

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

Eighty-Fourth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1929

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Friday, March 15, 1929.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Hershey, Chaplain of National Soldiers' Home.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Senate Bills in First Reading

S. P. 33, S. D. 323: Resolve in favor of Philip T. Carroll.

S. P. 459, S. D. 186: An act relating to rules and regulations governing the issuance of teachers' pensions.

S. P. 527, S. D. 335: Resolve in favor of the Augusta State Hospital.

S. P. 47, S. D. 27: Resolve in favor of the Bangor State Hospital.

S. P. 190, S. D. 326: Resolve in favor of the Department of Maine Grand Army of the Republic.

S. P. 156, S. D. 334: An act relating to the salary of the Sheriff of Washington county.

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting ought to pass on bill an act to amend the Charter of the city of Westbrook in reference to reducing the number of its Aldermen, and increasing the time of their office as well as that of the Mayor and the Board of Assessors (H. P. 171) (H. D. 70)

which report and bill were recommended to the Committee on Legal Affairs in the House March 1st.

Comes from the Senate the report accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Mr. ROBIE of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, through a misunderstanding in the Senate the report was accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed. It is understood and they want it to go back to the committee on Legal Affairs. Therefore, I move that we insist on our former action and that the bill be recommitted to the committee on Legal Affairs.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman wish to ask for a committee of conference or not?

Mr. ROBIE: I do not think it necessary, Mr. Speaker.

Thereupon the House voted to insist on its former action to recommit the bill to the committee on Legal Affairs.

From the Senate: Ordered, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet, Monday afternoon, March 18, at 4 o'clock.

In the Senate, read and passed. In the House read and passed in concurrence.

Orders

Mr. Aldrich of Topsham presented the following order and moved its passage:

Whereas, In the message to the Legislature the Governor transmitted a letter from the former Secretary of Agriculture of the United States which implied charges against and which questioned the integrity of the Highway Commission of this State; and

Whereas, In said message the Governor advised the Legislature that he had demanded the resignations of all of the members of the Highway Commission; and

Whereas, It is public knowledge that the members of the Highway Commission have refused to accede to the Governor's demand and have asked that they be given an opportunity to protect their reputations from the implied and suggested charges against them; and

Whereas, The said letter from said former Secretary of Agriculture indicated that the Highway Commission had been under suspicion for two years;

Ordered, The Senate concurring, that a committee of ten be appointed, three on the part of the Senate to be named by the President of the Senate, and seven on the part of the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House, to investigate the proceedings, acts and actions of the State Highway Commission since January 1, 1927, and at such other time or times as may be affected by any evidence relating to said Highway Commission in the possession of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of Justice at Washington, to the end that the Legis-

lature and the people of the State may be advised of the basis for the complaint of said authorities in Washington and may learn the facts in connection therewith.

Ordered, That said Committee be and it hereby is directed to invite the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice of the Federal Government to submit upon the investigation to be held hereunder any and all evidence in their possession which said Departments feel reflects upon the ability or the integrity of any or all members of the State Highway Commission.

Ordered, That said Committee be and it hereby is directed to request the said Federal Departments to send to the hearings upon said investigation to be held hereunder such agents of said Departments as the heads thereof may desire and such agents or other employees as the Committee may feel should be heard.

Ordered, That public hearings hereunder be started on Monday, March 25, 1929, at 2 o'clock, P. M. in the Hall of the Maine House of Representatives same to continue until the investigation is completed, and that the Departments of Justice and Agriculture at Washington be notified forthwith of the time and place of said hearings.

Ordered, That said Committee be and it hereby is given full authority to issue subpoenas and compel the attendance of witnesses and to compel the production of books and writings of every description and to compel the giving of evidence by anyone so subpoenaed. The Chairman of said Committee may administer oaths to witnesses.

The members of said Committee shall be reimbursed for all expenses actually incurred by them in connection with said investigation, and counsel shall be furnished said Committee and the respective members of the Highway Commission; all expenses in connection with said investigation to be paid out of Legislative funds.

Mr. ALDRICH of Topsham: I wish to state at this time, Mr. Speaker, that this order which is here introduced in no way conflicts in principle with another order which is now on the table in this House. The principle involved in both is the same, and the only

question which will be raised under either is as to the advisability of the method to be pursued. Now in fairness to the other order which is upon the table, I would now move that this order be tabled to be taken up by me later in the morning.

