

# 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-Sixth Legislature*

**OF THE**

**STATE OF MAINE**

**1953**

**DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

## HOUSE

Wednesday, April 1, 1953

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Wilbur I. Bull of Waterford.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any previous unanimous consent agreement or any rule of the House, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955," Senate Paper 476, Legislative Document 1316, be taken up for consideration at ten o'clock this morning.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair hear objection to the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller?

The Chair hears none. It is agreed to.

### Papers from the Senate

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act relating to Charter Changes for City of Lewiston" (S. P. 508) (L. D. 1387)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence.

### Senate Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act Regulating the Manufacturing and Sale of Soft Drinks, Syrups and Non-alcoholic Beverages" (S. P. 417) (L. D. 1127) reporting leave to withdraw.

Report of the Committee on Business Legislation reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Filing Proof of Insurance Policy Under Workmen's Compensation Act" (S. P. 411) (L. D. 1103)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Providing a Uniform Deposit Law for

Insurance Companies" (S. P. 447) (L. D. 1261)

Report of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Digging of Clams and Marine Worms in Wiscasset, County of Lincoln" (S. P. 88) (L. D. 195) which was re-committed.

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Salary of County Commissioners of Waldo County" (S. P. 423) (L. D. 1129) as it is covered by other legislation.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

### Ought Not to Pass

Report of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Interstate Transportation of Shellfish" (S. P. 441) (L. D. 1208)

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting same on Bill "An Act Closing Offices in Somerset County Court House on Saturdays in Summer" (S. P. 338) (L. D. 839)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

### Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Creating a December Term of Superior Court in Hancock County" (S. P. 178) (L. D. 414)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Carrying of Firearms by Private Detectives" (S. P. 303) (L. D. 919)

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

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

### Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to Liquor Billboards and Signs" (H. P. 275) (L. D. 262) reporting "Ought not to pass" and Minority Report "Ought to pass"

on which the House accepted the Minority Report on March 17, and the Bill was passed to be engrossed.

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mrs. Christie of Presque Isle, the House voted to insist on its former action.

#### Messages and Documents

The following Communication:

STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION  
STATE OF MAINE  
AUGUSTA

March 26, 1953

Hon. Harvey R. Pease, Clerk  
House of Representatives  
State House  
Augusta, Maine

Dear Sir:

Reference is made to House Order dated February 4, 1953, directing the State Highway Commission to furnish to all members of the House of the 96th Legislature, prior to April 1, 1953, a listing within each county of the order of priority for the construction projects described in the 1951 Accelerated Highway Program.

A great deal of time was given to the development and preparation of this program, and while there are without doubt errors of judgment and reasons for differences of opinion with respect to this program as published, we sincerely believe that the completion of the program as a whole is highly desirable, and it is the purpose of the Commission to accomplish this.

The priority indices shown in the program are intended to be the results of ratings, first with respect to heavy maintenance costs and second with respect to traffic volumes. While they do not necessarily indicate the order of construction, it is logical to accept them as a guide for yearly construction programs.

On account of changing conditions, some beyond the control of the Commission, involving approvals, right-of-way problems, and conditions and needs which have required the application of our best judgment in order to serve, in our opinion, the best interests of the State, we have found it impossible to follow in all respects the order

of priority as set forth in the program.

After due consideration of the order of February 4, 1953, we beg leave to submit the same listings of projects for each county as shown in the Accelerated Highway Program of 1951.

We shall endeavor to carry out the program to the best of our ability and judgment. We urge that we be allowed to make such changes and variations in the order of work as we sincerely believe to be necessary in order to carry out the program efficiently and in the best interests of all concerned.

Copies of the 1951 Accelerated Highway Program with project listings have been furnished to all members of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully submitted,  
STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION  
(Signed) Lloyd B. Morton  
Chairman  
Harley D. Welch  
Harold B. Emery

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

#### House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Potter from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of Mary Heckman Leathers of Kennebunkport (H. P. 962) (L. D. 1047) reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Peterson from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Number of Members of Superintending School Committee of Stonington" (H. P. 996) (L. D. 1083)

Mr. Clements from the Committee on Welfare reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Census of Penobscot Indians" (H. P. 599) (L. D. 614)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Medical Aid for Penobscot Tribe of Indians" (H. P. 1068) (L. D. 1167) as it is covered by other legislation.

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Ought Not to Pass Tabled

Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Agriculture reported "Ought not

to pass" on Bill "An Act Limiting Milk Control to Producers" (H. P. 1033) (L. D. 1169)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Riley of Livermore Falls, the Report, with accompanying papers, was tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

Mr. Lane from the Committee on Business Legislation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Declaring Certain Practices in the Sale of Books, Magazines and Periodicals Unlawful" (H. P. 316) (L. D. 388)

Mr. Hussey from the Committee on Claims reported same on Resolve in favor of Mrs. Earl Worster of Kingman (H. P. 796)

Mr. Tuttle from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Albert Redmond of Winterport (H. P. 909)

Mr. Dickey from the Committee on Education reported same on Bill "An Act to Promote Safety with Firearms by School Instruction" (H. P. 1083) (L. D. 1218)

Mr. Roundy from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to General-Purpose Educational Aid" (H. P. 1040) (L. D. 1170)

Mr. Fuller from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Proof of Agency by Registration of Motor Vehicle Involved in Accident on Public Way" (H. P. 67) (L. D. 63)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Redefining the Crime of Perjury" (H. P. 968) (L. D. 1056)

Mr. Martin from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Unauthorized Use of Communications" (H. P. 1020) (L. D. 1139)

Mr. McGlauffin from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Creating an Assistant County Attorney for the Town of Brunswick" (H. P. 828) (L. D. 859)

Mr. Trafton from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relative to Prerequisite to Recording Deeds" (H. P. 1048) (L. D. 1189)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Tabled

Mr. Trafton from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Penalty for Selling Narcotic Drugs to Minors" (H. P. 334) (L. D. 401) as it is covered by other legislation. Report was read.

(On motion of Mrs. Lord of Portland, the Report, with accompanying papers, was tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

Mr. Moulton from the Committee on Natural Resources reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Regulating Boats for Hire on Inland Waters" (H. P. 988) (L. D. 1076)

Mr. Archer from the Committee on Public Utilities reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Transmission of Electric Power Beyond Limits of State" (H. P. 941) (L. D. 989)

Mr. O'Dell from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Incorporate Cumberland-North Yarmouth Water District" (H. P. 233) (L. D. 258)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Tabled

Mr. Low from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Sales Tax on Farm Machinery" (H. P. 1062) (L. D. 1199)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Bailey of Woolwich, the Report, with accompanying papers, was tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

Mr. Sanford from the Committee on Taxation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Abatement of Poll-tax of Deceased Persons" (H. P. 946) (L. D. 988)

Mr. Willey from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Excise Tax on Aircraft" (H. P. 356) (L. D. 372)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

On motion of Miss Steeves of Lincoln, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session, in order to permit smoking.

**Tabled**

Mr. Evans from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Expenses of Maintaining Burying Grounds in Unorganized Territory" (H. P. 947) (L. D. 1001)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Brockway of Milo, the Report, with accompanying papers, was tabled pending acceptance of Committee Report)

**Tabled**

Mr. Evans from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Closing County Offices on Saturdays" (H. P. 1145) (L. D. 1293)

Report was read.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, I move that Item 24, Bill "An Act relating to Closing County Offices on Saturdays," House Paper 1145, Legislative Document 1293, be tabled pending the acceptance of the committee report, for the purpose of presenting an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, moves that Item 24, House Paper 1145, Legislative Document 1293, lie on the table unassigned, pending acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the report, with accompanying papers, was so tabled.

Mr. Hilton from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Setting Off Part of Spruce Head to South Thomaston, Knox County" (H. P. 241) (L. D. 222)

Mr. Scott from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Number of Medical Examiners in Androscoggin County" (H. P. 448) (L. D. 491)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

**Tabled**

Mr. Scott from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act

relating to Holidays for County Offices" (H. P. 1146) (L. D. 1294)

Report was read.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker, I move that Item 26 be tabled, unassigned, pending acceptance of the committee report, for the purpose of presenting an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair requests information from the gentleman. The House is now acting on Item 27, Bill "An Act relating to Holidays for County Offices".

Mr. COTE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Cote, moves that Item 27, Legislative Document 1294, lie on the table, unassigned, pending acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the report, with accompanying papers, was so tabled.

Mr. Clements from the Committee on Welfare reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Election of Penobscot Tribal Officers" (H. P. 600) (L. D. 615)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

**Ought to Pass in New Draft**

Mr. McCluskey from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act relating to Taking of Blood-Worms in Georgetown" (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 1328) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1219) (L. D. 1404) under title of "An Act relating to the Taking of Marine Worms in Georgetown" and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Stanwood from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Digging Clams and Marine Worms in Edgecomb, County of Lincoln" (H. P. 542) (L. D. 523) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1218) (L. D. 1403) under title of "An Act relating to the Digging of Marine Worms in Alna, Edgecomb, Newcastle, and Wiscasset" and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice, and tomorrow assigned.

