 6500 state employees with a payroll of around \$7,000,000. In the P. A. S. survey we were asked to make the increase retroactive to October 1st, but we found out the employees would be content if we took March 1st for the increase under the P. A. S. system, if you accept it, and by that token we save \$300,000. The cost would be about \$190,000 if we begin as of March 1st, but in order to carry it along, if my analysis is right, we have to consider \$30,000 each year to carry it along.

I will say to you in this P. A. S. survey—probably it is a little confusing with the different brackets they have—but in simple figures each step-up means about 4½% increase of your total payroll, which is \$7,000,000. So anytime you come to another bracket in the over-all picture you can multiply \$7,000,000 by 4½% and get the answer.

I merely point this out to you by way of explanation so you will know what it is all about.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, to adopt Senate Amendment "H".

A viva voce vote being had, the motion to adopt Senate Amendment "H" prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Palmer of Lincoln, the Senate voted to take from the table, Senate Amendment "I" to S. P. 495, L. D. 1196, tabled by that Senator on March 21st pending consideration.

Mr. PALMER of Lincoln: Mr. President and members of the Senate, before giving my reasons for making this particular cut in the

Appropriations bill, there are two or three explanations which I would like to make.

The first is I realize that the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Leavitt is not here today and because he is not here and unable to vote against this amendment, I would, to make it fair, like to request that when the vote is taken I be permitted to pair my vote with Senator Leavitt in all fairness to him. I want this debated on the merits of the question, itself.

As a bit of background as to why I oppose this, let me say this: When I saw the Governor's budget and also the budget as given us by the Appropriations Committee, I considered both to be very fair. In my voting here this morning and yesterday morning I think I have been consistent in that I have not exceeded the figure as presented by the Governor in his budget. Many times as I have voted I have had to hold my nose because of certain appropriations. Under Health and Welfare I agree with many of those who spoke that there are abuses but I cannot bring myself to believe that the benefits, for example, by cutting out all cases of A D C because of divorces or desertion would outweigh the fact that many worthy people would lose funds that are necessary, and in each case had to consider the fact that we merely punch a pillow in one place only to have it bulge out in another place at the local level.

In considering the bills I also considered statements expressed by the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Reid, yesterday as to where we are going in our appropriations, as to how far we can carry the amount of aid which the State can give in whatever category we may be discussing, so I like to think of voting in such a way that I do not exceed the estimates which the Governor thought necessary during the next biennium.

Many of our troubles, I believe, especially in the Department of Health and Welfare, stem from the fact that we are trying to sell a program. We are trying to give away aid. We are begging them to take it under existing laws. I don't think we are going to correct it by making across-the-board sweeps and

refusing to grant to those who really are worthy. I think the difficulties many times stem from the fact that in the administration of these funds down through the welfare workers, themselves, there is a gross incompetency. We are witnessing it today, but I, for one, am not willing to vote against an appropriation which is going to hurt many many worthy people for the sake of cutting out a few who could be gotten out through proper administration and case work.

So we come to the Maine Maritime Academy. I oppose this in that it exceeds that which the Governor's budget calls for. I believe I am consistent because as I said before, I have not at one time voted for an amendment which called for an appropriation beyond what the Governor recommended.

I stated in the Senate when this first came up, that we are subsidizing these students at the figure of \$475 while at the same time we are subsidizing students at the normal schools and the University of Maine for \$200 less — \$275. I, for one, can not see the logic in it.

I will say I believe the school is a good school. It is serving a purpose and doing good work. I have visited it and have seen the work they are doing, and I approve, but as the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Reid, said yesterday, I do not think we can continue on and on, increasing these appropriations.

The day that I first spoke against this amendment I pointed out several other cases which had been increased and said I would not go along with them until it was proved to my satisfaction that there was justification for increasing those particular appropriations. I have found justification for those but I have not, to this point, been able to find what has been the reasoning or logic which led the Appropriations Committee in its conclusion to go beyond what the Governor recommended.

Let me reiterate in closing that I have no particular axe to grind, and I know that this cut that I have proposed here amounts to but \$40,000—\$20,000 for each year of the biennium, but if we take ourselves out of the atmosphere of Washington and Augusta at times, \$40,000

at the individual level means a great deal and \$40,000 cut in this case means \$40,000 less that the taxpayer of Maine has to appropriate.

I say again I think the school is a good school, but I also know, as do the other members of the Senate, that it is very highly subsidized by the federal government at the present time regarding clothing, board and instruction, and it is possible for a Maine boy to go to that school for much much less money than he can go to the University of Maine under current conditions.

I think it is fair enough to give them what they have been getting, just as I think the Appropriations Committee was justified in turning down the desires of those who sought help on secondary and elementary levels.

If we are going to be consistent with our reasoning and if we are going to be consistent in this entire Appropriation bill, I think we should amend this and bring it back at least to where the Governor said it should be. Those on the Appropriations Committee said they made all the cuts they dared to make but I question why they didn't dare to make the cut in this, back to the figure the Governor recommended, \$75,000 for each year of the biennium.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I hope we will adopt Senate Amendment "I" to this bill.