Thereupon the order presented by the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich, was tabled and specially assigned for consideration by a viva voce vote under orders of the day this morning.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Stone from the Committee on Claims on resolve in favor of the town of New Sharon (H. P. 231) (H. D. 74) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1646) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Rounds from same Committee on resolve in favor of Lloyd W. Hickey to reimburse him for injury and expense incurred while in the employ of the State of Maine (H. P. 776) (H. D. 243) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1647) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Hawkes from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on resolve in favor of the town of Salem, for a new bridge (H. P. 563) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1648) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Reports read and accepted and the new drafts ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. Littlefield from the Committee on Claims reported ought to pass on resolve in favor of John M. Eastman (H. P. 736) (H. D. 212).

Report read and accepted and the resolve having already been printed, was read once under suspension of the rules and tomorrow assigned.

Mr. Stone from the committee on Claims reported ought not to pass on resolve in favor of Daniel M. Maher for moving picture films of Governor Parkhurst's inaugural and funeral services (H. P. 123) (H. D. 51).

Mr. Blodgett from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of James L. Martin, compensating him for services rendered and supplies furnished, in the burial of Joseph Eldridge (H. P. 653) (H. D. 194).

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on resolve to

reimburse James L. Martin of Milo (H. P. 761) (H. D. 228)

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Rounds from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of the town of Thomaston (H. P. 637) (H. D. 204).

Mr. VOSE of Cushing: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by a member of this committee that this adverse report is not in any way a reflection on the bill, and the only object in making the report in this manner is that the bill does not constitute the subject matter of the claim. Therefore, I move that pending the acceptance of the committee's report, this bill be laid on the table.

Thereupon the motion to table, pending acceptance of the report, prevailed.

Mr. Holman from the Committee on Judiciary on bill an act relative to absent voting (H. P. 1283) (H. D. 440) reported that legislation thereon is inexpedient.

Mr. Small from the Committee on Education reported ought not to pass on bill an act relating to the Superintendent of Schools in Harpswell (H. P. 1405) (H. D. 467).

Mr. MacKinnon from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on bill an act to close ice fishing in Cathance Lake (H. P. 1466) (H. D. 510).

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Williamson from the Committee on Judiciary on bill an act authorizing the State Highway Commission to designate county and town highways as through ways (H. P. 1212) (H. D. 404) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1640) under title of an act relating to designation of through ways and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Blaisdell from the Committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act to require the investment in permanent securities of school funds and other trust funds held by city, town, quasi-municipal corporations and state officers (H. P. 320) (H. D. 95) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1642) under title of an act relating to the investment in permanent securities of school funds and other trust funds held by city, town, quasi-municipal corporations and state officers and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Jack from same committee

on bill an act to incorporate the South Orrington Cemeteries Association (H. P. 166) (H. D. 69) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1641) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Chase from the Committee on Public Utilities on bill an act granting the right of eminent domain to electric power companies doing a public utilities business (H. P. 616) (H. D. 182) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1644) under same title and that it ought to pass.

(Tabled by Mr. Sturgis of Auburn pending acceptance of the report, and on motion by Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth 500 copies of the new draft ordered printed.)

Same gentleman from same committee on bill an act to incorporate Madawaska Water Company (H. P. 728) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1643) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Reports read and accepted and the new drafts ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. Hawkes from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on bill an act relative to highways through towns of less than five thousand inhabitants (H. P. 522) (H. D. 151) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1645) under same title and that it ought to pass.

(Tabled by Mr. McKnight of Poland, pending acceptance of report and 500 copies of the new draft ordered printed.)

Mr. Pratt from the Committee on State School for Boys, State School for Girls and State Reformatories reported ought to pass on resolve in favor of the State Reformatory for Women for the erection of a house for mothers and babies. (H. P. 185)

Report read and accepted and the resolve ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. Small from the Committee on Education reported same on bill an act to amend Section 4 of Chapter 173 of the Public Laws of 1921 relating to deductions from State School Fund (H. P. 1181) (H. D. 387)

Mrs. Day from same Committee reported same on bill an act relating to equal school privileges for all pupils (H. P. 1383) (H. D. 463)

Mr. Anderson from the Committee on Indian Affairs reported same on bill an act to place the adminis-

tration of the affairs of the Indian Tribes under the Department of Forestry (H. P. 1275) (H. D. 432)

Mr. McLean from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on bill an act relating to fishing in Kewayden Lake in the town of Stoneham (H. P. 1534) (H. D. 555)

Mr. Jackson from the Committee on Labor reported same on bill an act relative to the hours of employment of women (H. P. 1568) (H. D. 603)

Mr. Chase from the Committee on Public Utilities reported same on bill an act relating to taking of land of railroad corporations for streets or ways (H. P. 1574) (H. D. 580)

