

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

Thursday, April 2, 1953

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Royal Brown of Gardiner.

The journal of the previous session was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate:

Resolve in favor of Clarence G. Ricker of Clinton (S. P. 515) (L. D. 1402)

Came from the Senate received by unanimous consent and referred to the Committee on Claims.

In the House, the Resolve was received by unanimous consent and referred to the Committee on Claims in concurrence.

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act to Validate Acceptance by the Town of Bristol of a Contract with Maine School Building Authority" (S. P. 514) (L. D. 1401)

Came from the Senate received by unanimous consent and referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

In the House, the Bill was received by unanimous consent and referred to the Committee on Judiciary in concurrence.

Senate Reports of Committees**Divided Report**

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Powers of Attorney General" (S. P. 172) (L. D. 438)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. REID of Kennebec
HARDING of Knox
WARD of Penobscot
—of the Senate

Messrs. TRAFTON of Auburn
FULLER of Bangor
MARTIN of Augusta
CIANCHETTE
of Pittsfield
FITANIDES of Saco
LOW of South Portland
—of the House

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. McGLAUFILIN
of Portland
—of the House

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House: Report was read and, upon motion of Mr. Trafton of Auburn, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted in concurrence, the Bill read twice and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Repealing Laws on Street Sprinkling" (S. P. 235) (L. D. 597)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. PETERSON
of Bar Harbor
EVANS of Cornish
SCOTT of Wales
HILLTON of Bremen
EDWARDS of Raymond
CALL of Cumberland
STANLEY of Hampden
—of the House

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WARD of Penobscot
WEEKS of Cumberland
BROGGI of York
—of the Senate

Came from the Senate with the Majority Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House:
Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker, I think the Committee on Towns and Counties should be complimented on the fine fight that they made in regard to this Bill, that we overrode the Senate in regard to this matter, and they should be commended, also, that it was the only divided report that came out of that committee.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair understands the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, not only compliments the committee but moves that the majority "Ought to pass" report be accepted. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the majority "Ought to pass" report was accepted in concurrence, the Bill had its two several readings and was assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs pursuant to Joint Order H. P. 1193 reporting a Bill under title of "An Act Accepting from Percival Proctor Baxter the Gift of Six Hundred Seventy-five Thousand (\$675,000) Dollars for the new Maine State School for the Deaf to be Constructed on Mackworth Island in the Town of Falmouth, Maine, and for a new Bridge connecting said Island with the Mainland of said Town" (S. P. 517) and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

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

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

Mr. **FULLER**: Mr. Speaker, this is the bill to accept the fine gift of the Honorable Percival Baxter. It is just another link in the chain of wonderful things that this fine gentleman has done for the State of Maine.

I now move that the bill be given its first and second readings without reference to any committee.

Thereupon the bill was given its two several readings, and on further motion of Mr. Fuller, under suspension of the rules, the bill had its third reading.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, moves that this bill be ordered printed.

Thereupon, the Bill was ordered printed and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Ought to Pass

Report of the Committee on Agriculture reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Moving of Poultry from Quarantined Areas" (S. P. 386) (L. D. 1094)

Report of the Committee on Business Legislation reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to the Executive Office" (S. P. 434) (L. D. 1203)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Acts of Employees of a Partnership as Insurance Agents" (S. P. 435) (L. D. 1202)

Report of the Committee on Public Utilities reporting same on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Kittery Sewer District" (S. P. 184) (L. D. 425)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Members of Penobscot Valley Water Commission and Extension of Powers" (S. P. 377) (L. D. 1040)

Report of the Committee on Taxation reporting same on Bill "An Act to Exempt Automobile Used in Driver Education Program from the Sales and Use Tax" (S. P. 457) (L. D. 1271)

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Aroostook County Law Library" (S. P. 192) (L. D. 440)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Tuition Contracts Between Towns" (S. P. 419) (L. D. 1132)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Salary of County Attorney of Knox County" (S. P. 420) (L. D. 1131)

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 assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Tabled

Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of County

Officers in Androscoggin County" (S. P. 444) (L. D. 1153)

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

Report was read.

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill, Item 15, be laid on the table for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is sorry it did not hear. Did the gentleman say "lie on the table" — unassigned or specially assigned?

Mr. TRAFTON: Unassigned, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, moves that the Report, with accompanying papers, lie on the table, unassigned, pending acceptance of the Report of the Committee. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the matter was so tabled.

Ought to Pass With Committee Amendment

Report of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act relating to the Packing of Sardines" (S. P. 440) (L. D. 1209) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A"
to S. P. 440, L. D. 1209, Bill "An Act Relating to the Packing of Sardines".

Amend said Bill by striking out Sec. 2 thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. R. S., c. 27, § 201, amended. The last sentence of section 201 of chapter 27 of the revised statutes, as amended, is hereby repealed and the following enacted in place thereof:

"The commissioner shall select and employ an assistant chief of the division of inspection for sardines. He shall also employ subordinate inspectors, sufficient in numbers, so that adequate inspection can be performed; and it shall be the duty of said inspectors to make adequate and uniform and impartial inspection of all the places, shops and factories in the state, wherever sardines are packed for sale, and for this purpose such inspectors shall have free access, ingress and egress at all reasonable hours to any sardine packing plant, may open any case or container and may, upon tendering the market price, take samples therefrom.

The assistant chief of the division of inspection for sardines shall vigilantly enforce all the provisions of sections 198 to 205, inclusive, and all provisions of the law and all regulations relating to sardine packing.

During the packing season, he shall not be assigned to perform or perform any inspection work, other than that pertaining to the packing of sardines."

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end of Sec. 8 thereof the following:

"No fish is free from defects, within the meaning of Section 203, which is broken, decomposed, contains foreign material, is unfit for food, or is not in good condition from any cause."

Further amend said Bill by striking out the word and punctuation "quality," in the thirteenth line of Sec. 9 thereof, by drawing a line through said word and punctuation.

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

Report of the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to Loan and Building Associations" (S. P. 469) (L. D. 1312) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

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

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 469, L. D. 1312, Bill "An Act Relating to Loan and Building Associations."

Amend said Bill by adding after section 2 thereof, the following section:

"**Sec. 2-A. R. S., c. 55, §162, amended.** The 2nd sentence of section 162 of chapter 55 of the revised statutes, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows: 'Profits and losses shall be distributed to the various serial and permanent plan shares existing at the time of such distribution, in proportion to their value at that time, and shall be computed upon the basis of a single share, fully paid to the date of distribution, or on the value at the time of distribution of each individual share exclusive of payments in advance.'"

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

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Numbers Boards in State Stores" (S. P. 227) (L. D. 589) which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 11.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Chase of Whitefield, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Non-Concurrent Matter

Bill "An Act relating to Classification of Coastal Wardens" (H. P. 149) (L. D. 146) which was passed to be enacted in the House on February 25.

Came from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House: On motion of Mr. Tupper of Boothbay Harbor, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to take up at this time a paper from the Senate not on the Advance Journal?

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Tuesday, April 7, 1953, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon. (S. P. 520)

Came from the Senate, read and passed.

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

From the Senate: The following Communication:

STATE OF MAINE SENATE CHAMBER

April 1, 1953

Hon. Harvey R. Pease, Clerk
House of Representatives
96th Legislature

Sir:

The President of the Senate today appointed the following Conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on the following matters:

Resolve to Repeal Certain Special Resolve Pensions (H. P. 612) (L. D. 732)

Senators: DUNHAM of Hancock
PARKER of Piscataquis
BOUCHER

of Androscoggin
Resolve Closing Little Sebago Lake, Cumberland County, to Ice Fishing (H. P. 260) (L. D. 290)

Senators: WEEKS of Cumberland
WIGHT of Penobscot
CARPENTER

of Somerset

Bill "An Act to Amend the Bracket Schedule in the Sales and Use Tax Law" (S. P. 191) (L. D. 439)

Senators: WIGHT of Penobscot
CARTER of Oxford
WEEKS of Cumberland

Respectfully,

(Signed) Chester T. Winslow
Secretary

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

Petitions Requiring Reference

The following petitions were received and, upon recommendation of the Committee on Reference of Bills, were referred to the following Committee:

Appropriations and Financial Affairs

Petition of Warren S. Colwell and 68 others of Lincolnville in favor of 100% payment by the State of the sum determined in accordance with General Purpose Educational Aid (H. P. 1222) (Presented by Mr. McCluskey of Warren)

Petition of Harold A. Wiggin, Supt. of Schools, and 76 others of Union in favor of same (H. P. 1223) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of A. E. Libby and 110 others of Vinalhaven in favor of same (H. P. 1224) (Presented by same gentleman)

Sent up for concurrence.

Orders

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I present an Order and move its passage.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, presents an Order and moves its passage. The Clerk will read the Order.

WHEREAS, it has come to the attention of the members of the House of Representatives that honors were conferred upon Mr. RICH of Charleston, a member of this House, Tuesday, March 31, during Farm and Home Week at the University of Maine, as an Outstanding Farmer;

BE IT ORDERED, that congratulations be extended to Mr. RICH on his achievement;

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the Clerk be directed to send to Mr. RICH an attested copy of this Order.

Thereupon, the Order received passage, amid the applause of the House, the Members rising.

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

House Reports of Committees

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Self-Service of Liquor" (H. P. 981) (L. D. 1069)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DENNETT of York
BOUCHER of Androscoggin
TABB of Kennebec

— of the Senate

Messrs. DOSTIE of Winslow
ANDERSON of Greenville
LARRABEE of Westbrook
CHASE of Whitefield
ALBERT of Augusta

— of the House

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. BROWN of Robbinston
Mrs. CHRISTIE of Presque Isle

— of the House

Report was read.

On motion of Mr. Chase of Whitefield, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Sale of Liquor in Connection with Pari Mutuel Betting" (H. P. 983) (L. D. 1071)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TABB of Kennebec
BOUCHER of Androscoggin
DENNETT of York

— of the Senate

Messrs. CHASE of Whitefield
DOSTIE of Winslow
ANDERSON of Greenville
ALBERT of Augusta

— of the House

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Presque Isle
Messrs. LARRABEE of Westbrook
BROWN of Robbinston

— of the House

Report was read.

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

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, L. D. 1071, Bill "An Act Prohibiting

Sale of Liquor in Connection with Pari Mutuel Betting" - - -

The SPEAKER: The Chair would like to request the gentleman to make a motion for the purpose of debate.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I move that the minority report be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, moves that the minority "Ought to pass" Report be accepted.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, L. D. 1071, Bill "An Act Prohibiting Sale of Liquor in Connection with Pari Mutuel Betting," provides that there shall be no sale of liquor at or adjoining or within 500 yards of a pari mutuel betting establishment.