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment. Senator Leavitt, as has been explained, is away and cannot be here. I know what his arguments are. This morning the Senate saw fit to add over a million dollars to the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee, and I have no fault to find with that. I think I stated yesterday and will state again today that honest and sincere individuals are divided in two camps and remain there, and both have good arguments. I also said yesterday and restate today that I would like to see the amount of money that is spent for public assistance be near the total that we spend for education, and vice versa. Apparently we are in a situation, in a fix, and cannot get out of it.

My reason for wanting to give the \$20,000 to the Maine Maritime Commission is this: In the first place, it is for deferred maintenance, buildings, and repairs, as I understand it. Maine has had a long history of the sea. There are thousands of miles of coast line, and back along in years gone by, a great many sons of Maine went to sea. Maine was famous for seafaring individuals and the ship industry. Today the United States Maritime fleet isn't what it ought to be, either in equipment or in personnel. I cannot think of a more logical place for the Maritime Academy to be located historically or otherwise than in the State of Maine. It is a unique academy. It isn't like the other academies we have. It serves a special purpose. It serves the purpose of educating Maine boys who want to go to sea and become master mariners. As a matter of fact, if they decide to do that and go through the Academy and graduate from it they get very good and well paid jobs, some of them \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year. Any boy who wants to go to sea and can go to this academy has a bright future. We should assist in the operation of at least one school in the state that will teach and train our young men who wish to, to go to sea, and thereby restore some traditions in Maine in that respect.

I know that the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Leavitt, has wholeheartedly been behind this a great many years and has put in a great deal of time on the project. I believe two years ago \$20,000 was appropriated and almost got by, but for some reason that is not clear the \$20,000 got knocked out. They need it. We have maintained the buildings and they are in good condition.

Another reason I think it is deserving and that is because it is good publicity for the State of Maine to have it. There are students outside the State who go to the Maritime Academy and become master mariners. I don't think the Governor when he made his recommendations, the so-called Governor's budget, had the slightest idea or that he felt in his own mind that there should be strict adherence to that. I am sure if

he had the opportunity to vote he would vote over the budget figure. His budget was a philosophy the same as the Appropriations bill was establishing the philosophy of holding the line. We are not holding the line. That is obvious.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I feel perfectly free, considering the way the voting went this morning, to spend money for education and something I think is constructive and help succeeding generations to do something we perhaps are unable to do in this generation, namely, cut down more than half the money we are spending for public assistance and perhaps raise the money we ought to spend for education.

I hope this Senate will vote against this amendment which will have the net effect of giving the Maine Maritime Commission the assistance which it needs at the present time. It certainly isn't costing the State very much money. The State could well afford to wholly support one institution and teach the young men who want to go to sea. It doesn't have to do that, but just give some slight assistance which they deserved.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President, I arise to inform the Senate that the State does not have an accredited college in this State. The only way teachers can teach outside the State is by reciprocal agreement such as is had with eight northeastern states. The State cannot and doesn't have enough funds to run a teachers' college on an accredited basis. I certainly think there are more teachers crying for an additional appropriation over the Governor's budget than for this Maritime Academy. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SLEEPER of Knox: Mr. President, my allegiance and loyalty for the Maritime Academy is pretty well divided and you can accuse me of being selfish. It is my privilege to have a son there and it is one of the many reasons I oppose the amendment of a man I respect as well as the man supporting his amendment.

I would like to tell the story of the Maine Maritime Academy as I see it. The Maine Maritime Academy is run almost wholly by the federal government. The only



thing the State has to do is maintain school equipment and keep the buildings up. When they started the Castine academy was pretty well run down, as you know, and it had been dropped off as one of the normal schools. I was here at the inception of the Maine Maritime Academy and I voted for it at the time and have always been very proud of that vote. Many of the graduates of this school have gone on to the United States Navy. The upper third of those classes are always taken into the Navy as ensigns and other boys have gone into the Maritime service. They have a system whereby if a boy comes from a family able to pay, that boy pays from \$750 to \$1000 a year tuition. The federal government pays for food and uniforms for the boys unable to pay. The federal government also pays for the instructors. The only thing the State of Maine has to pay for is maintenance and upkeep of the buildings. I think I can tell you the reason they need the extra \$20,000 and I will have to give a little personal story. My second son entered last year as a paying student. I was perfectly willing to pay a thousand dollars a year for his education because we have a slight maritime history in our family, ancestors who were seafaring men. He wants to follow the sea. While not too well off, I was willing to pay his tuition there. As war clouds grew darker the federal government saw fit to increase the quota of the new students there and Brad being a healthy, active boy was taken on as one of the students under government subsidy and I don't have to pay anything for his tuition now, but I did in the beginning, and I will be glad to again.

When the government increased the quota that made it necessary to provide more rooms and classrooms and increase the equipment there. We all know the war clouds aren't getting any lighter and that that is a pretty small sum for the state to pay for such a splendid institution. I don't know just how many but there are several of those boys over in Asia now fighting, seven graduates of that school, and I can't see any reason to question the \$20,000.