Mr. McCart from the Committee on Revision of Statutes reported same on bill an act relating to vacancies in town offices (H. P. 1255) (H. D. 427)

Mr. Stone from same Committee reported same on bill an act relative to probate courts (H. P. 1281) (H. D. 438)

Mr. Hammond from the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation reported same on bill an act to amend Section 66 of Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the funds of the Maine Forestry District (H. P. 1404) (H. D. 466)

Mr. Varnum from the Committee on State Prison reported same on bill an act relating to the collection of a fee from persons visiting the State Prison (H. P. 1166) (H. D. 373)

Mr. Varnum from same Committee reported same on resolve in favor of the Maine State Prison for maintenance and current expenses (H. P. 1584) (H. D. 587)

Mr. Hawkes from the Committee on Ways and Bridges reported same on bill an act to revise, arrange and simplify the Mill Tax Highway Fund Laws (H. P. 1445) (H. D. 500)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on bill an act relative to snow removal from State and State aid highways in unincorporated townships and plantations, and declaring Chapter 227 of the Public Laws of 1927 to be a part of Chapter 25 of the Revised Statutes entitled State Highways (H. P. 1443) (H. D. 498)

Reports read and accepted and

the bills and resolve having already been printed, the bills were read twice, the resolve read once, and tomorrow assigned.

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

(H. P. 1637) (H. D. 661) An act relating to fusible plugs in steam boilers.

(Tabled by Mr. Picher of Waterville pending second reading.)

(H. P. 1638) (H. D. 662) An act relative to the extermination of mosquitoes.

Passed to be Engrossed

(S. P. 547) (S. D. 224) An act to amend Section 38 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes relating to duties of superintending school committees.

(S. P. 666) (S. D. 332) An act relating to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Judicial and Superior Courts.

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment, though perhaps this should be offered after the report is accepted.

Report of committee on bills in third reading accepted and the bill had its third reading.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A to Senate Paper 666 and move its adoption.

House Amendment A to Senate Paper 666, Senate Document 332 "An act relating to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Judicial and Superior Courts."

Amend Section one of Senate Paper 666, Senate Document 332 by inserting the word "voluntary" after the word and punctuation "death" in the second line of the second paragraph of said section.

Thereupon House Amendment A was adopted and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

(S. P. 668) (S. D. 330) An act to incorporate The Maine Foundation.

(S. P. 669) (S. D. 331) An act to license and regulate private hospitals and private houses for the treatment of patients mentally deranged.

(H. P. 842) (H. D. 268) An act relating to the establishment of the Lewiston Municipal Court.

(H. P. 1214) (H. D. 405) An act to amend Sections 44, 45 and 48 of the Revised Statutes, relating to procedure before Public Utilities Commission.

(H. P. 1406) (H. D. 468) An act providing for committee of visitors to Pownal State School.

(H. P. 1407) (H. D. 469) An act to amend Section 15 of Chapter 49, relating to certain reports to the Commissioner of Labor and industry.

(H. P. 1595) (H. D. 593) An act regarding disposition of motor vehicle fees.

(H. P. 1629) (H. D. 648) An act relating to the relicensing and registration of undertakers.

(H. P. 1634) (H. D. 660) An act relating to the removal of snow from highways and town ways.

(Tabled by Mr. Sturgis of Auburn pending passage to be engrossed.)

(H. P. 1635) (H. D. 659) An act to set off certain land from the town of Hudson to be annexed to the city of Old Town.

(H. P. 1636) (H. D. 658) An act to prohibit lobster fishing in certain waters of Winter Harbor and Gouldsboro.

Paper from the Senate out of order.

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that bill an act to establish a Park Commission for the city of South Portland, H. P. 334, H. D. 96, be recalled from the files of the Senate and returned to the House, which was read and passed in the House March 8th, and in the Senate indefinitely postponed, the House on March 14 voting to insist and asking for a committee of conference.

Comes from the Senate that body voting to insist on its action and appointing a committee of conference, with the following conferees: Senators Crosby of Penobscot, Dwinal of Knox and Murchie of Washington.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Under tabled and today assigned the Chair presents the first matter, joint order relative to proceedings against members of State Highway Commission, H. D. 657, tabled on March 13th by the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Kitchen, the pending question being passage in concurrence, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is not

my matter, and my only thought in connection with this, and I am sure it is your thought, is that we proceed in a right and orderly manner.

I would like to inquire at this time as to whether it would be in order to discuss the merits of the order which is before the House and tabled.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the passage by the House, and any discussion of the merits of the order is certainly appropriate.