**Ought to Pass  
Printed Bill**

Mr. Low from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Residence Requirement for Divorce" (H. P. 970) (L. D. 1058)

Report was read and accepted, the Bill read twice, and tomorrow assigned.

**Ought to Pass with Committee  
Amendment**

Mr. Scott from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the Municipal Court of the City of Auburn re Payment of Expenses of the Court" (H. P. 196) (L. D. 207) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 196, L. D. 207, Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the Municipal Court of the City of Auburn re Payment of Expenses of the Court."

Amend said Bill by striking out the Title thereof and inserting the following Title: 'An Act Relating to Salaries of Judge and Clerk, Clerk Hire, and Payment of Expenses of the Municipal Court of the City of Auburn.'

Further amend said Bill by indicating the striking out of the figures "\$2,400" in the 3rd line from the end of section 1 by drawing a line through said figures "\$2,400" and by inserting immediately after said stricken out figures the underlined figures '\$2,650'

Further amend said Bill by indicating the striking out of the figures "\$1,800" in the 3rd line from the end of section 2 by drawing a line through said figures "\$1,800" and by inserting immediately after said stricken out figures the underlined figures '\$2,050'

Further amend said Bill by indicating the striking out of the figures "\$600" in the 2nd line from the end of section 2 by drawing a line through said figures "\$600" and by inserting immediately after said stricken out figures the underlined figures '\$1,200'

Further amend said Bill by striking out the underlined words "**the treasury of**" in the 3rd line from the end thereof.

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and tomorrow assigned for third reading of the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Under the unanimous consent order, the hour of ten A.M. having arrived, the Chair now lays before the House the Special Order of the Day, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955," Senate Paper 476, Legislative Document 1316, tabled by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, pending the adoption of House Amendment "I", which is distributed as Legislative Document 1397.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think, when we left this hall yesterday forenoon, the members were somewhat confused in regard to this bill, especially the introduction of Amendment "I", which in a sense is the bill or the recommendation of the Governor's Budget Committee, disregarding entirely the Appropriations Bill which we have before us today, which has passed the upper branch of this Legislature and now we are to consider.

I have no objection to any amendments that may be offered to the original bill, but I think this Amendment "I" is rather confusing. If we discuss Amendment "I" and amendments to Amendment "I", I do not know just exactly where we will land, because I understand there are amendments to the original bill to be offered.

For regular procedure in orderly fashion I move at this time the indefinite postponement of Amendment "I", so that if this is passed we can direct our attention directly to the bill itself.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, moves the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "I".

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Albee.

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Jacobs) says that this House was quite confused yesterday. I am getting more confused every minute because of the change of procedure that we are having on this particular bill.

I believe, if one realizes that what we have before us, I believe if we start down on a budget which was recommended by our Leader, and I believe that if we take the Kennebec Journal and read his statements of yesterday, where he says that this State can live within this budget, I see no reason why we have to take 1316 and cut it back. We tried that one year and in about four days we wound up with about some \$800,000 more than the original Appropriations Bill, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Jacobs) does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker: I rise to a point of information.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my point is this: If I remember correctly, yesterday, you ruled that in essence we were treating House Amendment "I" as a substitute bill. I take issue with the ruling of the Chair inasmuch as House Amendment "I" does not carry an emergency preamble as listed on Legislative Document 1316, therefore if it does not carry an emergency preamble, it would not be adopted as a true bill. If it were to carry the emergency preamble, it would have to be an amendment to Amendment "I", and therefore I believe that it should be treated as simply House Amendment "I" rather than as a substitute bill. I ask for information on the same.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, requests an explanation. The Chair will attempt to clarify his problem.

If the members will all look at Legislative Document Number 1397 and Legislative Document Number 1316, they will see that House Amendment "I", referring to Legislative Document 1397, states the title of the bill and then says: "Amend said bill by striking out all of said Bill after the heading 'Gen-

eral Fund, Appropriation for General Fund'."

If the members will refer to Legislative Document Number 1316, they will see that that does include the emergency preamble because the beginning of the rewording, referring to Legislative Document Number 1397 to 1316 begins toward the close of the second page of Legislative Document 1316.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote this morning's Portland Press Herald. In an Associated Press release it states: "Augusta, March 31—(AP)—Governor Cross disclaimed today any responsibility for Representative Albee's move to substitute the Governor's budget for the considerably higher general appropriations bill.

"x x x It does not stem from this office," the governor told a news conference. "His (Albee's) actions are his own."

Divorcing myself completely for the moment from the Appropriations Committee, speaking very definitely as a member of the minority, I go along with that statement, and I think it is very unfair to our leader, who has been elected Governor of the State of Maine, regardless of the fact that he may not be a member of my faith politically, to bring him in here to try to influence the passage of the whim of any one individual, be it my own or anyone else's. Those are his wishes. He is a member of the executive branch. The Judiciary is not coming in here. We are the third branch, and I certainly hope, feeling the same way as the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, now speaking as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that the bill certainly can stand revision and possible cutting, that we go along in the orderly manner in the proper procedure, defeat House Amendment "I", go along, and then amend, reject, pass, whatever you may, along the line of the real bill, 1316.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to ask your indulgence for just a few



moments to try to point out what, in my opinion, and based on a little bit of experience here in this House and in the other branch, seems to be sound and logical procedure and the correct way to approach a problem which is perhaps of the greatest importance of any measure which we will have to decide. My remarks will be chiefly aimed at clarifying any possible confusion that may be in the minds of any person within the sound of my voice.

First, by the indefinite postponement of Amendment "I" you have not, in any way, precluded your opportunity to discuss to your hearts' content, ask any questions that you wish, offer any amendments that you wish, to the regular Appropriations Bill.

Your Appropriations Committee has, for ten or twelve weeks, diligently and to the best of their humble ability been in session every day, listened to the arguments for and against every item contained in your Appropriations Bill, each item has been properly advertised as all other L.D.'s, and it has been possible for any person in the State of Maine to attend those hearings and voice their opinions for or against the subject before the committee at that time.

So I ask you members to consider whether or not, in your humble opinion — and I know you will judge us fairly — whether or not we have approached the analysis of your funds, analyzing your funds and properly suggesting an appropriation, or whether or not we have just picked something out of the air. I, personally, do not believe that anyone is capable of picking out of the air the financial program which the State should adopt for the next biennium.

Now, if you wish to adopt Amendment "I", you would be in effect saying — and I refer to those items which show an increase over the Governor's Budget: Let me take Hospital Aid as a fair illustration: If you adopt Amendment "I", you would be saying to the hospitals throughout the State of Maine, "You must increase the rates to those paying patients who happen to be unfortunate and sick." Now

I, for one, believe that the State's cases, who properly fall within hospital aid, should be paid for at the State level, and that the time has come when increased rates at the hospital should level off, and that the sick patient who pays his bills should not be asked to subsidize those others.

Let me take that burial under Old Age Assistance: The Appropriations Bill has added \$50,000 to the Governor's Budget. Why? Because we know that the funeral directors throughout the State should have more than they are receiving for proper burial of these people, and these people are entitled to a respectable burial.

Development Commission: That one shows a reduction of \$100,000. I will try to give you briefly our thinking on that. I believe it was distinctly shown that with the usual \$300,000 appropriation they could properly operate and finance that department. It is true that our good Governor wished more, but before this bill became printed and appeared on your desks, the entire bill was discussed with our Governor, and I believe our differences were ironed out, and it was agreed that the \$300,000 would be reasonably adequate.

I will not take up your time to go into all of these things, but those are items which have been seriously considered, which you would be pitching to the wind if you decide to adopt Amendment "I".

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to heartily endorse the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, and move you, sir, that when the vote is taken, it be taken by yea and nay.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I go along with this proposition, that we should not now try to substitute some other bill for the bill reported by the committee. This committee has put weeks of time on preparing this Appropriation Bill. Most of us who are on other committees had no time to give it the consideration that the members of this committee have given it. I do

not feel that I am remiss in my duties up here if I do not know all about the Appropriations Bill. I have plenty to do on my own committee. If we start to substitute some other bill, we are going to open up discussion that will keep us here indefinitely. I have the highest respect for the man who introduced this new bill, but I am definitely against him on this proposition. I, too, will go along with the indefinite postponement of this proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis.

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise to support the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, to indefinitely postpone Amendment "I". I discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee, this morning. I informed him that I am very much in sympathy with his purpose of economy. I feel that the Appropriations Bill is high and must be cut, but I feel that the way to consider it is to hear the explanations of the Appropriations Committee who have spent months studying this bill and I feel it would be a terrific slap to every member of the Appropriations Committee were we to accept House Amendment "I".