At the committee hearing on this measure objections were made that this would tend to harm licensees at Lewiston, where there are retail stores selling alcoholic beverages, which have no connection whatsoever with the pari mutuel track, which are outside the grounds of the track, and that it would be unfair to penalize them.

It was likewise brought out that at Bangor a hotel was within that 500-yard requirement, and for that reason it would be penalized by prohibiting them from selling year-round alcoholic beverages in connection with a pari mutuel establishment.

Having these objections in mind, a redraft of this bill has been prepared and is your Filing Number 211, House Amendment "A". The purpose of this amendment is to take care of the objections brought at that hearing, the principal objections, as I view them, and it would provide, in effect, that concessionaires of the track would be prohibited from sale of alcoholic beverages. As the proposed amendment would read, it would prohibit only lessees, grantees, licensees or concessionaires of the track; it would not affect those year-round establishments that have no connection whatsoever, which do not contribute to the financial success of the pari mutuel betting establishment.

Now, the purpose of this bill has been to separate two items which

many people concede are evil. It is to separate liquor and gambling. I think there are many people who feel that liquor and gambling should not mix. There are many people who have no objection to the sale of liquor, and yet who feel that you should not allow sale of liquor at pari mutuel establishments. One of the regulations now in the rules of the Liquor Commission, or rather, three of the regulations, regulations 4, 5, and 6, concerning the operation and control of licensed premises, prohibit gambling of any sort in connection with liquor establishments.

Apparently the reasoning behind these regulations is that a man would be led to bet more than he should if any slot machines or any type of pinball or gambling device is allowed upon licensed premises. This is a condition of the licenses that are granted and suspension or revocation may be invoked in case of a violation of this, and it is one of the most strictly enforced rules of the Liquor Commission. We are thankful for that. But I think it is the same type of reasoning that applies to the adoption of this regulation by the Liquor Commission which applies here, the principle being that liquor and gambling should not mix. If you should not allow gambling upon liquor premises, it is my feeling that you should not allow the sale of liquor upon gambling premises, and it will result, if it is continued, in persons betting the money of their families, betting far above what they otherwise would be inclined to bet if there were no sale of liquor.

There is another difficulty connected with the sale of liquor at pari mutuel establishments, and that is the traffic hazards. Great numbers of cars go to Scarborough, and I should judge also to other pari mutuel betting establishments. If you allow the sale of liquor in connection with these establishments, you will have an incitement to mixing drinking and driving, you will have an incitement to driving under the influence of alcoholic beverages. It strikes me that many of those people who may drink at those establishments may feel that they can drive their car home, and having taken a drink they will feel

that they are the best driver on the road, that they can cut corners more closely than anyone else, that they are perfectly reliable and safe as a driver, as many people are inclined to feel after one or two drinks, and then you would have the violation of the law of driving under the influence of alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Speaker, if the minority report on this measure is accepted, I will offer Amendment Filing Number 211. It is my hope that you who oppose gambling, you who oppose liquor, and you who oppose a mixture of liquor and gambling, may join and give this bill fair passage.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Liquor Control Committee, and a signer of the majority report, I would have a few remarks to make in reference to this bill.

I, personally, firstly I will say that this hits at Scarborough Downs. I have personally been down to Scarborough Downs, not to gamble, but I went down there more to find out what kind of a place it was; I had heard so much talk about it. I found a well-organized place. I should say that it was a credit to the State of Maine. We have already accepted gambling in the State before Scarborough Downs was ever thought of. The bar there is a big room overlooking the track. It is well organized, enforced; I did not see a person that showed any signs of intoxication.

The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, says if the liquor was not sold on the premises, or near the premises, there would be less drinking in the cars. I do not agree with him. If they don't sell the liquor on the premises, they will bring it with them. On the way to the grounds they will drink it in the cars, they will drink it under the bleachers, they will drink it anywhere they can, and believe me, they will drink it straight. The results will be bad. I had much rather see a place legally selling liquors under the control of the law, well organized, and I think the results will be much better. I can-

not see where there is anything to be gained by the bill or the amendment. I therefore move for the indefinite postponement of the bill and accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Whitefield, Mr. Chase, moves that the Reports and Bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, in support of the motion of the gentleman from Whitefield (Mr. Chase) it appears to me that this not only would apply to Scarborough but it also would apply to those Fairs where they have trotting and where it is the custom to have a licensee on the premises during the period when racing is being conducted, therefore it would not only hamper the operation of Scarborough but also would hamper the operation of any of these other establishments where the practice has been to allow the sale of beer and ale. That is the point. It not only applies to the hard liquors but also to the sale of beer and ale during hot weather.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not wish to indulge in this Dry versus Wet argument. However, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact, as an example of just how poorly written an amendment can be and how dangerous it is to glance at amendments without careful scrutiny, here is a prime example in front of us. The first line says "No liquor license of any kind shall be issued to any person, partnership, association or corporation conducting a pari mutuel betting establishment" and then there is another "Nor" and it goes on.

I would like to point out to you that some of the men who run, for example specifically, both the Bangor Fair and Scarborough Downs also own restaurants, and they have a malt liquor license in Bangor. The way this amendment reads, that man would have his restaurant taken away, if we adopt this amendment.

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

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not care to enter into technicalities in regard to this amendment, but I do feel that since there are only three places in the State where liquor is allowed in connection with pari mutuel betting establishments, it would not be any great hardship if these were not allowed to operate.

As far as it being a detriment to the places conducting pari mutuels, I do not feel that that would be the case. It seems to me that people would be more orderly if they did not have such easy access to liquor, and if it were a little farther away from the place where the betting was going on, I feel that it would be a help and not a hindrance to these establishments, and I hope that the House will go along with the minority report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to say that this bill was held a week for me because I did not agree with either side on the matter, and now that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, has mentioned Rules 4, 5, and 6 of the Liquor Commission and he has further stated that gambling is prohibited by rule and regulation of the State Liquor Commission, I would like to read Rule 4 of the State Liquor Commission: "Any type of pinball machine, slot machine, shuffleboard, baffleboard, or punchboard, or any device which furnishes anything besides merchandise of a quantity and quality commensurate with the price deposited therein is prohibited on licensed premises and the payment to the Federal government of a tax on a gaming device or chance, slot machine or pinball game for the licensed premises by a licensee or his agent or servant shall be prima facie evidence of violation of this rule."

I would not say that the rules of the State Liquor Commission prohibit all gambling. It is my contention that betting is gambling, and the rules do not prohibit all types of **gambling**.

Now with reference to the bill itself, I certainly do not think the bill ought to pass, and if it should pass by any chance, certainly House Amendment "A" should be adopted.

With reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, that any individual who may be connected with a race track could not have a license in his restaurant, I would refer to the portion of the amendment that says that his license in his restaurant must be within four hundred yards of the ground. Now I don't want to confuse the issue, but I think the whole thing should be made clear.

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

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, further along the lines of the reference of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman, as to prohibiting persons who have other licenses for licensed sale of beverages, most of the places, as I understand them, conducting pari mutuel betting, do the same under a corporate charter; they are corporations, and the corporations are the ones which have the license, and there is nothing to prevent them from incorporating so that that particular difficulty would be easily taken care of.

It is my view of this amendment which was to be offered that the provision in it set forth by the gentleman from Greenville, Mr. Anderson, would clearly take care of the objection also of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Totman.

As to these establishments being such good boys, the conduct of the premises perfectly in order at Scarborough Downs, I would like to point out to the members of this House that there has been so far one suspension of their licenses at Scarborough Downs for violation of the liquor laws.

It is my hope that the minority report may be accepted so that the amendment may be offered which would take care of most of the objections which were offered at the hearing.

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

Mr. McGLAUF LIN: Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to know anything about the merits of this bill. I have not even read it. But I think it would only be fair to give the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, the chance to put in an amendment, if he wishes to, and we can then pass upon the merits of the amendment. If he can get a good one, that is not objectionable to the members who have spoken against it, all right. You still have plenty of time to throw the entire matter out and later act.

I shall vote to give Mr. Stewart a chance to amend.

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

Mr. COTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As far as this amendment is concerned, I do not believe that it takes care of the situation in Lewiston. 400 feet, almost a quarter of a mile, that is quite a ways around a racetrack. I feel that we have about a half a dozen establishments in the City of Lewiston that will be hurt by this. I believe this bill is discriminatory in that it only hits Bangor, Lewiston and Scarborough Downs. Therefore, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Whitefield, Mr. Chase.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, stated there has been violation down there at Scarborough Downs but I want to say that that shows that the enforcement division was on the job and the place is being looked after and being run on a good legitimate basis. That proves it. Thank you.

Mr. STEWART of Portland: Mr. Speaker —

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, may I ask for a division?

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Whitefield, Mr. Chase, that the House Divided Report of the Committee on

Liquor Control, Majority "Ought not to pass" and Minority "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Sale of Liquor in Connection with Pari Mutuel Betting", House Paper 983, Legislative Document 1071, and accompanying papers, be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Stewart, requests a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Whitefield, Mr. Chase, will please rise and remain standing in their places until the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-six having voted in the affirmative and twenty-nine having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and the Reports and Bill were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Age of Employees on Licensed Liquor Premises" (H. P. 986) (L. D. 1074)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TABB of Kennebec

BOUCHER

of Androscoggin

DENNETT of York

—of the Senate

Messrs. LARRABEE of Westbrook

CHASE of Whitefield

BROWN of Robbinston

ANDERSON of Greenville

DOSTIE of Winslow

ALBERT of Augusta

—of the House

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mrs. CHRISTIE

of Presque Isle

—of the House

Report was read and on motion of Mr. Albert of Augusta, the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting

"Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Liquor Advertising" (H. P. 1026) (L. D. 1147)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TABB of Kennebec
BOUCHER
of Androscoggin
DENNETT of York
—of the Senate

Messrs. LARRABEE of Westbrook
CHASE of Whitefield
BROWN of Robbinston
ANDERSON of Greenville
DOSTIE of Winslow
ALBERT of Augusta
—of the House

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mrs. CHRISTIE
of Presque Isle
—of the House

Report was read and on motion of Mr. Anderson of Greenville, the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Prohibiting the Sale of Malt Beverages in Unincorporated Places" (H. P. 1172) (L. D. 1327)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. TABB of Kennebec
BOUCHER
of Androscoggin
DENNETT of York
—of the Senate

Messrs. LARRABEE of Westbrook
ANDERSON of Greenville
DOSTIE of Winslow
BROWN of Robbinston
CHASE of Whitefield
ALBERT of Augusta
—of the House

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mrs. CHRISTIE
of Presque Isle
—of the House

Report was read and on motion of Mr. Chase of Whitefield, the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought to Pass in New Draft Recommended

Mr. Henry from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to Examination of Domestic Insurance Companies" (H. P. 315) (L. D. 387) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1221) (L. D. 1408) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that a mistake has been made in the new draft of this bill. I therefore move that the Report and accompanying papers be recommitted to the Committee on Business Legislation.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis, moves that the Report of the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to Examination of Domestic Insurance Companies," House Paper 315, Legislative Document 387, reporting same in a new draft, House Paper 1221, Legislative Document 1408, together with accompanying papers, be recommitted to the Committee. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the Report and accompanying papers were recommitted to the Committee on Business Legislation and sent up for concurrence.