That seems like a large amount and it is more than was in the Governor's estimate but at that time things were different and I think in fairness to Ralph Leavitt who has been a constant supporter of the school and who is not here to defend it and since all it costs the state is \$95,000 we certainly shouldn't cut it. It brings credit to us all over the country and I know most of the boys down there are unable to pay anything at all and the only thing the government will do is to feed and teach them; they will not do anything towards maintaining the buildings. That is Maine's job and if we don't do that they won't help us at all. We have to maintain the buildings to keep the boys there. I hope the amendment does not prevail.

Mr. PALMER of Lincoln: Mr. President, I just want to add one more thing. I realize now that this is for maintenance of the buildings at the Maritime Academy. But I want to call to the attention of this Senate the fact that as long as I have been in this legislature your teacher training institutions have been asking for money for maintenance and we haven't been able to afford it, and we have reached the point this year where one institution is considering closing one of its buildings because it would cost too much to rebuild it and make it suitable and we have in two of our teacher institutions laboratories in which we are trying to train the teachers, in a scientific age, which don't even come up to the specifications of a second grade high school. I think I would be inconsistent if I voted for maintenance of one without voting for maintenance of the others.

Mr. BREWER of Aroostook: Mr. President, replying to Senator Palmer and Senator Broggi in the examples they have stated and also as to not being on the accredited list, I will say that if the Senators will look at the appropriations that were first recommended they will find that your normal schools have been pretty much taken care of. We did have hopes of constructing buildings in what we called an omnibus bill but as you know the Supreme Court ruled it was illegal.

However, I still think we can find a way out of that.

I probably had as much to do with the founding of the Maine Maritime Academy as anybody in the Maine legislature except Senator Leavitt. My first year here I sat on the Military Affairs Committee with Ralph who had dreamed of the Maritime Academy in Maine and he was asking for \$50,000. At that time we had an economy minded legislature as we have today. We didn't have much of a surplus but we had some and I was one of the ones who said to Ralph, "You don't know whether you need a thousand or five or ten thousand for this. The smart thing is to get a wedge in and take the Castine building which the state department has given up and we do think we know where there is an appropriation of ten thousand dollars in Bath"—it later didn't materialize—"but I think the appropriations committee would go along to the extent of \$25,000." That is what happened and as you know later on the federal government came in and we went through a war time period and they practically ran the school and all we were asked to do was keep buildings in condition.

My second boy graduated from the Maine Maritime Academy and has been to Korea and back and his ship is now in drydock and on trial run to see if they are in condition to go back into the fighting zone again.

We have five of those schools in the United States and I can tell you in all fairness and pride that of the five schools they will hire our boys from the Maine Maritime Academy in preference to any of the boys of the other maritime schools because our boys have been taught to get down and work with tools and in the grease. I think my son was quite proud when he was assigned to his first cruiser. He took off his insignia of rank and went down with his division to work and the machinist's mate said to the chief petty officer, "Who is the new machinist's mate they have sent us?" And he said, "That is your divisional officer." The other fellow said, "It can't be—he wouldn't be down here." So I want to say to you that our boys from the Maritime Academy rank the high-

est and are the most desirable of any of the five schools in the country.

I did get cold feet when the last war was over and I wondered if it was necessary to maintain this school. I have had a guilty conscience ever since for not backing up Ralph in many of his struggles in the past to keep this school open. But we now know that it is just as essential as anything else. For that reason as Jim told you, Ralph thought he had his appropriation for the school two years ago and the only reason the Governor recommended this amount is because it was the amount given two years previously. But in the shuffle somewhere—and I am not accusing anybody of skulduggery—the amount was cut when it finally came out and for that reason that is the necessary amount. It is a very small amount, compared to what the federal government puts in and you will find out that from now on the federal government will subsidize it much more. It is also one of the things we do need, and I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, it makes me very happy that the graduates of the Maine Maritime Academy are preferred over graduates from other parts of the country and I would also be very happy if the same situation was applicable to our teacher college graduates but they are the least desirable based on their not being accredited. I think it is up to the legislature to decide what is important and what is not important.

Not to be repetitious, but in my high school in Sanford we have better laboratories than any normal school in Maine. This legislature has consistently in its sessions decided not to put our teachers colleges in the position where the graduates can be accredited and I personally cannot vote for legislation beyond and above the secondary level, for graduates who all will leave the State of Maine 100% and when we cannot in our judgment see fit to have our teachers colleges on the accredited list.

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

of the Senator from Lincoln, Senator Palmer to adopt Senate Amendment I to L. D. 1196.

Mr. PALMER of Lincoln: Mr. President, I ask for a division.

A division of the Senate was had, the Senator from Lincoln Palmer being paired with the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Leavitt.

Eight having voted in the affirmative and eleven opposed, Senate Amendment I was not adopted.

Mr. CROSBY of Franklin: Mr. President, I want to apologize to the Senators for not adjourning

earlier. I did not realize the time it might take, and I want to thank the Senate for its cooperation and patience in carrying on this morning.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, the rules were suspended and L. D. 1196 was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendments C, F, H, J, K and M.

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.