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

Mr. GILMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am of the same opinion as the previous speakers in support of Mr. Jacobs' indefinite postponement. I can add little, if any, to what has been said. I do heartily agree with the idea that the committee certainly knows what they have done, but then again the opportunity to amend and cut off as much as anyone so desires, if they do, is still left.

I sincerely hope that the indefinite postponement motion does prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Boothbay Harbor, Mr. Tupper.

Mr. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I, for one, think this Amendment "I" is a feasible and sound way of approaching the problem. I would like to go on record, regardless of the meth-

od we take, as favoring substantial cuts in this Appropriations Bill. I think we ought to get back to the Governor's recommendation.

We all know the many influences, good and bad, brought to bear on this committee, and how difficult it is to deny appeals for larger appropriations.

I fully realize the unpopular position one takes by urging cuts in appropriations. It is for this reason and the worthy purposes increases are to be used for that makes it doubly hard to oppose extra funds. However, if I may borrow a phrase from Representative Crabtree, I think this budget is fat enough.

Lest I be misunderstood, I am in favor of appropriating as much as Maine can afford to all institutions. I am not in favor of a deficit two years from now.

Thinking the Committee on Appropriations was practicing economy, I sat quietly in my seat last Wednesday, and the "Ought not to pass" report was accepted by this body, killing any chance of a Marine Fisheries School. There are among us a few coastal legislators who thought that such a school in marine fisheries was a good idea. Such a school would have cost the State \$25,000 per year.

The committee apparently thought that there was nothing to learn about marine fishing in its many and varied forms, yet this same committee now asks us to appropriate more than \$300,000 to be used partly for further extension services at the State University.

I do not want to get too far from the subject matter at hand, but let me say that it is time that we began giving a little thought to our great fishery resource. We have a four-year course in agriculture, a two-year course in agriculture, plus many extension services to farmers. This is as it should be, but there are no similar education facilities or services for fishermen. If Maine cannot afford a \$25,000 Fisheries School, then we certainly cannot afford to increase the budget recommendation.

I note, under the appropriations, a comparative statement of Sea and Shore Fisheries, a proposed allocation of \$16,262 for Atlantic Sea Run Salmon Commission. I wonder how many of you know what this refers

to? While \$16,000 seems to be but a drop in the bucket today, I would like to give the House briefly the benefit of my own knowledge on this project. Around 1940, at Poole's Mills, Town of Bristol, in Lincoln County, there was a large number of Atlantic salmon observed. The Sea and Shore Fisheries Department put in a gate, allowing them to go into a pool to spawn. At that time there was no separate commission or appropriation, but the salmon did not seem to mind.

The Atlantic salmon comes back to spawn every five years, I am told. Since our Commissioners of Sea and Shore Fisheries sometimes do not last five years, the results of these programs often are lost. Headquarters now for "Operation Atlantic Salmon" is the University of Maine. Now this is not now, nor will it ever be, a commercial activity. In 1948 there were 216 Atlantic salmon caught in Maine; in 1949, 179 fish; in 1950 — and bear in mind that all the time the scientists were working to get more salmon — there were 81 fish caught; in 1951, 86 fish, and in 1952, 116 fish.

If we appropriate the sum of \$16,262, and 116 of these fish are caught this year, the State of Maine is paying \$140 for each salmon, or \$14 per pound. It would be my recommendation, members, that the Atlantic salmon be allowed to take care of themselves, as they have for many years. As Representative Hanson remarked to me yesterday, "These are Democratic salmon, and they come back every eight years anyway." (Laughter)

As you can see by these figures I quoted, only about half as many are caught now as in 1948, with all the attention the University of Maine is giving them.

I hope this body will show the courage to repudiate some of these requests for additional funds, and go along with the Governor's recommendation.

In answer to the question posed by the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess: "Do you think we picked this figure out of the air?" let me say, as far as this one is concerned, "Yes."

The SPEAKER: The chair recognizes the gentleman from Warren, Mr. McCluskey.

Mr. McCLUSKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to give you a few observations of a rather confused freshman legislator.

With all due respect to our able Appropriations Committee, I think at this time we should remind ourselves that we have had a Budget Committee studying and working on this financial problem since last October, and we should give them credit for having done a thoroughly good job.

If we but take the time to study, or even peruse, the budget as submitted by them and compare it with the schedule as submitted by the Appropriations Committee, we find that of over hundreds of various requests for monies, the Appropriations Committee differs with the Budget Committee in but slightly more than fifty instances, and in all others the Appropriations Committee agrees with the Budget Committee, which committee had made, in most cases, substantial cuts. This indicates to me that it is the feeling of both the Appropriations and Budget Committees that in all but a very few instances many department heads have asked for more money than they absolutely needed to run their respective departments.

I agree with them, and have also observed, after looking over the requests of the various departments, that very few of them have indicated, in the slightest manner whatsoever, that they are endeavoring or intend to economize. Those departments that have so indicated this, by their conservative and apparently studied requests, should be commended.

I would like to cite the case of one department that I have a slight knowledge of. A department head appeared before an Appropriations hearing relative to the financial needs of his department for the next two years, and I was present at this hearing. Originally, he had asked for approximately \$193,000. The Budget Committee had cut him back to \$163,000. That is a \$30,000 cut, out of \$193,000. He was asked the usual questions by the

committee and he stated that he was satisfied with the revised figure, that is the Budget Committee figure, except for one small item.

He did not offer one argument, nor did he protest in any way on the substantial cut that he had been given, and the hearing lasted less than five minutes.

Why did he take the cut so gracefully? I think the answer is simple, and goes for many of the other departments, — he just did not need all the money requested.

I wonder how many of us have heard of any department or facility stating that unless they get all the money they request, they will have to stop operations? I have not heard of any.

It is my opinion that with some businesslike adjusting on the department level, all of them can operate efficiently on the Budget Committee's figures, with slight revisions in some cases. It is time some of them stopped building themselves up, regardless of the money involved, and you may take that statement "building themselves up" any way you wish.

One item that the gentleman from Limestone (Mr. Burgess) failed to bring to our attention is the figure and the statement that goes with it as submitted by the Appropriations Committee on their Comparative Schedule Sheet, and it intrigues me. It involves a sum of approximately \$700,000 for a two-year period, as recommended by the Appropriations Committee over and above what the Budget Committee had recommended, and to justify this sum it is explained to us by the Appropriations Committee with nineteen words, which are both vague and obscure. I, for one, would like to see this figure broken down and explained in detail.

We are reminded by some of our good colleagues that time is getting short and we must expedite this matter of appropriations. Maybe so, but I have noticed that when a resolve is presented to this House, closing some isolated pond to ice fishing, we argue it out on the floor, not knowing and caring less where the pond is located, spending valuable time, but this Appropriations Bill or "Package," as our good friend from South Portland would

have it, we are asked to take it and pass it. Just like that! I don't think we should be so nonchalant about a financial matter of such magnitude and importance. As this involves thousands of dollars, which must come out of the pockets of the citizens of this State, I think we should give it the most serious consideration. I am sure we would do just that were we considering the financial aspects of our own business.

In asking this body to accept the Appropriations Report, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, has said in part that we should be fair with the Commissioners who run the State of Maine during the absence of this Legislature. I agree with him, but I also believe we should be fair with the people of the State of Maine, who foot the bills, whether the Legislature is in or out of session.

Last Thursday, the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low, House Chairman of the Taxation Committee, stated that we were scraping dangerously near the bottom of the barrel. This fact, coupled with my contention that in many instances department heads can operate efficiently in spite of the budget cuts, leads me to suggest that we endeavor by every means at our command to try to keep the financial affairs of our State in a healthy condition.

The gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree, stated, in substance, last week that if we revise or fool around with these appropriation figures, we might throw the baby out with the bath water. Maybe so, if we are careless. All I can say is that if we do, we can pick the baby up, and he might be hurt a little, but he will be that much cleaner for having had the bath. (Applause)

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Warren, Mr. McCluskey. He calls himself a freshman, but I think he speaks certainly close to the hearts of many of the older members when he points out that this is not just a fishing resolve,

and as he also points out that fishing resolves are debated without much regard to time.

I personally feel that whether you adopt Amendment "I" or whether you go back to the original L. D., it is not of emergency importance inasmuch as either one can be adjusted. However, I do feel that our procedure last session, in going over the budget item by item—and I want to assure you that I do not mean each line, but I mean department by department in its total—appeared to me then, and appears to me now even more so, a very sound procedure and a very definitely needed one at this time. I therefore hope that, regardless of which action you take, this Legislature will prove to the people of Maine that we consider this Appropriations Bill one of the most important items in our entire legislative session by examining it department total by department total, and I would like to make that motion at the proper time after we have decided which bill we will take, the substitute "I" or the original L. D.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Fogg.

Mr. FOGG: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: One of the confusing things about this Legislature to me is it seems that every two years the Budget Committee comes out with recommendations for the amount of money to run the State for the next two years, and then when it comes time for the Appropriations Committee to sit, all of these departments suddenly find out that they have to have a whole lot more money. I have often wondered just the reason for it.