Mrs. Christie from the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act Regulating Liquor Advertising" (H. P. 191) (L. D. 202) which was recommitted, reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1220) (L. D. 1407) under same title and that it "Ought to pass".

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

Ought to Pass Printed Bills

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Liquor Control reported "Ought

to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Malt Liquor License Fees in Un-organized Territory" (H. P. 982) (L. D. 1070)

Mrs. Christie from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Excise Taxes on Malt Liquor" (H. P. 1140) (L. D. 1274)

Mr. Dostie from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Sale of Cigarettes and Tobacco Products in Taverns" (H. P. 1025) (L. D. 1146)

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

**Ought to Pass
With Committee Amendment
Tabled**

Mr. Jacobs from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Building Committee of Eastern States Exposition" (H. P. 628) (L. D. 652) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read.

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

Mr. BAILEY: Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Standish, Mr. Center, is not present today, out of respect to him, I ask that this be tabled until Tuesday next, both bill and amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Bailey, moves that the report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Building Committee of Eastern States Exposition", House Paper 628, Legislative Document 652, together with accompanying papers, be tabled pending acceptance of the report and unassigned. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Mr. Fuller from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Revising the Charter of the Bangor Municipal Court" (H. P. 521) (L. D. 557) 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. 521, L. D. 557, Bill "An Act Revising the Charter of the Bangor Municipal Court."

Amend said Bill by striking out all of the first paragraph following the enacting clause and inserting in place thereof the following:

'**Sec. 1. P. & S. L., 1895, c. 211, amended.** Chapter 211 of the private and special laws of 1895, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:'

Further amend said bill by striking out the underlined figures "\$3,750" in the second line of the second paragraph of that part designated as "Sec. 9." and inserting in place thereof the underlined figures '\$3,500'

Further amend said bill by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

'**Sec. 2. Effective date.** The foregoing provisions relative to clerk hire for said court shall be retroactive to January 1, 1953.'

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

Mr. Chase from the Committee on Liquor Control on Bill "An Act relating to the Sale of Liquor on May Thirtieth" (H. P. 1056) (L. D. 1171) 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. 1056, L. D. 1171, Bill "An Act Relating to the Sale of Liquor on May Thirtieth."

Amend said bill by inserting after the underlined figure "30" in the last line of said bill the following underlined words, 'prior to 12 noon Eastern Standard Time'

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

Mr. Berry from the Committee on Veterans and Military Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Civil Defense" (H. P. 556) (L. D. 536) 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. 556, L. D. 536, Bill "An Act Relating to Civil Defense."

Amend said Bill by omitting Section 3.

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

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

Mr. **FULLER**: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the regular order of business provided for by the Rules of the House that the unfinished business of yesterday be taken up at 2:05 today.

The **SPEAKER**: Will the gentleman please approach the rostrum?

The Chair understands that the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Fuller, temporarily withdraws his request?

Mr. **FULLER**: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Creating a December Term of Superior Court in Hancock County" (S. P. 178) (L. D. 414)

Bill "An Act relating to Carrying Weapons by Private Detectives" (S. P. 303) (L. D. 919)

Bill "An Act relating to Residence Requirement for Divorce" (H. P. 970) (L. D. 1058)

Bill "An Act relating to the Digging of Marine Worms in Alna, Edgcomb, Newcastle and Wiscasset" (H. P. 1218) (L. D. 1403)

Bill "An Act relating to the Taking of Marine Worms in Georgetown" (H. P. 1219) (L. D. 1404)

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

Amended Bill

Bill "An Act relating to Salaries of Judge and Clerk, Clerk Hire, and Payment of Expenses of the Municipal Court of the City of Auburn" (H. P. 196) (L. D. 207)

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

the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

Orders of the Day

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair lays before the House the first item of unfinished business of yesterday, 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. The pending question before the House is on the third reading.

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

Mr. **DICKEY**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I now offer House Amendment "D". It is not my purpose to try to hog the floor with my amendments. However, I have had them on your desks since the 25th of March.

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

The **CLERK**:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "D" 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 the line which reads as follows:

"**MERIT AWARD**

BOARD 10,614 10,661"

Further amend said Bill by correcting totals therein affected 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: I am sorry that you didn't want to save money yesterday. However, here is an opportunity for you to save \$21,275. This Merit Award Board, in my estimation, should no longer function. I had a very nice talk with Mr. Maurice Williams, who was, I believe, one of the first members on this board when it started and he has pointed out to me many

instances where they have saved money but I ask you this question. Have you noticed in the Appropriations Bill any place where any money may have been saved by this Merit Award Board where it is reflected in the lowering of an estimate in any department in the State of Maine?

We had a hearing a short time ago. I do have a bill which is now before the Appropriations Committee to do away with the Merit Award Board. I could not find an instance wherein they could substantiate any good of this Merit Award Board.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Liberty, Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I differ quite a bit with my good friend from the Town of Brooks in Waldo, Mr. Dickey, and I can answer his questions very thoroughly in regard to savings in different departments throughout the State. In one department alone, Institutions, one recommendation of the Board saved the State \$11,331 annually and that is in the Maine School for the Deaf. This suggestion was that responsible relatives and parents who were financially able should contribute to the board and care of these children attending the Maine School for the Deaf, it being understood that there was no charge for the education at that school. The first year after its adoption, this suggestion brought in \$6,000 and the revenue has now increased, as I said before, to \$11,331 annually. It is expected that this will be at least \$13,000 for each of the next two years.

Another suggestion that was brought to bear fruit was the surplus materials throughout the State, that is, supplies, office furniture, equipment in various state departments and institutions that were distributed to other departments which needed them, whereby before they were carried to the dump.

And also here is another recommendation on which I can't go into detail too much now because it hasn't been approved, but this will save the State \$230,000 a year. What I like about this Merit Award Board, they work over the depart-

ment heads. This recommendation was made to the Highway Commission by another employee from another department and as yet this hasn't been adopted but I understand pressure is being brought to bear and that it will be, thereby saving the State a lot of money.

Since this board was adopted the overall saving has been eight thousand and a half, that is considering all the years that this has been in operation, and I can't see where this is costing the State of Maine a cent. If we can save eight thousand and a half over a period of these years, why not do it? I thank you.

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

Mr. ALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, part way, but I can't go all the way with him. He tells that the savings of the Merit Award Board do not appear in the budget but if the savings hadn't been made they certainly would appear in the budget and it would be pumped up a little more than it is now. I have to go along with the Merit Award Board. I guess I had better rephrase that: I don't have to go along with it but I will. I think that employees of the State or the employees of any organization should submit their ideas on their own but I do think in this case that we have to give them a little incentive and it isn't much to ask for in the total budget, the \$10,000. I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, does not prevail.

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

Mr. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The whole purpose of this Merit Award Board is to stimulate creative and money saving ideas by State employees. I think if we want to save some money we had better go back to my suggestion of yesterday on the Atlantic salmon. (Laughter)

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

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is up to

you if you want to save \$21,000. This old one in the School for the Deaf was when Mr. Maurice Williams was a member of the board and I realize that he worked very hard.

You answer me, why, two years ago, we raised the department heads a thousand dollars and there is a bill before you now to raise them a thousand and if they are worth a hoot they can see these savings and should report them to us. Now, we have a bill here for \$400,000 a year for the employees. Why shouldn't they give us a little recommendation whereby instead of having to pay them \$25 for some little idea that doesn't amount to anything? I tell you it is not reflected in our Appropriations Bill any saving that they have made. You may say that we have saved \$10,000. Where is it? Tell me. You can go along if you want to save \$21,000. I can tell you where you can use \$21,000 to more advantage than in any little, miserable Merit Award Board that doesn't amount to a hoot.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that the House adopt House Amendment "D".

All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted, a division of the House was had. Seventy-five having voted in the affirmative and twenty-five having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "D" was adopted.

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

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, again I am sorry to appear to hog the offering of amendments. My same remarks apply. My amendments have been here since the 25th of March. I now offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

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

The CLERK:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" 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 the paragraph entitled "EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF" the line: "General Purpose

Educational Aid 6,613,017 6,609,974" and inserting in place thereof the line:

'General Purpose

Educational Aid 6,898,198 6,895,024'

Further amend said Bill by correcting totals therein affected 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 in this amendment, filing number 155, that I have asked you to appropriate 570,000 added dollars to the biennium.

I will have to say in clarification and I am sorry to bring in a percentage but it is only for the purpose of clarification, this amount of money will approximate 99.9 per cent of the school subsidy. I realize that in the school subsidy the State of Maine does not have to guarantee 100 per cent. I believe it should be vested in the Legislature to appropriate such sums of money as they think are needed and necessary to carry on education in the State of Maine.

Now, when we passed the sales tax two years ago—

The SPEAKER: May the Chair interrupt the gentleman? There seems from here that there is an unusually great amount of noise behind the railing. May the House have your cooperation?

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, maybe they can't hear me. I will speak louder if you wish.

When they passed the sales tax two years ago there was a savings to the towns of 7¼ mills to be sure and many have thought that the towns should take on more obligations to the tune of 7¼ mills. I think the towns have tried to improve the conditions in their towns with sewer construction, school construction, and so forth.

Now, if you will go along with this amendment, which is an increase of \$570,000, we are not asking you

to spend something that will not be reflected right back in your own town. This is simply appropriating the money and the only method by which the towns can receive this aid is from the State. There isn't a city, with perhaps the exception of Portland, that can carry on a school system such as we want. Therefore, we do have to have a subsidy from the State.

Now, you will recall in the subsidy bill there are brackets from 14 up to 65 per cent. If you knock off 5 per cent of the town that is getting 14 per cent aid, it isn't so much, but when you get to the smaller towns that are receiving 65 per cent, and you knock off 5 per cent of 65 per cent, it approximates quite a figure and it is almost impossible for some of these small towns to carry on their schools.