Mr. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, should the discussion be confined to this one in particular, or the one before the House?

To explain myself, I thought it might be appropriate for the gentleman from Topsham (Mr. Aldrich) to define the difference between the orders, as he understands it.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman address an inquiry to the gentleman from Topsham (Mr. Aldrich)?

The Chair will state that the merits of this order are in order in discussing this order, and the merits of the order of the gentleman from Topsham (Mr. Aldrich) are open to discussion in the discussion of his order, and the Chair sees no objection to a statement by either gentleman of the distinction between the two orders.

Mr. KITCHEN: I would then like to yield to the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Kitchen, yields to the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich.

Mr. ALDRICH: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Kitchen, but I really feel that until I have heard the order which is before us discussed by those who may be in favor of it, that I should not be called upon to say anything with reference to it. If nothing is to be said in support of the order, I shall be very glad to then state my position with respect to this entire situation, which I believe is not to any great extent different from the position of the gentleman from Presque Isle (Mr. Kitchen). In

other words, I believe, as I said before, we are all in this House aiming to reach the same end, and it is just a question of method. I am open to conviction that this is the best method if it may be so shown.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state for the benefit of the House that the order under consideration is printed as House Document 657, and should be on the desk of every member. The order of the gentleman from Topsham (Mr. Aldrich) having been introduced this morning, obviously is not printed.

Mr. FARRIS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Chair to say the order is on the desks?

The SPEAKER: The order under discussion is House Document 657, and should be on the desk of every member.

Mr. ALLEN of Sanford: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives: I have been here for the last two or three weeks, and I have come downstairs in the morning and somebody would say—

"Have you heard anything?"

"No, not a word. Have you?"

"No, what do you think they are going to do?"

"I don't know. What do you think?"

"I don't know."

That is all I have heard for about two weeks. Now I want to say in connection with this that that situation, as it now stands, is not fair to the Highway Commission of the State of Maine. I want also to say that it is not fair to the Governor of the State of Maine; it is also not fair to the Legislature of the State of Maine. It is not fair to the people of the State of Maine for us to sit here like a lot of sick ducks. Now that is sure, there is no question about that.

Now as far as these two orders are concerned, as far as I can see, I have heard them both read and it is "whereby and whereas and whereon and so on and so forth." There is a distinction; but no difference, as I understand it—just a distinction. Now for Heaven's sake, let us do something and not pass the buck. I do not know anything about this order at all, but I move that we concur with the Senate in the adoption of this order. Now, for Goodness' sake, let

us do something! I am sick and tired of listening to this stuff. (Applause)

Mr. FOSTER of Ellsworth: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recess for ten minutes.

(Cries of "No, no.")

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, moves that the House recess for ten minutes. As many as are in favor of the gentleman's motion will say aye; as many as are opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion failed of passage.

Mr. ALDRICH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not take much of the time of this House in recounting what is already familiar to it. Last week we received a message, accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, advising that the Department of Agriculture in Washington would do certain things adverse to the State of Maine unless the State of Maine pursued a certain course. Thereafter, the members of the Highway Commission were requested to resign, and we were so advised. Now I have no disposition or intention at this time to in any way criticise that action. I do feel, however, that we may with propriety recognize that a state is entitled to demand that its sovereign rights shall be respected, and, so far as I know, no state in this Union has abrogated those rights at the dictation of the Federal government.

The Highway Commission, as is well known, refused to resign, and thereby, in my judgment, notice was served by the State of Maine that the State of Maine does not propose to supinely take dictation from Washington unless a reason therefor adequate to our rights is given.

The entire matter has been presented to us. As the gentleman (Mr. Allen) has just stated, and I agree with every word he said, the time has come for this Legislature in the name of the State of Maine to act, if we are going to retain the respect of the people of Maine. And that brings us to a consideration of the only thing that is before us in these two orders, Mr. Speaker, as to what, under the circumstances, the method to be

adopted by the State of Maine should be.

Now this order which is before you proposes that we shall appoint a committee which shall go out and seek from the Federal government, if it can be secured, ex parte evidence against three men or one of these three men, or two of them. If that can be secured, then this committee can come back and formulate an address, and after that address is formulated then there may be a joint convention of this Legislature. Now the first thought that occurs to me with respect to that proposal is this: That we are proposing to take action by the State of Maine, which action will be absolutely limited by what the Department in Washington sees fit to do, and if the Department in Washington does nothing, you are powerless. What will your committee do? And if the Department in Washington intimates they will be glad to cooperate with us in our personal business, they cannot give us anything for three months. Are we going to stay here for three months until we learn what they are going to do? And I submit to you that if you follow the method which is proposed in this order which is before us, you will put yourselves in a position where the State of Maine is absolutely helpless to do anything towards clearing up this matter unless the Federal government cooperates, and I for one am not willing to place myself in that position.