Now this Appropriations Bill, I realize, is a unanimous report, and I realize, bearing that in mind, it is sort of a hard thing to speak against the Appropriations Bill, but during the last few days around the State there have been a lot of people come to me and speak, and I have heard an awful lot of criticism about this Appropriations Bill, and some of it has been by members of the Appropriations Committee themselves.

Now it seems to me that if perhaps some of the members of the Appropriations Committee do not have too much faith in their own bill, it is pretty hard for us to have faith in it as a whole Legislature.

Now we have a whole lot of amendments here which have been put in to increase the Appropriations Bill, and if we go ahead and add some of those amendments to the bill, the expenses for the next two years are certainly going to go up. I am inclined to believe that if we start out with the original Governor's budget, by the time we get through adding amendments to this bill, we are going to be in much better financial condition than we would be if we start out with the Appropriations Bill.

During this last week end I sat down and I took the previous budget from the last session of the Legislature, and I took the actual appropriations as of June, 1950, and compared them to the estimated Appropriations Bill as of the year ending June, 1954, and there are some very appalling increases. It seems to me that there are a very few departments that didn't go up at least thirty per cent and some of them went as high as sixty and sixty-five; and the conclusion I came to is that this State is rapidly spending itself broke.

Now if we should have the recession which some people speak about, I think that we are going to end up in a very serious financial condition. Now whatever we do on this, I think that there is one thing that we should bear in mind: We have got to keep our expenses down in this State for the good of the legislatures to come.

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It seems to me that what we are discussing is a choice of method, and that in deciding which method to use, you ought to consider a bit what your objective is. Many people feel that it would be desirable to cut down somewhat the amount of the budget from the Appropriation Committee's recommendation. Many feel that there is not a sufficient

reserve left in the estimate of revenue to be received. If your aim is to cut down some, which is more logical, to start low and build up or to take a high figure and cut down, it is important who knows most about the subject. The Appropriations Committee has studied it and worked hard on it. They are well able to explain to us why items should be raised from a lower base. The rest of us, who have not their detailed knowledge, cannot very well come in and say "That item is too high. Let's cut it," because we don't know the detail. They have studied and they know.

Now it seems to me, if your objective is to keep the budget down, that the correct approach is to take the lower base of Amendment "I" and then build up. If your object is to raise the budget even more, then start with the higher base of some increases and some decreases but you will end up higher. For that reason, I think they are more or less the same thing but the practical question of who has the information would recommend following Amendment "I".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Low.

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the Appropriations Bill should be cut, below the present figure, but I feel equally strongly that the only practical way to do this is through cutting the present Appropriations Bill. I hope very much that Amendment "I" is postponed indefinitely.

The SPEAKER: The question pending before the House at this time is the motion of the gentleman—

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center.

Mr. CENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to go on record at this time in support of the amendment offered by my seatmate, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Albee. I have given this matter considerable thought, and although I want to pay tribute to the Appropriations Committee for their effort, and I fully realize the long, hard days that they have put in on this measure, I feel that when you take everything into consideration, the margin of safety in this

new draft of the Appropriations Bill is too narrow. I feel that if we accept this new draft, practically all of the L.D.'s that carry with them a price tag will have to be indefinitely postponed, and I believe that there are some almost essential matters in that group.

I personally feel that the Governor's Budget is more nearly in line with what we can afford, and I would like to point out that it is the largest budget ever presented by any Governor to a Maine Legislature.

Now any item in this Governor's Budget can be amended by amendment to Amendment "I" if good cause can be shown for that amendment, and any items not taken care of in that manner can be taken care of in the Supplemental Appropriations Bill.

Now the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, likes the method that we used in the last session, but if my memory serves me correctly, after about four days' debate, we ended up with a budget approximately \$800,000 larger than the Appropriations Bill brought out from the committee, and then the Ways and Means Committee made a study of it over the week-end and brought in recommendations which were in substance adopted to bring the budget back to a balanced budget.

I do not like to see the State of Maine appropriate almost the last dollar that it expects to receive. Revenues are estimates, and could fall short; appropriations are definite, and must be paid.

I urge you to preserve a greater margin of safety in this budget and adopt Amendment "I". I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, to indefinitely postpone, does not prevail.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When the Governor gave his Budget Message I remarked, and I heard many more remark, that it would be a good thing if he could get it. I feel that the Governor's Budget is plenty high enough, and I think that a lot of us are confused in this Amendment "I". Amendment "I" is the Governor's Budget. Last year

I voted for the 2 per cent sales tax, along with many others, because I felt that the revenue was needed. The 2 per cent sales tax produced more than was required. There was a surplus. Now the surplus has been earmarked, and now the Appropriations Committee has come out with a bill using up all of the revenue that is expected to come in within the next two years without consideration for supplemental bills, many of which are worthy ones, and also without consideration for exempting automobile trade-ins. Automobile trade-in tax is an item that many of us used in our campaign. I definitely feel that this double tax should be done away with. How are we going to if we go along with this Appropriations Bill? If we do go along with the Appropriations Bill as it is now, I definitely feel that we will arrive at a crisis whereby we will be called back into special session, to increase the 2 per cent sales tax to a 2½ per cent tax.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the only way to economize in government is to cut your Appropriations Bill. If we had passed a 3 per cent sales tax at the last Legislature, I say the surplus would have been used. I also say that the Appropriations Bill would have come out "Ought to pass," using up that 3 per cent. Therefore I am definitely in favor of going back to the Governor's Budget. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree.

Mr. CRABTREE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This seems to be the normal, usual season of viewing with alarm, and I guess we are subscribing to that all right. This has been a good discussion, helpful all the way around, and probably we ought to have a lot more, but I am unutterably opposed to Amendment "I". It does not seem to me that there can be very many in this House who suddenly can be final authorities on everything from whales to humming birds or Atlantic salmon, or whatever they were. (Laughter) I do not see how we suddenly can make ourselves, 151 members, into an efficient Appropriations Com-

mittee. I do not feel able to do it. As much as I admire most of my constituents, I have serious doubts of their abilities along that line, to do in a day or two what it has taken the wise and learned men on the Appropriations Committee many weeks to do. There are inconsistencies that worry me. I have found some of them, but I am so mixed up with "I" that I don't imagine I found them all; there are some. There is no saving clause in it, but there is nothing to save, so I guess that is all right.

It seems to add \$100,000 to the Development Commission. It adds \$112,300 and something for the operation of the new Medical and Surgical building in Central Maine Sanatorium, and I understand, on good authority, they find they don't need it. It adds \$10,000 over the Senate Amendment for the Military and Naval Home in Bath — oh, that \$10,000, I shouldn't have mentioned that — that is a tender subject — but it does not provide for the salary increases of some \$400,000 in each year's biennium, which is a moral obligation, to say the very least. If we want to empty our workshops out back here of all the employees, this seems to be a pretty good instrument to do that. Then there are \$209,000 of Old Age Assistance, which is already signed and in law — I don't see that in the "I" or the "I's"; \$29,000 more for the blind and so on.

Anyway, I am opposed to it. It seems to me that the orderly process of government would be to dispose of "I" as quickly as we can and go back to the Appropriations Bill and then, if it seems, after a suitable discussion, that there are cuts necessary and that might well be, leave it to those who know how to do it without harming all of our State departments. Somewhere in the orderly process this Appropriations Bill has got to be stopped and we must be sure that the pattern fits the cloth of the revenue that will be produced. Certainly our Governor would not sign for the bill unless he was assured that the income was great enough to cover it. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, prevails.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, I think most of us have wandered away from the real issue and that is the indefinite postponement of Amendment "I". When that is disposed of, the door is wide open for everybody to attack the bill of Appropriations. We haven't closed the door on that but we can't discuss in my opinion two major articles at the same time. Dispose of the "I" Amendment and then attack the Appropriations Bill.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is one of the times that I only wish I was one of these silver-toned orators that we have around here. This, of course I don't think it makes much difference how we go at this, but I think that by listening to the Budget Committee's Report, which is an unbiased report and there is no pet department worked into this and no horse trading by the members of the Appropriations Committee, I think we could keep the Appropriations Bill down pretty low. Of course, the only proper way to handle this in a businesslike way would be to hold this bill right on the table until every pet bill that is in the committee or on the calendar is brought out and either lives or dies on its merits. I don't think you folks want to do it in a businesslike way. A little later, it doesn't make much difference what we do with this bill, we can't get it down too low, but in the last day or two of this Legislature we will have another Appropriations Bill here which will be a super-duper and that will come in just like that, boy, and she'll pass and she'll go and that is why I would like to go along with the budget recommendation and I will vote for Amendment "I".