I would like to hear arguments on this and before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I will ask that when the vote is taken it be by a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that the House adopt House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Believe you me, I recognize the spot that I am in at this moment and the unpopularity I will have throughout the State of Maine for taking the position that I do but I believe that the time has come, and I say this honestly and from the bottom of my heart to every person in the State of Maine, when the people back home should draw their hand in and put it on the plow and see if they can do something for themselves and stop asking the State for continued subsidies in every respect.

Now, that not only applies to education but it applies to a great many other things. Two years ago, the State of Maine subsidized the schools to the tune of 93.7 of the formula. The present Appropriations Bill gives you 95.7 of the formula. Now, every town, not every town, perhaps some towns, are hurt by inequities in the formula, but until the formula is changed I am firmly convinced that the State has gone

as far as it should in subsidizing education at the local level. We have returned to them through taxation five and a half million dollars, approximately, in the form of state tax or eliminated the necessity of assessing it, whichever way you wish to figure it. We have gone a long ways in the past few years in assisting towns throughout the State.

Believe you me, I am not opposed to assisting them but I say that so far as education is concerned, you have gone as far as you can afford to go.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that the House adopt House Amendment "A".

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

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do thank the Appropriations Committee for their study in this matter and they have upped the figure of two years ago. The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, has said he thinks that the State has gone as far as it should. I will say to the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, that we are simply passing on to the towns what is rightfully, in my estimation, theirs. You will note that I have made my figures 99.9 so that the Appropriations Committee in the future will not have a precedent set whereby we have given 100 per cent at one time. I realize that there is much confusion. I have many letters from superintendents saying that the law said that we should have 100 per cent. I have pegged this by asking in my abatement for 99.9.

Now, Mr. Burgess says that the State has given back to the towns five millions of dollars. The towns with that 7½ mills have undertaken different projects and are working on that now. The reason that the State has a surplus at the present time is that they have the advantage of charging the towns that tax of five millions of dollars and at the same time getting six months of the sales tax.

That is the reason that we have a surplus now and the State is asking us to turn that surplus over

into improvements for state buildings and schools and so forth to benefit the State. I think the greatest benefit to the State is an education and the reason I have asked for a roll call vote is because it will give each member a chance to see his name in the Legislative record, his vote today, and I am sure that you will all feel that you should go along with my Amendment "A".

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

Mr. McGLAULIN: Mr. Speaker, I have always tried to support the appropriation of money for educational purposes but as I understand this proposition, it is going to put an additional \$500,000 for us to raise. Where are we going to get the money? I feel that it is my duty at this time to oppose this proposition.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell.

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to report something to the House at this time. You will recall, most of you who were here two years ago, that I came down here with a very unpopular proposal to grant subsidy to the town of New Sharon for completion of the school building and the Legislature very generously gave a part of that appropriation to me.

I would like to report at this time that we used that to the best advantage that we could. We received last year, in spite of the fact that we received no more per cent of the school subsidy than any other town, we received more from the State school fund than we ever have at any time within my recollection and I would like to report that we have completed the building so far as it is practical and we have had our usual number of weeks of school and so far as I can see we have gotten along very nicely even though we got only 93 and a fraction per cent of the subsidy. I would like to express myself as in accord with the remarks of the gentleman from Aroostook (Mr. Burgess).

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Beal.

Mr. BEAL: Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a school teacher and I am interested in schools and I would approve any amount of money that goes directly to the schools. Therefore, I hate to see this particular appropriation cut. While it might not be to the point, I would suggest that if you want to save some money in this educational business you could well do it down here under this item which says: "Departmental Operations of \$174,572." A cut can be made there that will never be felt by the school children of Maine but this cut is going to affect them directly so I am going along with the gentleman from Brooks (Mr. Dickey).

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I want to be consistent. This amendment means over half a million dollars. I said, yesterday, that if this Appropriations Bill went through as it was there would be more tax. It would mean a crisis and I was definitely against that. Therefore, I have to go along with this amendment. The Governor's budget gives an increase on this over the last two years. I think that they have studied this matter. I am not necessarily going against education but if you give it to them on one hand and take it away with the other, I cannot see where it is good business. I therefore broach my opinion against this amendment.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I dislike to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, but if you will look at the Governor's budget, you will find that we have followed his recommendations on this item. Perhaps this information is a little late but probably you all have it. There are only six items that have been raised by any great amount over the Governor's budget. There are some things here that we feel obligated to recommend and that is the salary

increase for the State employees which is \$400,000 each year, the Department of Health and Welfare is \$239,000 each year of the biennium and that is already in our bill and it has been voted by the Legislature, Aid to Public and Private Hospitals is \$200,000 each year. Then we have the Department of Education, which is about \$215,000 for the biennium over the last two years.

I feel that we have been fairly generous with education, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the amendment of Mr. Dickey does not prevail.

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

Mr. CRABTREE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not ever remember a more painful pill to swallow than the one I must swallow now. I ache all over and that is a big ache. (Laughter) I am so heartily in sympathy with the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, of our committee, in his purpose in offering this amendment. If I had any idea that it would develop in the next few days that there would be money available to bring this subsidy up to this figure, I believe most of you know no one would be more in favor of it than I would be.

At this time, until we see more clearly our income structure, as painful as it is for me to say, and I sure am on the hook, I don't believe I can go along with the worthy object of Mr. Dickey's amendment. I hope that if our income structure shows up different than it seems now that then it might be considered, but at this point I am not convinced that we can afford to do this, as much as I would like to do it. I dislike very much to say that I can not go along with this at this time.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The Appropriations Committee took a lot of time in discussing this problem. It is misunderstood throughout the State by many people that this is a law, that it should be 100 per cent. It is not. We have raised it from 92 and some fraction to 95.7 and with what money we have to spend we felt we had gone as far as we

could. We are not injuring anybody. If we could get \$500,000 more, it would be helpful, of course, but we felt that we could not go beyond the 95.7 per cent.

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not think the money is available for this increase and I believe that the only way we can get it is to place a sales tax on household fuel and I believe if you vote for this increase you will have to resign yourselves to voting for a new tax on household fuel.

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

Mr. SANFORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The way all of these members are talking, I am in doubt whether they will be back here two years from now or not, but, by golly, I am going to be with them and I will take a chance of not coming back. I don't think we have got the money and if we haven't got the money we just can't go along with it.

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

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't weigh quite as much as the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree, but I think I feel as badly about the situation as he does. I am 100 per cent for education. I talked with the Superintendent of Schools of Westbrook last week end. He brought up this very question of 100 per cent subsidy. I told him very frankly that I did not feel we could afford it. He was very disappointed but I feel that the Appropriations Committee have studied this very carefully and they are allocating \$1,447,222 more than was appropriated in the last biennium, that is a million and a half. I feel that they have been very generous and I feel that that is as far as we can go.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call.

Mr. CALL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have heard several speakers pro and con. I think they have made it very clear

and concise. I would wish permission of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, to ask for a division at this time on this matter.

The SPEAKER: The Chair rules that the request for a roll call, a ye and nay vote, is before the House prior to the gentleman's request.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that the House adopt House Amendment "A" and the same gentleman requests a roll call. In order for the vote to be taken by the yeas and nays, it requires the consent of one-fifth of the members present.

As many as are in favor of having the vote taken by the yeas and nays 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 less than one-fifth of the members present having expressed their desire, the yeas and nays are not ordered.

The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Call, requests a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, that the House adopt House Amendment "A" 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: Eight having voted in the affirmative and one hundred and twelve in the negative, the motion to adopt House Amendment "A" does not prevail.

If there are no further amendments to be introduced, the Clerk will read Senate Amendment "A".

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "J" and after the same is read I would like to speak on it.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Martin, offers House Amendment "J" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read House Amendment "J".

The CLERK:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "J" to S. P. 476, L. D. 1316, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Ex-

penditures 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 the line entitled: "L. D. 453 — SALARY PLAN FOR STATE EMPLOYEES 400,000 400,000" and inserting in place thereof the following:

'SALARY PLAN FOR STATE EMPLOYEES		
To Continue the Provisions of		
L. D. 453	400,000	400,000
Base Equalization Adjustment	90,000	90,000
<hr/>		
Total Salary Plan for State Employees	490,000	490,000'

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

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

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The only question that this amendment asks is does the State of Maine intend to pay the prevailing rates to its employees? In order that there will be no confusion in the minds of the members, I would like to take just a few minutes to bring you up to date on this plan.

Two years ago, at the cost of \$25,000, the State adopted a pay plan which was proposed by the Public Administration Service. This firm came into Maine and made a survey of the prevailing rates in comparable industries in the State. This salary plan was adopted by the 95th Legislature and a 4½ per cent increase was given to the State employees. Shortly after this and by September, only six months later, the prices had gone up another 5 per cent and, at the present time, the industrial wages in the State of Maine are 18.5 per cent higher than they were in June 1950. Since that time, the State raises have gone up but 7 per cent. It takes only a simple matter of arithmetic to show that the workers of the State of Maine are being paid 11 per cent less than the workers in industries and people doing the same jobs as they are doing.

I would like to call to the attention of the members of the House that all of the other legislatures in the surrounding states have gone ahead and have given their state workers an increase in salary so that the State of Maine is still behind all of the adjoining states.

Now, the situation is that the State Personnel Department, although it has many applicants, cannot secure the type of person that it should secure for an efficient worker and the department heads find themselves daily looking for workers who have left to seek employment in higher paying jobs in outside industry.

If the State were to bring the pay level up to what it should be, and this comes under recommendations of the Personnel Board which has made a careful study, we would have to ask for an increase of 9 per cent. They are not asking for an increase of 9 per cent; they are asking for one of 4½ per cent or \$400,000 and I point out to the members that this \$400,000 is contained in the Appropriations budget.

Now, the second part of the amendment, which you have before you, calls for a base equalization adjustment of \$90,000. This compromise was made by the employees themselves. Instead of asking for an additional 4½ per cent to bring the total to 9 per cent, they have asked for \$90,000. This bill affects some 6,000 State employees and I would like to point out that they all do not live in Augusta. They live in your towns and in your counties. I am interested in the State employees because I know a lot of them. I have lived in Augusta and I am in contact with them in my business almost daily. I think the State of Maine can be proud of its employees.

Now, I want to economize just as much as the rest of the Legislature does but I do not want to economize to the point where we are left with inefficient, underpaid workers. I do not want the State of Maine to be the training school for the rest of the New England states or the training school for other industries.

We have had a surplus at the end of the year and I do not think it is so much an underestimation of

the revenue from the sales tax, I think it is more due to the fact that for the last two years the State of Maine has grossly underpaid its workers.