I believe that the State of Maine, under the circumstances which have arisen, has a right to insist—and I know you will agree with me on this—that these men, who presumably are under some kind of vague charges, shall be treated like the humblest men in our commonwealth, and we, I believe, are glad to see they are so treated, and to see that they be given an opportunity, without hindrance by Washington, without the say-so or consent of Washington, but solely at the behest of the State of Maine, solely under our control, and in a proceeding controlled by us, the opportunity of having the evidence presented to them, if there be such evidence, of their wrong-doing, in order that they may be faced with

their accusers and meet the charges.

Now, gentlemen, I believe we are all agreed we do not want to stay here all summer. I believe we are all agreed we want to do whatever will enable us to get action quickly. It is for that sole reason that I introduced this order which will come up later.

The objection to the order before you is that there is no assurance that you will get any quick action. If you will pardon me for repeating: You will absolutely be limited under that order to what Washington may see fit to do. Now I might go on and discuss it further, but that, to me, is a sufficient reason why we should not adopt that method.

Now permit me to say this before I sit down. I believe that we in this whole Legislature are a unit on the proposition that we demand fair treatment for any of our citizens. I believe we are a unit on the proposition that the members of this Highway Commission are entitled to that kind of treatment at our hands; and I think it would be unfortunate if by anything we do here today any impression should be given that we are not a unit. Whether you pass this order or whether you pass mine, we are a unit, and all we are discussing here is the question of what is the best method. We will go along together. I will go along with anyone in this proposition, or on any method that this Legislature or this House decides is the better method. I will subordinate my judgment to the judgment of the Legislature. And so I want it clearly understood in your minds that I am not opposing this order because it suggests getting relief which we are entitled to—not at all. I am opposing the order because I think under that order your committee will be absolutely dependent upon this department in Washington, which I now say, in my judgment, based upon what we have had, has acted in a most unfortunate way, to speak charitably. Now that is all there is to this matter.

The gentleman (Mr. Kitchen) asked me to explain the distinction, and I have tried to do so. The order I propose would provide for immediate action. We will begin

our hearing, and we will invite them to come up and bring any evidence they have. And why shouldn't we? If they have it, let them produce it. If they have evidence upon which any one of these men can be convicted, I say to you, and you know, that those men have got to get out, without any addresses to the Governor or any impeachment proceedings. We are in a position here to legislate them out if we have to, so there is no question as to what the result will be, based upon the report of your committee. After you have had public hearings, the people of the State of Maine for the first time will be given an opportunity of knowing what the affairs of this State are in connection with our Highway Commission, and you gentlemen and the members of the Senate will have the opportunity. We will begin immediately and we won't be depending on whether Mr. McDonald in Washington sees fit to give us information or whether he does not. If Mr. McDonald does not want to come up here with his evidence, he can stay in Washington, but we will give him a chance to come up and present it, and if he has got it we will accept it without question after the opportunity has been presented to these men to face it.

Now do you want quick action, or don't you? That is all there is to this matter. Do you want to stay here for three months? Do you want to stay here until the middle of April or the latter part of April hoping to God you are going to get something down there, and then have that committee report they have effected nothing, and we will have to have a special session? Do you want that, or do you want to hold an investigation which we are perfectly capable of holding right here and which we will begin at once. The reason for the date suggested, a week from Monday, is in order to give opportunity for Washington to pull itself together and come up here, if they want to. We all want to know, the people of the State want to know. Don't let us have this thing shrouded in mystery any longer.

I say to you, friends, if it is your judgment that the better way to proceed is under this order, I have no objection. I stated to you my reasons and the sole reasons

for offering the other. And I say to you, if you want to go on on this one, I will go along with you smilingly; but it is my own judgment that if you want to effect something you won't go under that order. I am friendly to the principle that is involved in both, but I want to call to your attention these facts.

This whole matter is unquestionably a question of states rights, unquestionably a question of our retaining our rights, unquestionably a question as to whether or not there shall be domination by Washington or won't, just because a department head down there sees fit to tell us that he will withhold federal funds from us without any more reason than he has given. Do not forget that is involved. But that is not involved in the question of the procedure you will take. If you want quick action, I believe the other order will give it to you.