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If you will forgive me for attempting to impose myself on you again, I would like to point out, which is very much a repetition of the remarks I made

a few days ago, the Appropriations Committee took the position that it was obligated to bring in a report based on your current revenue laws and the estimated income from those revenue laws and that was exactly what we did. We have given the House the best of our humble judgment in this measure and if you will analyze it thoroughly, you will find that in almost every instance where there has been an increase, with the exception of State employees, and one or two other items, it will be reflected back into your various communities. You can hold your budget at any level you wish and the committee certainly, and may I speak now for myself, have no objection to what items you attack, how you amend them; that is the prerogative of the Legislature to do. Our bill is only a recommendation based upon the information given us at the various hearings and may I further add that we have had the benefit of two gentlemen who, in my opinion, know more about the State finances than anyone else around here. I take the liberty of naming them: Ray Mudge and Maurice Williams.

I do not for a minute try to inflict upon this House any idea that we have done a perfect job. I do want you to consider this: That if you will indefinitely postpone Amendment "I" and follow the regular procedure of then attacking, if you wish, up or down, our Appropriations measure, you will accomplish much more and you will do it in an orderly fashion and you are not being deprived of any opportunity. Therefore, I hope that you will follow a sound, reasonable procedure and indefinitely postpone this attempt to rape the Appropriations Bill.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, that in some cases we are getting away from the question. I do not think there is any argument whether we are for or against the Appropriations Bill. It may be too high, it may be too low, that is for us to decide. I am against House Amendment "I" because in one breath we say we commend the Appropriations Com-



mittee, saying: "You have done a wonderful job" and in the very next breath we say "We don't want anything to do with your bill" so we throw it out the window and adopt something like House Amendment "I". I think it is ridiculous and I have all the faith in the world in our Appropriations Committee and if we are going along in an orderly manner, let's go back to the Appropriations Bill and start from there and do the job right. I told you how I felt about this bill last week and I haven't changed my mind now. I think possibly there are places where it can be reduced and there may be others that need to be increased but that is for us to decide when we get going on the bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey.

Mr. BAILEY: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to burden you with my time this morning but after listening to the pros and cons of this question, and it is coming up for the yeas and nays, I wish to state my position and how I feel on the situation.

It always has been and I trust it will be my effort to try to economize so far as possible in the administration of any work or factors with which I may be connected. As we can plainly see, this committee bill is in excess of what we have called Amendment "I" but nevertheless I shall support the committee bill on the indefinite postponement of Amendment "I" and when that bill comes before the House for amendments, you can depend that I will do all that I can to help hold the appropriations down wherever they may be done logically.

The SPEAKER: The motion pending before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, for the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "I".

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

Mr. ALBEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The statement was just made that we were getting away from the question but I do want to say that we are getting away from the question to the tune of \$5,381,000 and that is a lot of money if that is getting away from

the question. We have a budget, the Governor's recommended budget of \$2,794,000 over expenditures of 1951 and '52 and the Appropriations Bill, the committee's bill, of \$2,794,000 on top of that which gives a little over \$5,000,000 and I trust that this House will take those figures into consideration and study this, as no doubt they have, and see some of the figures on that and I trust that this motion does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Boothbay Harbor, Mr. Tupper.

Mr. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this vote is not as unimportant as some would like to have us believe. I think that this is the acid test of whether or not the budget will actually be reduced and I think time will bear me out. I think that this vote is all important whether or not we go back to the Governor's and the Budget Committee's recommendation, House Amendment I, or whether we go along with the other inflated bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Larrabee.

Mr. LARRABEE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think we have had ample discussion on the motion now before the House and I should say as an ardent listener that we were getting nowhere fast. I therefore move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Larrabee, moves the previous question. The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, has requested the roll call. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it requires the consent of one-third of the members present.

All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will kindly rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third of the members present having arisen, the motion for the previous question is entertained.

The question before the House now is: Shall the main question be

put now? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending motion is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, that House Amendment "I" be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, moves that when the vote is taken it be taken by a roll call. Under the Constitution, in order for the yeas and nays to be called requires the consent of one-fifth of the members present. All those in favor of the yeas and nays being called will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

Obviously more than one-fifth having expressed their desire the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, may the members have tally sheets?

The SPEAKER: The members may.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, that House Amendment "I" be indefinitely postponed will say aye when their names are called; all those opposed will say nay.

The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Abbott, Alden, Anderson, Archer, Bailey, Baldic, Bearce, Berry, Bibber, Boston, Brockway; Brown, Bangor; Brown, Robbinston; Buckley, Burgess, Butler, Call, Campbell, Carter, Caswell, Cates, Caverly, Christie, Clements, Cole, Cormier, Cote, Couture, Crabtree, Currier, Davis, Dennis, Dicker, Dickey, Dodge, Dorsey, Dostle, Downing, Dumals, Edwards, Emerson, Ferguson, Fickett, Finemore; Fuller, Bangor; Fuller, South Portland; Gates, Gilman, Gowell, Hand, Hanson, Harnden, Hilton, Jacobs, Jalbert, Kelly, Kimball, Lane, Larrabee, Latno, Legard, Letourneau, Lord, Lovely; Low, Rockland; Macomber; Martin, Augusta; McCluskey, McGlauffin, Morris, Moulton, Nadeau, O'Dell, Osborne, Peterson, Pullen, Reynolds, Roberts, Robinson, Roundy, Sanford; Scott, Alfred; Seaward; Senter, Brunswick; Smith, Stanley, Stanwood, Steeves; Stewart, Portland; Story, Tondreau, Totman, Travis, Tuttle, Vaughan, Walker, Watson, West, Whiting, Winchenpaw, Woodcock, Wylie, Bates.

NAY—Albee, Albert, Beal, Billings; Center, Standish; Chase, Cianchette, DeBeck, Denbow, Duquette, Evans,

Fitanides, Fogg, Ford, Frechette, Gardner, Goslin, Henry, Higgins, Hussey, Jewett, Keay, Lawry; Low, South Portland; Ludwig, Murray, Riley, Rogerson; Scott, Wales; Small; Stewart, Paris; Trafton, Tupper, Turner, Wadeigh, Whitney, Willey.

ABSENT—Childs, Curtis, Cyr, Madore; Martin, Eagle Lake; Ready, Rich, Tardif, Taylor, Williams.

Yea, 104; Nay, 37; Absent, 10.

One hundred and four having voted in the affirmative, thirty-seven having voted in the negative, ten members absent, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "I" was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now offer House Amendment "F" and move its adoption and I would like the opportunity of speaking on my amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, offers House Amendment "F" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read House Amendment "F".

The CLERK:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "F" to S. P. 476, L. D. 1316, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955."

Amend said Bill by striking out from the paragraph entitled "TREASURER OF STATE" the line:

"Departmental Operations	48,152	48,554"
and inserting in place thereof the following:		
Personal Services	31,757	31,039
Other Departmental Operations	16,395	17,515

Total Treasurer of State	48,152	48,554'
--------------------------	--------	---------

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You will note that I have not changed the total in the first instance \$48,152, in the second instance, \$48,554. I am not up here to lambaste the Appropriations Committee. I have this amendment which I think is helpful. I have tried for a month

to get the figures and to get the answers and that isn't from the Appropriations Committee; that is from the Department. I think the request was proper; I think the amount is proper but I do want to earmark it for the purpose for which it was requested. There are some of the departments which have been there in the neighborhood of thirty years, I think they are in line for one step. The request was brought in at one step; my amendment is simply to earmark it as you will note "personal services and other departmental operations" and I hope that you will go along with my motion.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that the House adopt House Amendment "F". Is this the pleasure of the House?

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of information. Could someone explain why this item was raised from the Governor's Budget?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, addresses a question to anyone through the Chair.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department asked the Appropriations Committee and the Budget Committee for an increase in personnel of three. We discussed it pro and con and finding the need of more help in the Treasury Department the Appropriations Committee recommended one additional employee.

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, satisfied?

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to further ask what that employee would do.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, addresses a question through the Chair to anyone.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, he will work in the Treasurer's Department.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt House Amendment "F"?

As many as are in favor of the adoption of House Amendment "F" will signify their desire by saying aye; those opposed, no.

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

Sixty-eight having voted in the affirmative and forty-four having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "F" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now offer House Amendment "C" to Legislative Document 1316. This is for Institutional Service and is in regard to the Augusta State Hospital.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, offers House Amendment "C" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read House Amendment "C".

The CLERK:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "C" to S. P. 476, L. D. 1316, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1954 and June 30, 1955."

Amend said Bill by striking out from the paragraph entitled "INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF" the line:

"Augusta State Hospital 1,652,694 1,658,775"

and inserting in place thereof, the line:

'Augusta State Hospital 1,602,694 1,608,775'

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You will note that I have lowered the appropriation \$50,000 each year of the biennium. I am frank to say that I do not know too much about this appropriation and therefore that is the reason why I put in this amendment to find out the answer. It is my desire to either give this

particular item a clean bill of health or else to cut it back \$100,000 as I have suggested in my amendment.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter.