I hope that the House will accept this compromise offer which comes from the State employees themselves, and go along with this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER, when the vote is taken I ask that it be taken by division.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This comes from the Appropriations Bill and we have recommended an increase of \$400,000 over what they have been receiving and after discussing it pro and con we believe that we have been fair to the employees of the State of Maine. It did not come to my attention, at least, or the members of the committee, and I have attended every meeting that we have had, that any inefficiency is apparent in this State for lack of funds or salaries and I hope that the amendment will not prevail and I move its indefinite postponement.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, moves that House Amendment "J" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN: Mr. Speaker, for the same reason that I opposed the increase in the Education Department, I oppose this measure. The members of this House are pretty nearly working for nothing and working themselves and if we can sacrifice for the good of the State perhaps the employees also can a little.

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

Mr. FOGG: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I consider this so-called pay-boost proposed for the State employees, I can't help but sort of snicker over it because last summer I was driving out in the country and I came upon a bunch of men working on a highway and they stopped me

and asked me if there was going to be a pay raise for State employees. I told them I didn't know. I asked them, I said: "How much are you fellows getting now?" They said: "Only 87 cents an hour." So I figured it over in my head and figured out that that was \$34.80 a week. So this 4½ per cent pay raise is going to give those fellows a \$1.56 a week increase in pay but you figure out that a person down here in Augusta who is getting \$100 a week is going to get \$4.50 a week pay increase.

Now, as far as this base pay equalization adjustment is concerned, and this bill to increase the employees' wages, I am not too keen about the thing at all until I have some assurance that some of these lower paid workers, working on the highways, are going to get a little more to put in their pockets. As the supervisor of this crew of men told me, he said: "I can't get them to work." He says, "For the money they are getting I don't feel that I should try to drive them either." And it seems to me that we have got a sort of serious condition right in our State Highway Department in the amount of money those workers are getting out on the highway and I think that if we are going to get any decent workers to work on the highways we are going to have to sort of level off a little bit and take some away from the top income group and give it to the lower income group.

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

Mr. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I happen to be one of the men who are not paid for it but who get statistical evidence of the conditions in the national government and they make a report that we receive. Now, inasmuch as it has to do entirely with farmers, I can just state as a matter of information what this report says. Since 1950, the farmers' income has gone down 14 per cent, previous to 1953. And what he buys has gone up 34 per cent. Now, farmers' income has gone down since January 1st and the dairy industry has gone down 11

per cent in Maine. The potato industry has gone down about 60 per cent and the pulpwood industry, I just got a report this morning, and for the man who cuts the pulp his income has gone down 11 per cent.

Those are figures from the record. I am very happy indeed to grant anyone an increase but I really believe that the recession is here and what are we going to do to meet it?

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, that House Amendment "J" be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, 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.

Eighty-seven having voted in the affirmative and eleven having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "J" was indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present House Amendment "K" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, offers House Amendment "K" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read House Amendment "K".

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "K" 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 the line which reads as follows:

"UNIVERSITY	
OF MAINE	1,781,616 1,888,320"
and inserting in place thereof:	
'UNIVERSITY	
OF MAINE	1,441,616 1,548,320'

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This cuts the blown-up appropriations bill back within a few dollars of the budget recommendations of the Governor, and that gives them a little more money to spend than they have had for the last two years and I think that they have got enough down there. This, I think, is a good place to save a little something. We are not taking anything away from the hungry children or the sick or the needy, and I think they can get along. They are really getting a cut because the cost of living is bound to keep on dropping a little for the next two years.

Of course this bill, as you all know, is one of the most lobbied bills that we have had before this House, and the old saying is, "The wheel that squeaks the loudest is the one that gets the grease," and I think that holds true with this one.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am really pleased at the spirit of economy that seems to prevail in the House, I think it is most commendable, and I think that perhaps the taxpayers back home are going to be quite pleased with it. I realize that you and I in our public life, in our business life, must live within our income. I think that the State of Maine must live within its income. I think perhaps we are facing a slight recession, and, as one gentleman has put it so aptly, we will have to pull in our belts a notch more, but I do think we should be very careful where we do the slashing.

In your business and in my business, when we cut we try to cut in those places where it won't hurt the business too much. Every dollar that the State of Maine spends should bring back dividends, and I firmly believe that the education problem in this State is a serious one, and I think that the dividends that will accrue to the State of Maine from the education of its boys and girls will be far greater than any other dividends that will be paid from any investment that the State of Maine

makes. I do not think we should tamper with the education of our boys and girls.

I can understand very clearly the feeling of a great many of you concerning the University of Maine, because during my first two terms here I was of that same opinion. I stood up and was counted among those who slashed the University of Maine. I did it because I was told the University of Maine could function on less; I was told that the University of Maine was getting away with greater appropriations than any other department. It was brought to my attention later on that I was wrong, and I looked into the matter very, very seriously, and I would like to lay the following facts before you, ladies and gentlemen of this House, before we vote on this amendment.

The only way that we can know whether or not the State of Maine is actually spending far in excess is to compare it with the other land grant colleges of states with a similar population and in industrial states such as ours. If the University of Maine compares favorably, then we have a right to cut, or we have a right to cut if it is in excess of others. If you look at the figures you will find that the State of Maine pays less per capita for the students at the University of Maine than any other land grant college in this country.

Let us look at the salaries that we pay to the teachers and the professors at the University. We are way below the general average in the country. It has reached the point at the University of Maine where our excellent professors and assistant professors and teachers who like Maine and who would like to stay here and who are doing a fine job for our boys and girls cannot meet the rising standards of living. They are forced to go elsewhere. And what do we do at the University? We must hire new teachers who have less experience, who are not acclimated to the situation here in Maine, and we pay them more money because we cannot hire them at the salaries we are paying the present teachers. Now I ask you: Is that a business-like way of doing things?

The University of Maine is below, in every single branch, every other land grant college.

I think that the Appropriations Committee has been very fair in its stand towards the University of Maine in its appropriation. I think that we can go along with the Appropriations Committee and not feel that we are cutting or doing too much for the University of Maine.

There are many ways, I think, in which we can save a penny in this State. This morning I went down and I talked with the Controller and I asked to see the travel expenses in this State. I find that they run almost to two million dollars a year. I firmly believe in my own heart with a sense of fairness that we could cut at least five hundred thousand or half a million dollars from the travel expenses in this State and that we would not be harming anybody and that the State would be run just as efficiently as it is being run at the present time.

In other words, when we are cutting from this budget let us cut and let us be fair. Let us not cut from the aged, let us not cut from the sick, let us not cut from the education of our young boys and girls. And remember this also: out of the forty-eight states the State of Maine is No. 4 from the bottom on the number of its children who are pursuing higher education. Why? Because they cannot afford it. The tuition at the University of Maine, which is our Maine State College by law, is \$316, which is fifty per cent higher than the nation as a whole.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, those are the facts that face us as far as the University of Maine is concerned. If we are going to maintain a State college by law let us at least maintain it to the honor and the dignity of the State of Maine. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hebron, Mr. Bearce.

Mr. BEARCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It was my intention to come to the defense of the University. I do not believe I need to. I think that the gentlewoman from Rumford (Miss Cormier) has said all that I

could possibly say, and, to save time, I simply will not speak. I would like to say, to reinforce her statement, it is a well-known fact that the faculty at the University are paid less than in any other land grant college; the tuition is far higher than in any other land grant college; the University is limited in research, they should have much more money for research.

I would like to state that I have absolute confidence in the President of the University; he has never yet asked us for a dollar that he did not need. The work that has been done by the University in the past and is being done at the present time is of such great value I do not see how we could reasonably deny them the money that they actually need to carry on the work of the University.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Rumford (Miss Cormier) for the splendid presentation that she has made.

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

Mr. MCGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I have got to leave in a few moments, I want to go on record now, so you will know where I stand, and I want to say that I do not want to see a single cent cut from the University of Maine.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Dr. Hauck came before our committee himself and discussed his problems. He informed us that he was faced with the proposition of losing some of his best professors in that college due to lack of appropriate salaries. This increase is largely for that purpose, to keep those professors in that college and to maintain the standard of the University of Maine.

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

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: If we are going to give three hundred thousand dollars for education it definitely should go for elementary education rather than secondary.

I bring to your attention the remarks of the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, comparing the University of our State with those of other states. I will agree with her remarks, but I ask you: how about our elementary educational standards; are they not also below the standards of other states? If the increase were to go for the elementary education would it not be much more evenly divided among the taxpayers? We turned down a few moments ago an increase for the subsidy. How can we go along with this increase and still be consistent?

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

Mr. CRABTREE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, has covered the matter adequately. I want to say amen to everything she has said.

We are much like a town meeting here, charged with supporting our own institution. To us, the University, our land grant university, must look for adequate support. I am sorry to say I never went to the University of Maine and neither have I ever had sons or daughters going there, but I have known many that have gone there who went on to great careers. It is a very very solemn responsibility of this House. This is a crippling amendment. I cannot think what would happen to the maintenance if such a thing were adopted. Of course there is more money needed. In pre-war days there were 2100 students there, last fall there were 2925, this next fall there will be 3100. It is growing. Of course we need more money there. I do not believe this House is going to cripple our own land grant University by adopting any such amendment as this.

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

Mr. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As Representative Crabtree so ably put it: this body is very much like a town meeting in its deliberations. In Boothbay Harbor in the old days we used to have a blackboard down in front of the town meeting, and,

as we appropriated funds, an old judge used to put it on the blackboard in chalk, and every once in a while we would total those appropriations. You would be surprised how much money we saved in Boothbay Harbor that way. I urge you all to have a mental blackboard down in front of us, and as we think of ways to save money I urge you to give them consideration.

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

Mr. LARRABEE: Mr. Speaker, I am in perfect accord with the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier; I think she has outlined the case very clearly, and I move the indefinite postponement of Amendment "K".

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Larrabee, moves that House Amendment "K" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, as yet I do not know how I wish to vote. There are certain items listed in the Appropriations Bill's presentation as to what represented this increase: a more adequate wage scale, replacement of equipment and funds for research and extension service. I would like to hear a breakdown of how this increase is made up.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to my good friend, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, first, that last year the University of Maine operated in the red to the tune of \$315,000. The increases which he has requested a breakdown of, I believe are something in this nature: \$151,000 for the second year of the biennium for increased salaries and wages. May I say this: I am giving him exactly what was presented to the Committee on Appropriations and upon which we based our opinion.

"Salary and wage scales at the University do not compare favorably with those of similar institutions. They have not kept pace with increased cost of living, and the University must do better by

its efficient staff members and other employees."

The budget request included \$171,348 for increasing salaries and wages in 1953-54 and an additional amount of \$151,000 for the second year of the biennium. I believe that the \$151,000 for the second year of the biennium was left out of the Governor's budget and put in here, which shows our increase.