I want to be fair. It may be your committee will go down there to Washington and get the facts. I don't know. The idea is that a great department in Washington could, with a great deal of plausibility defer and delay the furnishing of such information as you want, and I again repeat to you that if that perchance were their course your committee under this order will be helpless, because that is what we want. That is the only thing that has been brought against us, what Washington has said, and that is what we want, and, if we invite them in a polite manner, we may get it. I, for one, assume that before that letter was written that department had evidence, and I cannot conceive that Washington won't send this evidence up here. If it does, we will get this thing straightened out before the end of this session and we will all know where we are and can adopt a road program and go along. But I say to you that if this is held up in the air much longer I wouldn't want to make any prediction as to what we will do. You know that as well as I do. Now this thing has got to be cleaned up, and the only question before us is: to the quickest way to do it.

They may tell you that is a constitutional method. That is true. I also wish to point out—I haven't looked it up—but I think

you won't find a precedent under impeachment proceedings in which an address has been taken where the charges have been of such a character that the State could not ignore them, and therefore it proceeded in the constitutional way. But because that is in the constitution, we are in no way precluded from conducting an examination and investigation by this body. The sole question, as I say, is the way you want to do it and whether you want to do it quickly.

Now I wish to say further: I beg of you, don't let us put this matter on the table any longer. Let us act. As the gentleman says, let us do something.

I hope, for the reasons that I have stated, you may see fit to defeat this order, not that I am opposed to the order—the gentlemen who prepared that order and I are in perfect accord as to our desire for results—but I cannot help believing that you will get the results quicker if you go ahead and do something and set a date when you are going to start.

Mr. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I gather from the gentleman's remarks that either order will eventually accomplish the purpose. I just want to state to the members of this House the position that we are in on this order which is before the House at the present moment. The order has been unanimously adopted by the Senate. If we reject this order and accept the other one, then that must go to the Senate.

Now I notice that the Senators are in the back of this Hall. I do not know whether they have simply recessed or whether they have adjourned for the day. But my thought is this,—that we should take some action today, as this is the last day of this week's session. If an order could be passed and a committee appointed today, then we would meet and start out the right way to accomplish results quickly. I support the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Allen. (Applause)

Mr. JACK of Lisbon Falls: Mr. Speaker and Fellow-members of the Legislature: The essence of this whole proposition at this time is this: The Government at Washington has preferred its charges, or stated them, or presented them.

There can be no hardship on the part of the Government, because it is not assumed, or it should not be assumed, that it presented its charges before it had its entire evidence. Therefore, there can be no disadvantage to the Government of the United States, there can be no disadvantage to this Legislature, to the citizenship of Maine, unless this matter is not cleaned up, and we should act at once.

Now I say again, the essence of this whole proposition is time. Washington is, or should be, in a position to be here at the time mentioned in the Aldrich order. The thing is brought to a point in that order, so they must present themselves for action, and that is what we want.

Mr. McCART of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, I really had no desire to be drawn into the Highway controversy, but as a member of this Legislature who was here last term, and was forced to sit by and listen to the so-called investigation, I really think my views might be of some benefit to the members of the Legislature who were not here last session.

Of course we all know there was a so-called investigation. Certain bombastic attorneys stood right up in the front of this House, and waves of hot air came up through that door. We got nowhere.

The present order calls for a safe and sane method of going at the problem. Two of my brother attorneys have spoken against it, and I am afraid they may have left a misapprehension in the minds of some of the laymen in the House. It has been stated that the present order, the so-called Spear order, is a method that we would not accord to the lowest citizens of the Commonwealth. Gentlemen, I cannot agree with that. This is the method which it is logically followed in all court proceedings of any moment. This committee, under the Spear order, is similar to a Grand Jury, which is granted to any citizen when he is accused of a felony. Furthermore, this committee is not dependent on the Department of Agriculture at Washington, as the gentleman from Topsham (Mr. Aldrich) would have you believe.

This order says "The committee is directed to obtain, if possible,

from the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Department of Justice, and other persons and sources, such data, evidence and information as they have in their possession, including names of witnesses, which will assist the committee in recommending the advisability and form of proceedings against the aforesaid members of the State Highway Commission or any of them, et cetera."

I presume you have all read it. Now we are not dependent on the Department of Agriculture at Washington. Those men from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice came to Maine to get their evidence. We are in Maine now, and we can get it if they can. And further, this committee can get right to work and hold ex parte hearings. If you get a committee—I am still going to call it a so-called investigation—you are going to have witnesses for and against both sides, and that committee is not going to base its conclusions entirely upon the evidence. It is not human nature. They are going to base their opinions partly upon the arguments of these attorneys, who are going to cost something. It cost pretty nearly \$2500 last session, I believe.