Mr. **SENDER**: Mr. Speaker, may I have the privilege of using the microphone at my rear so that I might look at the House when I am addressing them. It is rather difficult to speak to a group which is behind your back.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair will rule that the gentleman may have that privilege as long as he does not leave his own seat and makes proper use of the microphone.

Mr. **SENDER**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think we should understand what this amendment would do if it is passed. Now, in considering this item, we are considering the care of the mentally sick who are committed to the Augusta State Hospital. By your vote, you will decide what type of care you wish to give those citizens committed to that institution. I think this fact should be brought out at the outset. There is, at the present time, a difference in the amount of money available to the superintendents in the two state mental institutions, namely, Bangor and Augusta.

I wonder if you want your State to provide a different type of care to the patients in Augusta than those patients, the same type of patients, receive in Bangor. I ask you: Why shouldn't the Augusta State Hospital be given an amount of money equal to the amount of money appropriated for care of patients in Bangor? Now these are the facts. My friend, the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, said that he did not have the information. I made an endeavor yesterday to give him the information. I have the information and the facts and furthermore these facts are available to anyone in this House.

Now, what is the ratio of employees to patients and I use the word "patients" instead of inmates. What is the ratio between employees and patients in the Augusta State Hospital? The ratio is 4.6 patients to one employee. At the Bangor State Hospital the ratio is

3.4 patients to one employee. In other words, there are less employees to take care of the patients at Augusta than there are at Bangor. What is the ratio between the patients and the physicians at the two institutions? The ratio at Augusta is 300 patients to 1 physician, 300 to 1. At Bangor, the ratio is 181 to 1, at Bangor. Now, these two institutions are doing and performing a similar service. The question is why do we expect, why will we tolerate a different type of care at the Bangor State Hospital than at the Augusta State Hospital? I think this fact should be brought out also and please do not misunderstand me. I do not think that the Bangor State Hospital has been allocated too much money to do the job that I think you want them to do.

I say that if you cut the Augusta State Hospital \$50,000 a year as this amendment would provide, you are making a bad situation there worse. You are making more pronounced the difference in the care per patient. This cut — I am not sure whether it is motivated because of a personal feeling towards an individual or not but I think we should understand that we will decide what type of care the mentally sick will receive.

Now, the Augusta State Hospital happens to be in an area in which there is more competition for employees. It is more difficult to get nurses at the Augusta State Hospital than it is at Bangor because of the fact that there are more opportunities in this area for nurses to work elsewhere and further, the Augusta State Hospital is by far the larger institution. There are 1786 patients today at the Augusta State Hospital. There are 1107 at Bangor. The overcrowded conditions at Augusta are a great deal worse than those at Bangor.

The Augusta State Hospital is located nearer the largest concentration of population in our State. What effect do over-crowded conditions have? What effect will a cut of \$50,000 have on the operation and care of the patient? This cut will mean fewer nurses-attendants. Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, understand that

with one doctor to 300 patients, the patients do not have the opportunity to have much attention from the doctors so that patients get their attention and care from the nurses-attendants.

Now, if you further cut the number of nurses-attendants at Augusta, you will have more accidents, and we have many accidents there at the present time: One patient attacking another, one patient tipping a chair over and a patient having a fractured limb. I know that because it happened to a resident of my town. You will have less care for the patient and your recoveries will be slower. Furthermore, you will lose valuable help because the people now working at the Augusta State Hospital will be asked to do more work. The turnover today is 100 per cent at the Augusta State Hospital. I ask any of you who run a business how could you run a business successfully if you had a labor turnover of 100 per cent? That is the condition that exists today at the Augusta State Hospital.

I am going to bring up this point because it will undoubtedly be mentioned. I have understood that there has been talk in the hall that the present superintendent of the Augusta State Hospital has lowered his standards in order to hire a great many employees and to justify his request. The only standard that has been lowered at the Augusta State Hospital is the standard which required a mental or psychometric test of applicants for physicians. Those in a position of authority have found that they were not able to attract employees to that hospital and they felt that this psychometric test given to an applicant was a further deterrent to hiring employees. That was dropped.

What about the case of alcoholism at the Augusta State Hospital on the part of the employees? There has been less trouble from this type of alcoholism on the part of the employees, there has been less trouble in the last six months than there has been for the last three years. I was told by the superintendent of that institution, yesterday, that he fires on the spot any employee who has the

smell of alcohol on his breath. He doesn't say that his employees do not drink nor would I say that members of the Legislature do not drink but I say that he does not tolerate drinking on the job. In fact, he fired 15 people for alcoholism during the first three months of his administration.

Now, in answer to this charge that he increased his number of employees recently. He has found over a period of years that every spring there are a great many employees who leave his employ for one reason or another, they quit work, and for that reason, in order to take care of the patients, it is necessary for him to be able to have other employees to take their places. He knows that he is going to lose some and so it is necessary to have these other employees ready to take their jobs.

So, what you will decide when you vote on this question is whether or not you want the mentally sick to receive less care than they are now receiving.

This fall, the beginning of our session, in January, rather, a group of 52 Representatives and Senators visited the Augusta State Hospital. I think after they had made their trip and I want to say here that the superintendent told them he would give any one of them the keys to the institution; that they could come over night or day and go through and see anything they wanted to see. His books are open and he will make his institution open for any of us. So, I move that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, be indefinitely postponed. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, moves that House Amendment "C" offered by the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will attempt to give you the other side of the picture. The remarks of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, that if we vote to pass this amendment we would give the mentally sick less care than they are now receiving. That remark,

my friends, is as phony as a three dollar bill. They say that figures can lie and liars can figure. Call me a liar if you want to but I am going to give you some figures and they will hold up. Before I do, however, I think that now that you have gone back to the Appropriations Bill you are entitled to know exactly where we stand.

The Appropriations Bill as it was turned out left us with an operating gain of \$580,988 for the first year and \$284,185 for the second year. That includes the \$436,200 and the \$435,500 for an increase in salary for the State employees.

It is the general opinion that L. D. 77, the elderly teachers pension program, will become law. That means \$144,800 for the first year and \$144,800 for the second year. The general opinion is that L. D. 12, aid to disabled, will become law. That means \$133,500 for the first year and \$254,500 for the second year of the biennium. One amendment from the other branch has already been included in the budget, the Military and Naval School at Bath had only the appropriation of \$25,000 for the first year. The amendment that is now law, that has been passed on the other side and has been accepted here calls to raise that \$25,000 in the first year, \$25,130 more in the second year, \$48,139. So, the way you stand now, specifically, if those two bills will become law including the State employees' salaries, including the 50 to 55 aid to the blind, including the 50 to 55 for old age assistance, you will stand now at \$277,558 in operating gain in the black for the first year and \$163,244 for the second year.

I join you in saying that the bill must be cut. The Appropriations Committee, as a group, turned out a bill. The Appropriations Bill, if you will check back the records of the House, for many many years has never come out in a divided report. If it were to come out in a divided report, it wouldn't be fair because there are so many items for us to ask the Taxation Committee or ask the Judiciary Committee or ask the Legal Affairs Committee to wrap up all their bills in one package and turn them out "Ought to pass" or "Ought not to pass" and it would be a tremendous task, and I

think you will appreciate it, to turn out individual reports on this item and that item.

I am of the thinking that we should have gone back and started with the Adjutant General, as we did two years ago, and again I will repeat what I said last Thursday, I was bitterly opposed to that program. I was wrong. I am one of those fools who like to admit that I am wrong.

Going back to this amendment, I want to assure you that it is sound. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the average employees for the year 51-52 at the Augusta State Hospital has been 325 employees. The number of employees authorized by the Legislature for 1951 and '52 was 390. I go back, the first figure was '50 and '51. The authorization by the Legislature in '51 and '52 was too high. The money given was 390. The average employees actually was 348. The amount of employees when we met in the Budget Committee in October was 352. On January 28, when the Department head met with us, he had 405 employees and he has taken no pains to run rough-shod over the Budget Committee, to run rough-shod over the Appropriations Committee and I take no pains in running rough-shod over him. Whether it be personalities or not, he dragged them off the streets; he lowered the standards tremendously. The time has come when some of these individuals who do not care to take care of their parents but will have them committed should stop. The commitment may be sound, but could be averted by sons and daughters at times being less heartless.

I will tell you how you can really cut and save a lot of money in the institutions; bar homes for the aged, if these boys and girls won't take care of their parents, because all they are doing, members, forty per cent of them, is just sitting there and nobody comes to see them, nobody cares and nobody wants to. If you think for one moment that I would stand here and have our physically handicapped and disabled hurt, you are wrong. If you think for a moment that the Augusta State Hospital by its appropriation is being hurt, you are wrong because in a couple of weeks you will

have before you another document, the capital outlay bill, and when you see the amount of money that is going to be expended, if you vote on it, if you have continued faith in the Appropriations Committee, for the hospital, it will astound you. It doesn't run into just a few hundred thousand dollars, it runs into millions.