The next one: "Supplemental annual allotment for faculty annuities and Social Security for other employees. The University has an annuity plan which, with Social Security payments will require \$141,000 from the general funds during each year of the next biennium."

Now that required an upping, to meet that situation, of \$11,000.

The next item: "To meet increased costs of operating and maintaining the physical plant, \$52,622.52." That is broken down in this manner: Supplies, including fuel, gas, electricity, building materials and so forth, \$5,076.76, equipment \$5,628.94, building maintenance and repairs \$21,916.82.

These are items, may I again remind you as I go along, which the University proved to the Appropriations Committee were not in the Governor's budget but were a must in order to operate the property.

The next is Personnel Adjustment. "It is estimated that the University enrollment during the next two years will continue about fifty per cent higher than for the pre-war year of highest enrollment, which was 1940-41, when it was 2100. 2925 students registered last fall, and the estimated enrollment for the next year, which is 1954-55, is 3100."

Now here is the alarming situation — it is not alarming, it is very pleasant: the freshman class this year numbers 909, which is an increase of 136 students over last year's class.

Now they go into an extensive breakdown. I do not know that you want me to read it all off.

"Because of the necessity of strengthening and augmenting the offerings of several departments and reducing class size in a number of the presently overcrowded basic courses, a number of ad-

ditional staff members and graduate assistants will be needed. The present trend toward scientific and technological training will increase the teaching load in engineering, mathematics and the science basic to engineering."

"A breakdown in personnel adjustment for which provision has been made in the proposed budget is as follows: A part-time assistant professor in Agricultural Engineering, one graduate assistant in Bacteriology, Assistant Professor, etc." I do not know whether Mr. Trafton wants me to break that down clear through. I would be glad to hand it to you.

Now those basically are the reasons why your Appropriations Committee felt it necessary to make the increase which is reflected in our Appropriations Bill. I hope I have answered the question of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton. It is my opinion as a member of the committee that the committee did consider fairly the needs of the University with particular respect towards its growth and did allocate what seemed to be a reasonable amount of money under which they could operate in the black.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Sharon, Mr. Caswell.

Mr. CASWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not want to be recorded as opposed to education, I do not want to take exception in general to the remarks of the gentlewoman from Rumford (Miss Cormier), but I want to make one suggestion in opposition, perhaps partly to one statement she made, if I heard her correctly. She stated that possibly we are in line for a slight recession. I am afraid that is the best example of understatement that I have heard for some time. You may take the implication of that as to my feeling as to whether the full amount as granted by the Appropriations Committee should be accepted. Possibly the amendment cuts the figure too low.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of a member

of the Appropriations Committee through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, requests the privilege of addressing a question through the Chair to some member of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentlewoman may state her question.

Miss CORMIER: Mr. Speaker, am I right in understanding that the appropriation as asked by the University has still been cut; that is, am I right in assuming that they asked for about five million and were cut to about three million?

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, the University of Maine did not get all they asked of the Appropriations Committee, but, in fairness to the University, the committee tried to meet the just requirements of the college.

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

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am one hundred per cent for the University of Maine. I would like to read one sentence from Dr. Hauck's presentation of February 18th to the Appropriations Committee, pointing out that "Fifty-two per cent of income for operation and maintenance during the next biennium will come from student fees, federal appropriations, endowment funds, gifts, and sales and services. The State appropriation, however, is the essential foundation of its income. It is the State appropriation that determines what salaries can be paid, what physical facilities can be provided for, construction and research, and what services can be rendered to agriculture and industry."

The gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, has pointed out the tuition fees. They are \$316 per academic year for Maine residents, \$476 for non-residents. To increase these charges would deny higher education to many worthy Maine boys and girls. I hope that you will go along with the indefinite postponement of this amendment because it was this amendment

which prompted me to prepare Amendment "M" which I will offer if this amendment is indefinitely postponed. I feel that this would, as the gentleman from Island Falls, Mr. Crabtree, has said, be a crippling amendment.

The SPEAKER: The pending motion is the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Larrabee, that House Amendment "K" be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. WINCHENPAW: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have refrained from saying anything before from the squeaking of my vocal chords. Six years ago I came to this Legislature, and then, roughly, the University of Maine got \$750,000. I believe that year we had a special session and gave them \$200,000 more, as I remember, roughly. Now I think that somebody should have the courage to stand up here and say a word for John Q. Taxpayer. The reason I am standing here is because I have no intention of voting for any further taxes during this session of the Legislature. I know that there are some honest cuts in that tax that we should pass and I am in favor of those exemptions.

According to these figures I have here the appropriation for the University of Maine is more than double what it was six years ago, and I would like to ask you members of the House: How many of you have had your salary doubled in the last six years?

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

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Speaker, I was kind of interested in the salary scale down there at the University of Maine, what they paid, and I asked one of the members of the Appropriations Committee for a copy of this. He had a copy here and he came along and ran through it quick and put it back in his pocket and said he would get me a copy. Well, he put me off two or three or four weeks, or two weeks anyway, perhaps a little more, but finally through one of the other members I managed

to get one. I wish you could read through this and see the assistants to the assistants and see the raises. It raises them anywhere from two hundred to three thousand dollars, right down this scale here, and I tell you it has become a closed shop.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rangeley, Mr. Harnden.

Mr. **HARDEN**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think it might be very well to cut a few limbs off of the tree but I think that we should be careful not to cut the tree down.

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

Mr. **TUPPER**: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any danger of cutting the tree down. As I look at these figures, there is \$441,676 more in the Governor's budget recommendation than there was in the last biennium. Now if we adopt this Amendment "K" we are still giving the University \$441,676 more. I think that is a point that ought to be clarified.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Larrabee, that House Amendment "K" be indefinitely postponed.

All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "K" will say aye; those opposed, no.

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

The **SPEAKER**: Seventy-three having voted in the affirmative and thirty-three in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "K" prevails.

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

Mr. **TRAVIS**: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "M" and move its adoption.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, offers House Amendment "M" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment "M" read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "M" to S. P. 476, L. D. 1316, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Ex-

penditures 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 the line which reads as follows:

"UNIVERSITY OF MAINE

1,781,616 1,888,320"

and inserting in place thereof:

'UNIVERSITY OF MAINE

1,656,616 1,763,320'

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

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

Mr. **TRAVIS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very sorry, of course, to present this amendment, but you recall that yesterday I said that L. D. 1316 must and would be cut. This University of Maine proposition is something that is very dear to my heart, and I am proving my sincerity by offering a cut in something I have been fighting for during this entire legislative session. Amendment "M" would reduce the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee by \$125,000 each year, or a reduction of \$250,000. I feel that the University of Maine with this reduction could increase salaries, which are a necessity, and could carry on their work. Then I am hopeful that if this amendment is successful that later on we may be able to give the University of Maine one of their capital improvements. For instance, as you probably know, I have put in a bill for \$370,000 for a pulp and paper wing to the Chemical Engineering Building. I would like very much to see the money available for that purpose. For that reason, I am proposing this amendment as I feel that this is one place that we can cut, and I feel that we have given the University of Maine sufficient so that they can do the things that must be done in the next two years.

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

Mr. **JACOBS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not want you to think that I am trying to defend everything that the Appropriations Committee attempted to do in this bill. The rumor was present this morning in regard to

this cut that the gentleman has just spoken about. I called up Dr. Hauck this forenoon and had a talk with him in regard to the proposed \$125,000 cut proposed in an amendment which might be presented and which is now before you. He said in substance, "Mr. Jacobs, we cannot get along with less than what we have asked for. Believe me, I have been sincere in everything I have said before your committee, and at no time, to my knowledge, has this college sent out word that they could receive a cut of \$125,000. It is not so. I hope that the members of this House when they vote will give us what we need."

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

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask through the Chair a question of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Dickey, requests the privilege of addressing a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is this: I wonder if the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, realizes that the Appropriations Committee has already cut \$150,000 from the requirements of the University of Maine, and I would also like to ask him if he would go along with his own amendment for cutting \$250,000, if he would like to line budget the University of Maine and take off the \$250,000 from Research.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, may answer the question if he so desires.

Mr. TRAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will answer the question in part.

This amendment, I realize, takes \$250,000 from the Appropriations Bill but it adds \$430,000 to the amendment which my friend, the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Turner, had proposed. I should be very happy to see the University of Maine get two million dollars and will vote for it later if I feel that the money is available. I feel that Research is very important, and if my motion is defeated I am not going to be terribly unhappy, although I feel that

it is a just motion. I did not check with Dr. Hauck when I put in this amendment; I put it in on my own. I do know that some of the members of the Appropriations Committee feel that my amendment is just.

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

Mr. ROUNDY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think in this matter of education we do have to remember that the matter of leadership and of trained leadership is of prime importance, and that while there are other factors that go down into the elementary elements nevertheless we must never get away from the fact that if we believe in education we must believe in the process whereby there shall be trained those who will be leaders.

If you have followed at all the investigation that may have come to your attention recently by our President Cole of Bowdoin College, you will have brought home to you in very emphatic terms that already Maine in comparison with many other states in this country is pretty low on the scale in the number of its leaders in the educational field that go from the various towns and cities of our State to receive the training necessary for that purpose. I certainly believe that in this request of President Hauck, in the decision of the Appropriations Committee which has been carefully made, that we have gone the limit so far as it is possible to support the University which we need to cultivate, to instruct, to produce the men and women that will be the primary forces for our culture, for our civilization, for the fundamental things that relate to our life, and I certainly want to see the Appropriations Committee recommendation followed. Thank you.

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

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I rise only to clarify one point. The gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, indicated that a reduction of the type which his amendment proposes might be of assistance in securing a capital expenditure for the University of Maine. I do not want anyone to be confused with

that statement. It is, I believe, the practice of the State to take from unappropriated surplus for capital investments, and that certainly is being considered at this time. Therefore a reduction of any kind will not reflect itself at the present time in any way with respect to what he is hoping will happen in the way of new buildings up there. I just want to clear that up.

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

Mr. TRAFTON: Mr. Speaker, many colleges and universities today supplement their revenues by contributions from alumni. I believe, and I am quite sure, that the University of Maine alumni do support the University by contributions, but I think there is a possibility that we might supplement the grants that we here in the Legislature can provide for them. I would like to look into the matter further and suggest the tabling of House Amendment "M" and making it specially assigned for Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand the gentleman moves the tabling of House Amendment "M" with special assignment for Tuesday next?