Now when the committee, acting under the Spear order, reaches a conclusion, it is not going to come in and say part of the Highway Commission or all of the Highway Commission—this committee has a number of ways in which to report, and when it does report, it may recommend an address to the Governor, or other proceedings for removal. "The committee is also to consider and to report the order of proceedings to be observed in presenting such resolve or other process, in ordering and conducting hearings thereon and in presenting and adopting such address or addresses to the Governor and Council as may result therefrom." So if this committee still feels that the Highway Commission is entitled to hearing under the Spear order, they can give them an opportunity to be heard, but in reaching their conclusions they are not going to be influenced by arguments of attorneys or some personal feeling in the matter. They are going to sit down by themselves and hear it as

a Grand Jury, and reach a consistent conclusion, and it probably will not cost one-quarter as much as an investigation would.

Mr. FARRIS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be discourteous to the Senate to non-concur in the passage of this order. The Senate presents this morning an order which I believe accomplishes the purpose we are seeking, and instead of concurring with the Senate, we are introducing another order from this House.

I notice in the order read, which has been introduced by Mr. Aldrich the gentleman from Topsham, that it states that the investigation will go back to 1927, January 1, or such further time as the committee may determine. I believe there is a little joker right there, that limiting it to 1927, January 1. We have a record of the proceedings in 1927, and we can use that record. If we are going back and going into this matter, we should go back to 1925, because the letter from the Department of Agriculture stated that some of this trouble occurred in 1926. I want to go on record as being in favor of the passage of this order now pending.

Mr. PEACOCK of Readfield: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Peacock, moves the previous question. As many as are in favor of the Chair entertaining the previous question will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will return the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: A sufficient number obviously having arisen, the question before the House is shall the main question be now put? This question is debatable, but no member shall speak thereon for more than five minutes.

Shall the main question be now put?

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The debate on the previous question must be confined to the question of whether the main question shall be put and not on the question of the merits of the order. The question before the House is shall the main question be now put? As many as are in favor of the Chair putting the main question now will rise and stand in

their places until counted and the monitors will return the count.

A division of the House being had,

One hundred and thirteen voting in the affirmative and four in the negative, the motion that the main question be now put prevailed.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, moves that when the vote upon the question of the passage of the order in concurrence is taken, it be taken by the yeas and nays. This motion must be supported by one-fifth of the members present. As many as are in favor of the gentleman's motion will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will return the count.

A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is upon the passage in concurrence of House Document No. 657, joint order relative to proceedings against members of the State Highway Commission. As many as are in favor of its passage will say aye when their names are called; those opposed will answer no. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, there still seems to be a little confusion as to which order is before the House and would the Chair undertake to make that a little more clear?

The SPEAKER: The only order on which the members are voting is House Document No. 657, which is the first today assigned matter on page seven of the calendar. This order comes from the Senate, having been read and passed. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Allen, that this order be passed in concurrence. The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Adams, Allen of Camden, Allen of Sanford, Anderson of New Sweden, Angell, Bachelder, Belleau, Bishop, Bissett, Blanchard, Boston, Bove, Briggs, Burkett of Portland, Burkett of Union, Burns, Burr, Buzzell, Carleton of Portland, Chase, Clark, Comins, Couture, Crawford, Daigle, Day, Farris, Fogg, Folsom, Foster, Gagne, Gay, Gillespie, Hammond, Harrington, Hatch, Hathaway,

Hawkes of Richmond, Hawkes of Standish, Heath, Hill, Holbrook, Holman, Hubbard, Hughes, Hunt, Hurd, Jackson of Portland, Jacobs of Wells, Jones of Corinna, Jones of Waterville, Jones of Windsor, Jones of Winthrop, Kane, King, Kitchen, Lenfest, Lewis, Libby, Littlefield of Farmingdale, Littlefield of Monroe, Lombard, Lowell, Mansfield, McCart, McLean, Melcher, Merrill, Milliken, Morse of Oakland, Morse of Rumford, O'Connell, Peacock, Perham, Perkins, Picher, Quint, Roach, Robie, Rogers of Greenville, Rogers of Yarmouth, Roy, St. Clair, Sargent, Saucier, Seavey, Small of Freedom, Sterling of Kittery, Sterling of Caratunk Pl., Stone, Stuart, Sturtevant, Taylor, Thatcher, Towne, Tucker, Varnum, Vose, Ward, Webster of Auburn, Webster of Buxton, White, Wight, Williamson, Wing, Wright—106.