I am not talking guess-work; I am talking straight facts. If you will check page 212 of your green book, you will find an item after the word "available"—"Unexpended Balance Brought Forward, Estimated \$131,595", money that was appropriated, money that was not spent, money that was encumbered. 65,000 some odd dollars can be accounted for for fuel, but the rest of it, figuring to put the further bite on us, purchase orders that have already been placed from the last biennium up against this one. Go down and see Captain Orr; look at the purchase orders. The amount that he has been raised from the Governor's budget is to the tune of \$160,000 to \$170,000. I don't believe that he is being hurt on that basis. The Legislature gave him for salaries \$784,854. He actually spent \$745,492.40, leaving him a balance of \$39,361.60. If he wants to give the care, why not hire the patients? The commodities, repairs and other things, food and everything else, which the Legislature gave him was \$569,861. Actually he spent \$511,556, leaving a balance of \$58,305. Out of that amount of \$58,000 and \$39,000, he lapsed \$2,323.05 and he encumbered \$131,000.

I am not trying to hurt the Augusta State Hospital. I am out to save some money. You said the thing was too high. I have been sitting with this budget committee for two terms; I have been sitting with the Appropriations Committee for four terms; I have studied this. Here is an amendment that won't hurt one soul and I heartily concur with the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

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

Mr. McGLAULFIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't know anything about any of these detailed figures but I was one of the men who visited that Augusta Hos-

pital for some several hours and the conditions that I found there convinced me that they need every dollar of this money and I, for one, won't vote to reduce it one cent.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter.

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to answer a few of the remarks and questions posed by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert. I want to assure him that I do not wish to engage in a heated argument on this matter. I am grateful and I realize the valuable service that he and other members of the Appropriations Committee give to the State, but, how long has it been since we should blame the head of an institution for not spending every cent of his appropriation? It seems that Mr. Jalbert is finding fault with the superintendent of the Augusta State Hospital because he hasn't spent every cent that he could have spent. I say that that is commendable, providing he is giving the best possible care to his patients. I believe that he is.

Now, the effect of the increased amount for the capital outlay for that institution—as a member of the Public Health Committee who has visited the institution I was very happy to see that the Appropriations Committee saw the need for improvements at the institution, but, ladies and gentlemen of the House, what good will additional buildings be, what good will additional facilities be, if we do not have the attendants, if we do not have qualified people to take care of the patients? It is the personal services that are of the utmost importance in caring for the sick, whether they be mentally sick or physically sick. It is the personal service that is all-important.

Now, we might gather from Representative Jalbert's remarks that there are some children in the State who are railroading their aged parents into this institution, the Augusta State Hospital. When our group of 52 visited the institution, I asked that question of Dr. Sleeper. I said: "How many patients do you feel are in this institution who have been railroaded because they were not wanted at home?" He answered me by saying that he does not keep

any patient in that hospital who is not mentally sick. If they are not mentally sick they don't stay there.

I am sorry that the argument became as personal as it did. I tried to keep that angle out of it but, ladies and gentlemen of this House, unless Dr. Sleeper, who is the superintendent of that hospital, unless he champions the cause, unless he tries to provide better care, unless he comes over here and tries to acquaint us with the problem, if he doesn't fight their case, who else is going to fight their case? Thank you.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, after hearing this gentleman who has just spoken about Dr. Sleeper appearing before the Budget Committee four times and hearing him before the Appropriations Committee four times, it seems to me that he is one who should understand somewhat the conditions facing us in the State of Maine in this institution.

No one really wants to work there, even at a fair wage. It is an institution that requires careful and thoughtful consideration; and while one member of the Appropriations Committee has expressed to you his views that does not hamper the other members of the committee from speaking their views if they wish to. I feel that we should protect in every way possible this institution especially, the home for the insane people of our State.

I think that Dr. Sleeper, whose name has been mentioned, is doing a good job and when he asks us as representatives of this Legislature on the Committee on Appropriations for a fund to satisfy the needs of that institution I think it becomes every one of us to stand behind him and show to him that we are doing the best we can for that institution and for his business in that institution. Therefore, I feel that that \$50,000 should not be deleted from the Appropriations Bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Cianchette.

Mr. CIANCHETTE: Mr. Speaker, the thing that is bothering me on this question is that we seem to be a little far afield. The question before the House is on the amendment, whether this \$50,000 that was added should be deleted. Of course I think we can say about any institution in this State, whether it is the penal institutions or the hospitals or the mental hospitals, that they could use more money, more money even than this Appropriations Committee has asked for. However, we realize, of course, that the money has to be divided.

Now the discussion has been mostly on the administration of the hospital, the personalities involved and the poor people who are there. The statement was made that we cannot cut that, that we have at least got to maintain the services that they have. But, as I read this thing, for the year 1952-53 the Augusta State Hospital had an appropriation of \$1,419,000 odd; the budget recommendation was \$1,602,000, or over \$180,000 increase, which certainly, it seems to me, would not leave the institution in a position where they were going to have to curtail their facilities and operations.

Now the Appropriations Committee, as we have heard said a good many times this morning, has given a great deal of study to all these questions, therefore they undoubtedly have a good reason for adding this, this other \$50,000 on that was not put on by the Budget Committee, but I think that before that \$50,000 is accepted and before we vote against this amendment that we at least ought to have some explanation of why this other \$50,000 is necessary in addition to the \$180,000 which has already been added.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The forty thousand of the fifty thousand is for personal services, ten thousand of the fifty thousand is for commodities. So isn't it fair enough



to say that we could save ten thousand at least out of the fifty thousand and take it out of capital outlay, unappropriated surplus, in view of the fact — and I am certainly not divulging any advance information so far as the other bill for capital outlay is concerned — in view of the fact that that will bring about a very substantial amount in so far as the Augusta State Hospital is concerned.

In answer to my good friend, the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, it certainly is not personalities, it is administration. Besides that, out of \$1,652,694 for the first year and \$1,658,775 for the second year, you are granting the Augusta State Hospital what we are granting all other institutions. He is not being privileged there. We are giving them a five per cent increase, a five per cent price increase.

Now if I read Consumers Research and Fortune correctly, and if I am to believe what everybody says and what I read, it is fair to assume that we are somewhat going into a program of recession, prices are going down, so that that five per cent itself amounts to \$61,634.70. So I do not believe—and that is why I am supporting the amendment—I certainly do not believe that there will be any curtailment whatever. There never has been and there never will be. This is just a question of figures and it is sound. You have got to appreciate this fact: anybody who has the courage to cut an appropriation for the Augusta State Hospital or the Bangor Hospital or what have you should be listened to at least so far as his facts are concerned when they pertain to figures.

So far as personal services are concerned, if he does not have enough money for personal services he will go to his commodities. At the Bangor State Hospital they did not have enough money two years ago for personal services. They went to commodities. What we have been doing to him, we have been giving him — and the facts are there—if you will look at Page 212 of your book—we have been giving him too much money for personal services which he is dumping into commodities. He comes up with a surplus of his own,

he encumbers it and spends it for other things. That is all. The program is not going to be curtailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie.

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Since I have no figures to present I am simply going to make an appeal from the standpoint of humanitarianism.

I was one of those who visited the Augusta State Hospital in January. They told us there that they have accommodations for 1250, I believe, and they have 1786 patients there. I could well believe that they were overcrowded when I saw beds setting head to foot until there was hardly room for the nurses to walk between them. I do not know how any nurse could be satisfied or happy in serving under such crowded and unsanitary conditions. Those who were employed were doing the very best they could, the place was neat, and yet there was such a lack of facilities there and such lack of room, that I feel, although I do not know the division of this money, that anything that could be spent there would be well spent.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Warren, Mr. McCluskey.

Mr. McCLUSKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a member of the Appropriations Committee, any member, in order to help us, if they have any comparative figures showing the cost per patient in our institutions and those in similar institutions in other states.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Warren, Mr. McCluskey, addresses a question particularly to any member of the Appropriations Committee through the Chair. Any member of the Appropriations Committee may answer if he so desires.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, I did not quite understand the question. If the gentleman will repeat it I will try to answer it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will request the gentleman from Warren, Mr. McCluskey, to repeat his question.

Mr. McCLUSKEY: Do you have any figures that will give us a com-

parative estimate of the cost per patient for taking care of the patient in Maine and in other similar institutions in other states. I mean is it say fifty dollars a year per patient compared with forty-five?

Mr. JACOBS: In answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are lower in price per patient than any other state of comparable size.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I think you can well understand why I offered this amendment. It is because there have been rumblings in the corridors. I thank the several gentlemen for their statements.

I would like to address a question to the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter. The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, may state his question.

Mr. DICKEY: My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: Would Mr. Senter be willing to put the Augusta State Hospital on line budget.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, may answer if he so desires.

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker, first of all I am not sure that I understand exactly what the term "line budget" is. Now this is what I think it is, and I would like to have any member of the Appropriations Committee correct me if I am wrong. By "line budget" you mean that you appropriate an amount for personal services and that amount can only be used for personal services; you appropriate an amount for commodities and that amount can only be used for commodities. Is that a correct interpretation of the term "line budget"?