Mr. TRAFTON: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, moves that House Amendment "M" be tabled pending adoption and be specially assigned for Tuesday next.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Trafton, for the tabling of House Amendment "M" with special assignment for next Tuesday will please say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to table did not prevail.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Last fall, at President Hauck's invitation, I spent a day at the University of Maine. I got myself an education. I believe, if you would care to check the records, you would find that I have been one of the great antagonists. I was one of five who

voted against a large grant at the Special Session.

I was very, very much, and am, concerned with the situation as far as the dormitories is concerned. I certainly feel that there is a great need there, so far as other capital outlays are concerned.

At the budget hearing President Hauck made his usual and charming presentation. His picture was clear; his picture was also clear when he presented his case in this very hall before the Appropriations Committee. I feel that the outstanding friends of the University themselves, today, when they would talk not through their hearts, so far as the University of Maine is concerned, but through their sound thinking — I feel that they, themselves, might possibly think that this item is a little high, and I assure you, Members of the House, that in that I once, or have been, a great antagonist of the University of Maine, my thinking has changed completely.

By the same token my thinking changed along the line of the Naval and Military School at Bath, when I spent a half a day there, and I was the first one to go, for the leaders of the Appropriations Committee, and told them that I think we should put back some of the money into the Naval and Military School.

I think this issue here is not based solely on the fact that we are giving the University of Maine over \$880,000 more than we did two years ago, with this amendment of Mr. Travis passing, but we are giving them \$250,000 over that \$850,000 if Mr. Travis's amendment does not pass.

I feel, by the same token, that we possibly could not or should not go along on the same basis as far as subsidies to schools are concerned on a base of 95.7, which is what this increase would bring us up to. I think those, too, are in different categories.

I am also aware of the fact that we own the University of Maine. I would like to stand here and vote for a higher appropriation. I would like to tell the members of the House that if we were

voting strictly through our hearts, absolutely forgetting the fact that money is tight, that we should not even look at this figure that the Appropriations Committee has recommended, but we should give them their request. The fact is now that if you are sincere about economy, if you are sincere about the fact that we must start cutting somewhere, we must now begin to be realistic. I feel as badly about voting for this amendment of Mr. Travis as Mr. Crabtree felt about voting against Mr. Dickey's amendment. It is now a fact that we must be realistic. We must not give the burden of slashing away quietly and effectively to the other branch. We are going to have to cut sometime. We gave the University of Maine \$880,000, even with this amendment of Mr. Travis. We must now start cutting, and in spite of the fact — I feel the same way as Mr. Travis does — I know he doesn't care too much to vote against the University of Maine with his thinking and the message that he has given us — concerning the University of Maine, and I beg you to start being realistic and let us do it now, and go along with this amendment.

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

Mr. TOTMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I beg your indulgence for about three or four minutes while a very confused mind tries to find its way.

I have heard people get up here — particularly the last speaker — and say that they are voting against their hearts when they go along with the amendment of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, to make this relatively lower cut than was originally proposed. No one in this House can possibly be on the same spot that I am on, and I will tell you why. My mother teaches at the University of Maine. My father recently gave, as you may have noticed, a modest sum to the University of Maine for an endowment, and I want to assure Mr. Trafton that the bottom of the barrel — alumni donations — has been pretty well scraped because he was Chairman, and I don't think there is a great deal more to come.

However, I have got to admire the men in this House, and the women, who have the courage to get up here and point out to you that you are representatives of all the taxpayers. I have got to admire the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, for pointing out to you that we would all like to give just as much as possible, and I think, for the reasons I stated, I should be at the top of the list, but I think I have got a certain amount of responsibility to the taxpayers of the State of Maine who possibly share very strongly the views of the gentleman from Whitefield, Mr. Chase, who feel that the school children, being all residents of the State of Maine, should come first. I dislike very much having to detract at all from the excellent statement of the gentlewoman from Rumford, Miss Cormier, but I think we should be just a little bit realistic and ask ourselves if the State of Maine, the University of Maine, is so low in standing nationally, why is it that we still have a considerable number of out-of-state students in the University of Maine, and believe me, it is true because they are in my mother's class.

I think, Members of the House, we are all on the spot, but as Mr. Jalbert said, if you have got the courage of your convictions, and you are going to economize, if you are not going to try to drain the savings bank funds of the State of Maine dry, you have got to cut somewhere, and I think this is a fairly modest cut. You are going to be asked later on to approve some capital expenditures, as the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess points out, from the surplus fund. I admit (but I think we will be helping them there) I must say, with a great deal of personal reluctance, that I think that Mr. Travis is on the right track. I will vote for his amendment.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, I will get this before the House. I will move that the amendment of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr.

Jacobs, for the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "M". As many as are in favor of the adoption of House Amendment "M" 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: Forty-one having voted in the affirmative and sixty-four having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "M" does not prevail. Is it now the pleasure of the House—

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Rich.

Mr. RICH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis. I know that I will be subject to a lot of criticism for doing this. I have four sons who are graduates from the University of Maine, and I prize the university very highly. I also have a son who has been teaching in the University of Maine, as Assistant Professor; he has been there over ten years, and I don't like to vote against it. I also had a very enjoyable visit at the University of Maine this week. But I do feel that this amendment that Mr. Travis has made is a fair one, that we are going to give the University of Maine a lot of money if we give them what this amendment calls for, and I move the adoption of Mr. Travis's amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Travis, for the adoption of House Amendment "M". Is it now the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "M" be adopted?

Thereupon, House Amendment "M" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lincoln, Miss Steeves.

Miss STEEVES: Mr. Speaker, I present House Amendment "P" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Lincoln, Miss Steeves, offers House Amendment "P" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read House Amendment "P".

HOUSE AMENDMENT "P" to S. P. 476, L. D. 1316, Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Ex-

penditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1954 and June 30, 1955."

Amend said Bill by adding to the paragraph entitled "INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF" after the line

"Total Institutions	6,622,043	6,652,984"
the line:		
'Nursing Service		
Salary Adjustment	183,000	189,000'

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lincoln, Miss Steeves.

Miss STEEVES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I realize that it appears absurd to rise to ask for money today from the Appropriations Committee, but I think that this pertains to one of the most pitiful responsibilities that we have as a legislative group.

I would like to tell about the trip back to Augusta on the bus last week-end. There was a passenger who wanted to know the way to the Augusta State Hospital. He said he was on his way there to obtain a job as an attendant. If you could have seen this passenger and talked with him, I think you would have wondered about the kind of people that are being hired for attendants in our institutions. I think that you would hate to think that any relative of yours would be under the care of a person with the apparent mental capacity of people who might be hired for these positions.

This problem of nurses in our state institutions I think is one of the most important issues to our State. It seems to me that it is more important than liquor, it is more important than Scarborough Downs, and it is more important, even, than aid to disabled people which is a new program that we are contemplating here in the Legislature. It does seem as though that we should take care of the programs which are already existing before we start new ones, and do it in a decent way.

I would like to disagree, too, with the statement made by the honorable gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, today, when he almost made

a flat statement that he didn't know of any inefficiency in our State government on account of low wages. It does sound sensible, and seems sensible, to think that there could be better nurses and there could be more nurses and much more efficient help in our hospitals if we did have better pay. We all know that many positions in our State hospitals are not highly sought after.

I would like to read, or at least review, some of the facts which are relative to the institutions, attendants and their wages.

It seems that Maine's hourly rates for nurses and attendants are lower than any of the New England states, that is, it is thirty cents below the New England average. These rates are lower than public and private hospitals in Maine, and it is at least seventeen cents below other hospitals within our own State.

I think it is true that many nurses from the State Hospital in Bangor are crossing the street and working at the Eastern Maine General Hospital, for at least twenty cents an hour more than they are offered at the State institution.

The beginning attendant salary at the State's institution is \$38.00 weekly for a 48-hour work time, and this does not include board and room. Now it does seem as though you could get better attendants if you gave them more money, and I would think it would make everyone sit back and wonder what kind of people are taking charge of our patients in these hospitals. The attendant is the person who spends more time day in and day out with the patient than anyone else and is much more responsible for his recovery than anyone else.

The employee turnover at mental institutions is 100 per cent. The turnover is 100 per cent a year. That should make people wonder how experienced our employees are too.

The adequate pay for 662 State employees would help to reduce the turnover and would contribute to better care for over five thousand patients and inmates in Maine's institutions.

There have been representatives of national labor organizations thinking about moving in to do something about organizing and to increase the pay and shorten the hours of the people who are working in our institutions, and I think it is quite certain that if the Legislature does adjourn without providing some kind of an adjustment for nurses and attendants, that the Personnel Board, the Governor and the Institutional Services Commissioner will be held in a position which could be embarrassing and vulnerable.

Now that you have seen fit to down Mr. Martin's bill, which would help in some way to increase the pay of the nurses of our State, I hope you will consider this in some degree. By introducing it I feel that the nurses and the doctors of our State institutions can feel that we are at least thinking about their welfare and realize that it is serious too, and it is our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the House, when the vote is taken.

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

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, if we adopt this amendment, it means \$372,000 to be added to the bill already before you.

Now in all the head departments of this State, where they employ nurses, we have given to these department heads increases in salaries, and I believe this takes the place of this amendment.

We all recognize the duties of nurses, trained or house nurses, or nurses in training, but I feel that when we deliver cash to these heads of departments for such work, it is for them to do the rest of it. Consequently I wish to move to indefinitely postpone this Amendment "P".

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Jacobs, moves that House Amendment "P" be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of indefinitely postponing House Amendment "P" will kindly rise and remain standing in their places until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. The SPEAKER: Eighty-six having voted in the affirmative and seven having voted in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "P" prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Abbott.

Mr. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, I present House Amendment "L" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Abbott, presents House Amendment "L" and moves its adoption.

The Clerk will read House Amendment "L".

HOUSE AMENDMENT "L" 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:

"CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS & PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOSPITALS" the line:

"Public and Private Hospitals, Aid to 1,200,000 1,200,000" and insert in place thereof of the line:

'Public and Private Hospitals, Aid to 1,100,000 1,100,000'

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Abbott.

Mr. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, during the 95th Legislature the amount raised was \$1,800,000. The Budget recommends \$2,000,000. I believe this gives \$200,000 extra, \$100,000 each year, and I believe, with careful supervision, they can do with this amount.

I know, from my own experience, that in my county supervision has not been strict enough in these hospital cases, and I think that with their supervision, which I understand they intend to do, that this will be sufficient.

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

Mr. LOW: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am very nearly as large as the gentleman from

Island Falls (Mr. Crabtree) and when talking about hospitals my heart cries just as much because I am president of my local hospital and I know its troubles and how hard it is to get along and I know that every dollar taken away from this appropriation will mean dollars put on the other sick people in our hospitals. But in spite of that, in view of the fact that we have cut another thing that is also close to my heart, the University of Maine, I move that we go along with this amendment and I move its adoption.

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

Mr. SANFORD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am against this amendment. The hospitals are asking for \$1,200,000 per year on hospital aid. Now, on a million per year they get back 50 per cent of their actual costs. On the basis of \$1,200,000 per year, they will get back a basis of 60 per cent of their costs. The hospitals can't afford to do it for any less than that. They can't afford to even do it for that but I think they are willing to do it for that.

Now, I can tell you a few instances here, for the last year the Aroostook General Hospital showed a loss on state aid cases of \$4,000; the Bangor Osteopathic lost \$8,400, I am just jumping over this. Calais lost about \$12,800; Central Maine General lost \$101,000; Eastern Maine General lost \$141,000; Maine General in Portland lost \$273,000; St. Mary's General lost \$56,000; Sisters lost \$27,000.

I would be willing to give anybody the figures on almost any hospital in my locality. I have them here but there is no need of naming all of them.

I think the time has come when we have got to realize that the hospitals have gone overboard on this state aid and that they just simply can't get along with less than \$1,200,000 per year. God knows, we want to take care of the people who need care. What I believe will happen, probably two things will happen, if you go along with less than \$1,200,000, I think a lot of people who need care won't get it because the hospitals will oblige

them to go on the town, otherwise pauperize themselves, which a lot of people don't like to do and they will go without medical care that they really should have.

Another thing, if any of them are pauperized, that simply goes back on the towns and cities. I haven't the figures but I think that the City of Bangor, it will cost the City of Bangor along between fifty and sixty thousand dollars per year if this \$1,200,000 is not given to the hospitals. I am heartily in favor of the appropriation just as it is and I make a motion that we indefinitely postpone this amendment.

I would like to add, if I may, that — now you take our hospital in Dover-Foxcroft for instance. We won't take state aid patients. We make them bypass us and go to Bangor. And that is the way with a lot of towns. They just simply won't take them; they can't take them; they couldn't afford to take them. Another thing, I know what happened in a town close to mine within forty-eight hours that a patient wanted to get into the hospital. The town manager wouldn't guarantee the cost. They called up the Eastern Maine General Hospital and said: "There is a man up here who is going to die. Will you take him in?" They said: "Sure, send him down." They know they are going to lose the whole of it. That is what these hospitals do and they have a lot of those cases. I think we are asking too much when we cut \$100,000 away from the hospitals.

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

Mr. ROUNDY: I wish to go on record, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in line with what the former speaker has just said, that it does seem to me that the question reduces itself to a rather simple matter and that is: Whether or not the State of Maine wishes to turn over to the hospitals expenses for which itself is responsible for its people who go to the hospitals, and I think from the point of view of respect that we certainly can not do that if we think of our State as something that we wish to believe has dignity enough to care for its people who need treatment.

We might say, I think, that the expense of the hospitals is considerable. In view of the fact and the realization that this matter was coming up, I went over to see the superintendent of the Maine General Hospital and asked him for some of the figures. The hospital is almost a neighbor to my own house. May I present briefly some of these comparisons.

For example, an electrician's rate per hour is \$2.32; a carpenter's is \$2.25; a bricklayer's is \$2.95, approximately that. An analysis made of 9,066 in-patients cared for at the Maine General Hospital during 1952 represented 98,991 patient days or 2,375,784 hospital hours. The total cost of care of these 9,066 patients was \$2,002,006, a cost of 84 cents per hour for all hospital services, including laboratory, operating room and others. You will notice that item is 84 cents as against the \$2.00 plus for those others that I named earlier. Food supplies, labor, maintenance have reflected the same upward trend in the hospital that they have in everyday life. That fact must be taken into consideration.

In 1948 the average hospital bill for private patients at the Maine General Hospital was \$141.12. In 1952, this average had increased to \$159.33, a difference of something like \$18, an increase of 12.9 per cent. And, incidentally, in this same period, the cost of living index in Portland rose 16.1 per cent, that is practically 13 as over against 16.

Then, too, in this cloud, a dark one, of generally increasing costs, there is this ray of light that medical science which has advanced hospital care has rapidly reduced the average length of stay in the hospital. In 1888, the average length of time that a patient spent there was 52 days. In 1902 this average had dropped to 30 days. In 1924 it was 16 days. In 1948, it was 12.1 days. And in 1952 the average stay per paying patient had reached an all-time low of 8.2 days. That to me was a real answer of the problem with which conscientiously and with the greatest wisdom possible these folks in this hospital are seeking to do their utmost to realize their responsibility in administering to the community

and this item of \$1,200,000 is only 60 per cent of the cost that the hospital is expending for the patients that the State sends them. I certainly think that it is a very modest and reasonable request that we should stick to the \$1,200,000 and not lower it. Thank you very much.

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

Mrs. LORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take very much time as the time is getting late. I just want to say that I think that we should cut other places besides in hospitals where people are sick. I do know that the Maine General Hospital has just recently been obliged to go on a 5-day week for nurses in order to keep nurses at all so that the cost has been increased and I move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord, moves that House Amendment "L" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Bibber.

Mr. BIBBER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This hits very closely to me. This is the first time since yesterday morning when this appropriations program started that I have got on my feet. I do not like to be penny-wise and pound-foolish but I can't help but think as I stand here that in this great State of Maine we have four large hospitals and I think of all the small hospitals who take care of the outlying rural areas, such as the little hospital in Northeast Harbor, over in Farmington, and down through the State. Groups of men and women have sacrificed and taken from their own livelihood to keep these small hospitals going and I think it is only fair that the State of Maine should aid them in some small way, and I hope that the motion of Mrs. Lord, the gentlewoman from Portland, prevails.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hanover, Mr. Ferguson.

Mr. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I can't

add very much to what my friend, the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Sanford, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Roundy, and the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord, have said. I happen to be overseer of the poor in my small town, and I know the hospital problem, what we are up against. The hospital never refuses anybody whether they are going to get paid or not. I wonder how many of us in any other line of business, if you come in and run up a bill and upon leaving or in contracting for that bill that they know under the pauper scale they would only get 50 per cent on every dollar that is spent. It means a great deal to all of us, particularly so in the small rural districts, where the hospitals are, on an average, 75 to 100 miles apart. I feel very strongly that we should not cut this appropriation. This is one of the things that I should like to see go along with the Appropriations Committee's recommendation of \$1,200,000.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise to oppose House Amendment "L" perhaps for a selfish reason but I am unfortunate enough to have some of my family in the hospital. I am tired of having not only to pay my own bills but for some state aid pauper as well. That is an obligation that belongs to the State as a whole and I think that they should take care of it. I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

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

Mr. LEGARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Without taking any of your time, I think this has been very well covered. I wish to go on record as in favor of the indefinite postponement of the amendment.

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

Mr. ARCHER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You all probably know that we have the hospital aid law, which provides that a citizen who is not normally dependent upon relief but who is

unable to finance a hospital bill shall be entitled to assistance from the State. The fact that such a law exists concerns the hospitals, because they are the only agencies able to render the services provided by that statute. Now, the administration of the appropriations statute, which is Section 16 of Chapter 22, requires that the Department of Health and Welfare shall take such sums as you appropriate and divide them among hospitals in proportion to the number of hospital days each contributes in carrying out the function of the statute. Very wisely, the Legislature specified that no hospital can collect a penny more than the proven cost of rendering that service. But on the other hand, the statute could just as well say that hospitals must make up the deficit between their cost and what this appropriation that we make provides for per diem reimbursement.

Humanitarian law insists that the hospitals take the patients. In that, they have little choice. The payment of any tax may well affect a special group or may affect all citizens. But please understand that when you give the hospitals only 50 or 60 per cent, I don't think that they are asking for more than they are entitled to.

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

Mr. **JALBERT**: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the hour is late and I will be on my feet a very few minutes. I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the House that this is another heartbreaker just like the University of Maine project was. I can state to the members of the House that the Appropriations Committee two years ago voted to give \$800,000 for the first year and \$800,000 for the second year to the hospitals. At the last moment, in the supplemental bill, late at night, in view of the fact that the sales tax had passed and we were going to hold on to five or six million dollars on property tax, that we raised that to a million dollars for the first year and left it at \$800,000 for the second year so that now this actually, what the intention was and what it really did was to give

\$800,000 for the second year so where we stand now we would go at \$1,200,000 for each year, which is really a hike of \$400,000 for each year. The Governor's recommendation was \$1,000,000 for each year. The Appropriations Committee recommended \$1,200,000 for each year and I don't think that I will be chastised when I state that as far as this particular item is concerned, I don't think I will be chastised by my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. We really rambled a bit from \$1,200,000 to \$1,100,000 to \$1,000,000. Now, I was very set on \$1,100,000 for one reason. I am set on it this afternoon again for one reason because I wouldn't want it to go to \$1,000,000 because eventually that is exactly what will happen. It would, as the proponents say, bring it from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. The Governor said in his budget recommendation, leave it at 50 per cent. It was brought up to 60 per cent. This amendment would make it 55 per cent. It isn't a drastic cut and I want to say before I sit down that I would like to throw into the record that the Chairman of the Legislative Committee for the Maine Hospital Association, Mr. Frank Curran, has been extremely kind, he has not pressured any member of the committee and he knows the position that we are in; he knows the position that he is in.

I go along with my colleague, the gentleman from Harrison, Mr. Davis, when he states that he doesn't want to pay the other fellow's bill if he is a paying patient. But it is just a case again of being realistic and cut slowly before we might have to cut drastically a little later on.

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

Mr. **BURGESS**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I arise to support the position of the Appropriations Committee in recommending \$1,200,000 and I will briefly state my opinions and reasons for taking that position.

I assume that a great many of you here in this House have had experience at the local level with hospital aid cases so I will not go

into the mechanics of how it works at home. I wonder if we should not look at it a little more realistically and consider raising it from \$1,200,000 upward instead of cutting it down for this reason: These patients that are being considered are charges of the State and very properly fall within a welfare category. They are not the responsibility of you and me as individuals who happen to be unfortunate enough to be sick and go to a hospital. They belong to the State, by law they come within those categories, let's face it realistically and provide for them and I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone prevails.

The **SPEAKER**: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland,

Mrs. Lord, that House Amendment "L" be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Lord, that House Amendment "L" be indefinitely postponed 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.

Fifty-eight having voted in the affirmative and thirty-three having voted in the negative, the motion prevailed and House Amendment "L" was indefinitely postponed.

On motion of Mr. Fuller of South Portland.

Adjourned until April 7 at ten o'clock in the forenoon.