Mr. JALBERT of Lewiston: That is right.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, may answer the question through the Chair.

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker, now, if I understand, we are in agreement as to what "line budget" means. I would say that inasmuch as this Legislature is in session once in two

years and that institution must operate for the next two years, I think it would be unwise to say to the Commissioner, to say to the Superintendent, you must operate on a line budget no matter what else happens, no matter what happens to the cost of commodities, if they go down you must still spend so much for food. I say I think it would be unwise and therefore I would not approve of the line budget. I do not think you should tie the hands of the Commissioner of Institutions in that way. Incidentally, we are spending only 31 cents for a meal today.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, if I could ask a question through the Chair: What is the per capita cost of maintenance at Augusta per person as compared with Bangor?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter. The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, may answer if he so desires.

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to answer that question because I think it is the nub of the whole situation, as I said in my earlier remarks. If I might be permitted about three minutes to get that figure from the back door I would like very much to have the opportunity to answer the question if you will give me that opportunity.

Mr. JALBERT of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, for the purpose of answering the question only.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, if I understood the question properly of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, which wove itself into the question of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, which wove itself into the question from the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, I would be forced to answer it based on the fact that if Augusta is lower than Bangor, I would be forced to answer on the basis that if the Augusta State Hospital were

on a straight line budgeting I would have no objection whatever to this amendment not passing. Is that all right, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order. Is the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, satisfied?

Mr. TURNER: No, I am a little confused. (Laughter)

Mr. SENTER of Brunswick: Mr. Speaker— -

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an inquiry to the Chair. I would like to know whether I may be permitted to get that information because I think it is very essential. I am glad the question came out. I would like to know the answer.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, moves for a recess of three minutes. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

(Recess)

The SPEAKER: The House will be in order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, for the purpose only of answering the question of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner.

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am grateful for this opportunity to be able to get this information. I apologize for not having it immediately at hand. Thank you for your indulgence.

The question was asked as to the relative per capita cost between the Augusta State Hospital and the Bangor State Hospital. I have the figures for the last three years. I want to make it clear that these figures include the following items: food, medical fees, and personal services. These figures do not include the cost of buildings which it would be definitely hard to break down per capita, the repairing of a roof and so forth, so these figures are for food, care and medical fees as well as personal services.

1949-1950, per capita cost Augusta State Hospital \$614.88; Bangor, 1949-1950, \$708.52, a difference

of \$93.64 higher at Bangor than at Augusta.

1950-51, Augusta State Hospital, amount spent per patient, \$670.37; Bangor, \$804.07, a difference of \$133.70 per patient higher at Bangor.

1951-1952, Augusta State Hospital, \$760.60 per patient; Bangor, \$927.45, a difference of \$166.85 per patient higher at Bangor—\$166.85 per patient!

Members, may I simply be permitted to say that I do not mean to give the impression that Bangor should be cut.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center.

Mr. CENTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, in his remarks a few moments ago, said that forty per cent of the patients in the Augusta State Hospital were old people just sitting around and railroaded into the institution by their relatives. I feel that that statement is a very definite reflection on the medical profession both allopathic and osteopathic.

I would like very briefly to review the procedure as to how a patient is admitted to a State Hospital. When the municipal officers have a complaint they act upon that complaint, and one of the things they must do is have that patient examined by two physicians. Those physicians must agree that this patient is mentally ill and should be confined to an institution. They sign a certificate and that certificate is part of those admission papers. In addition to that, the statutes provide that twenty-four hours after the patient is served a notice they will have a public hearing at which they have an opportunity to prove that they should not be confined to that institution. I think the statutes lean overboard to prevent railroading.

Now if honest mistakes are made, and they undoubtedly have been made, by those examining physicians, I agree with the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, completely, that the superintendent of the institution—in the case of Augusta, Dr. Sleeper—will quickly correct that mistake, because after a period of observation of that pa-

tient in his institution if he decides that he or she is not a fit inmate and does not necessarily have to be confined, I can assure you that he will release them. But I have every confidence in the medical profession on the whole and I know of no one in either branch of our profession who would sign their name to a commitment paper for any patient unless they really and truly and honestly and conscientiously believed that they should be committed for their own safety and comfort.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to Representative Center through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my question to Representative Center is this: Does he believe he is consistent in his voting when a short time ago he voted nay on Amendment "I" which cut \$100,000 from this Augusta State Hospital, and now I find he is on the floor arguing for the \$100,000.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, addresses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter. The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, may answer if he so desires.

Mr. SENTER: Mr. Speaker, I am glad I have this information at hand—

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt, but it was Dr. Center of Standish that I addressed my question to.

The SPEAKER: The Chair apologizes. The question is addressed to the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center. The gentleman may answer if he so desires.

Mr. CENTER of Standish: Mr. Speaker, in the first place I did not know that in my remarks I had indicated how I was going to vote on this amendment. In the second place, I think in my remarks on the Amendment "I" I pointed out that Amendment "I" was subject to amendments to it and that in that manner some of these matters could be taken care of. I did not imply

by my nay vote that I wanted to adopt the Governor's budget without any amendments.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Tondreau.

Mr. TONDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not have a large list of figures to reel off but, like the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin and the gentlewoman from Presque Isle, Mrs. Christie and others, I was one of the members of the House who visited the Augusta State Hospital earlier in this session, and what I saw at the Augusta State Hospital impressed me more than anything I have ever seen. What impressed me the most was that patients seemed to be herded like sheep in most of the wards due to the lack of space. More in keeping with this proposal here, it seemed to me that the attendants were very few and far between, and I was also very surprised to hear that at certain times there was only one attendant for one whole building at the Augusta State Hospital. Now if this is the case I say that we cannot afford to take one single penny off of this appropriation. I think if we are going to cut on this appropriations bill we had best look elsewhere. Therefore I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis.

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, misquoted the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, on the question of the aged being committed by their relatives. I understood him to say that he would favor a home for the aged.

Now, on the matter at hand, I am in favor of this amendment. If my arithmetic is correct, we are giving the Augusta State Hospital \$350,176 more in the next biennium than the 95th Legislature did. I feel that they are entitled to everything we can give them, but in view of the general financial picture this appropriations bill has got to be cut, and I feel that this \$350,000 is all the practical amount that we can give at this time.

There is an emergency institutional fund which I believe amounts to \$800,000 for the next biennium, and they can get additional money from this fund if necessary.

I feel that the point that the gentleman from Brunswick has brought up about the increased cost per patient at Bangor is an argument showing that there must be more efficiency in management at Augusta, and I am very grateful for those figures. I am very desirous of doing everything we can for the State Hospitals, but I feel that this is one place where we have got to be realistic about the appropriations bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford.

Mr. SANFORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I happen to be one of those fifty-two who went over across the river here to the institution, and they told us that every one of us was a candidate for that place when we were over there. Now I am not so sure, if I stay around here much longer, but what I will be the first candidate. But seriously, I think it is a poor place to start cutting, hospitals—I do not care whether it is the insane hospitals or other hospitals. I think that every hospital can use every cent they can get. I think the Appropriations Committee knows more about this than some of the rest of us and they are in accord with this appropriation and I would hate to see the amendment voted favorably. I don't think that we can do any too much for the unfortunate folks and I am heartily against this amendment.

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

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, states that we increased the amount some three or four hundred thousand dollars but in the past we never have given enough.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Purely for the purpose of clarifying something that might be mixed up here, may I state that with respect to com-

modities, there has been allowed in the general Appropriations Bill five per cent for an increase in commodity prices. That has been stated here this morning; that is correct. In addition to that, there is a five per cent emergency reserve. I hope that the House, in voting on this amendment, will, as far as possible, confine their thinking to the question of personal services as I feel sure that at a later date that question of the five per cent commodity allowance will in turn be a question for debate and should be entirely separate.

Might I clarify another point that has been discussed here with respect to personal services and line budgeting and point out that in the event that your appropriation, as you finally enact it, is too much for this and is not used for this and they wish a transfer, the head of the institution, or the commissioner, whoever may wish, may appear before the Governor and the Council and they must prove their case beyond any question of doubt and the transfer of funds from one account to another is one which must be approved by your Governor and his Council. Therefore, you do have what I consider to be a business-like check in that way.

May I again state — this is repetition — but I hope we may be able to keep our thinking when we vote on this amendment strictly to the issue whether or not we believe that extra funds for extra people are necessary and may I state what was, I believe, the intention of your Appropriations Committee, to attempt in as far as they could to make the Augusta State Hospital on a par with the Bangor Hospital.

The SPEAKER: The pending question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, for the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "C", filing number 157. The gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, has requested a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Senter, to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "C" will kindly rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. Seventy-four having voted in the affirmative and thirty-six having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "C" was indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 1:00 P. M.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, moves that the House adjourn until 1:00 P. M. tomorrow. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House so adjourned.