NAY—Aldrich, Anderson of South Portland, Ashby, Bailey, Bisbee, Blaisdell, Boynton, Butler, Campbell, Carleton of Winterport, Clifford, Eaton, Ford, Friend, Hamel (George), Hamel (Rodolphe), Ingraham, Jack, Jackson of Bath, Jacobs of Auburn, Leonard, Locke, McKnight, Morin, Palmer, Patterson, Potter, Powers, Pratt, Rea, Richardson, Rounds, Stetson, Sturgis—34.

A BSENT—Blodgett, Dudley, Laughlin, MacKinnon, Pike, Rackliff, Rumill, Small of East Machias, Stanley—9.

One hundred and six having voted in the affirmative and 34 in the negative, the order received passage in concurrence.

Mr. JACOBS of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I move now that the Chair appoint the committee as mentioned in the order.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman incorporate in his motion the number desired to be appointed on the part of the House, as the order refers to such as the House may join.

Mr. JACOBS: Seven, Mr. Speaker.

Thereupon, a viva voce vote being taken, it was voted that the Chair appoint seven members on the part of the House and the Chair appointed as such members: Representatives Foster of Ellsworth, Melcher of Rumford, Holbrook of Vanceboro, Bishop of Boothbay Harbor, Holman of Farmington, Small of Freedom and Wright of Bath.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the second matter tabled and today assigned, House report ought to pass in new draft, committee on

Sea and Shore Fisheries, on bill an act to insure the quality of sardines packed in Maine, H. P. 1090, H. D. 352, reported in a new draft, H. P. 1630, tabled on March 14th by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Carleton, the pending question being acceptance of report, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Carleton, the report of the committee was accepted, and the new draft ordered printed under the joint rules.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Farmingdale, it was voted to take from the table the fourth unassigned matter, S. P. 164, S. D. 74, resolve in favor of the Central Maine Sanatorium for maintenance, personal services, repairs and equipment, tabled by that gentleman on March 13th, the pending question being passage to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment B to Senate Paper 164, correcting the total figures, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Farmingdale, Mr. Littlefield, now offers House Amendment B to Senate Paper 164, and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment B to Senate Paper 164.

"Amend said resolve by striking out the words "forty-nine" in the eighth line and inserting in place thereof the words 'sixty-nine.'

Thereupon, House Amendment B was adopted; and on further motion by the same gentleman Senate Paper 164, Senate Document 74, as amended by House Amendment A and as further amended by House Amendment B, was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Farmingdale, it was voted to take from the table the fifth unassigned matter, S. P. 165, S. D. 75, resolve in favor of the Northern Maine Sanatorium for maintenance, personal services repairs and equipment, tabled by that gentleman on March 13th, the pending question being passage to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker,

I now offer House Amendment B to Senate Paper 165, and move its adoption. In explanation, this is simply correcting the total figures.

The SPEAKER: The same gentleman now offers House Amendment B to Senate Paper 165, and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment B to Senate Paper 165.

Amend said resolve by striking out in the first line the word "fifteen" and inserting in place thereof the words 'twenty-three', and further amend by striking out the word "seven" in line eight and inserting in place thereof the word "fifteen."

Thereupon, House Amendment B was adopted; and on further motion by the same gentleman Senate Paper 165, Senate Document 75, as amended by House Amendment A and as further amended by House Amendment B, was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Hammond of Van Buren, it was voted to take from the table the twenty-fourth unassigned matter, S. P. 368, S. D. 218, an act to incorporate the Big Black River Dam Company, tabled by that gentleman on March 14th, the pending question being passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment A and move its adoption. The amendment is introduced by consent, I believe, of all the parties concerned.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Van Buren, Mr. Hammond, now offers House Amendment A to Senate Paper 368, Senate Document 218, and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment A to Senate Document 218.

Amend Senate Document 218 by striking out the name "Blin W. Page", in the first and second lines of said bill and inserting in place thereof the name 'Louis W. Eaton'.

Amend Section 4 of said bill by striking out the word "ten" in the second line of said section and inserting in the place thereof the word 'five', and by striking out the word "twenty" in the second line of

said section and inserting in place thereof the word 'ten'.

Thereupon, House Amendment A was adopted; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the bill, as amended by House Amendment A, was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. McKnight of Poland, 500 copies of Senate Amendment A to Senate Paper 65, Senate Document 36, were ordered printed.

On motion by Mr. Blaisdell of Franklin, it was voted to take from the table the third unassigned matter, bill an act in relation to the Ellsworth Municipal Court, H. P. 1626, H. D. 644, tabled by that gentleman on March 13th, the pending question being passage to be engrossed.

Mr. BLAISDELL: Owing to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there appears to be some question as to the statute which is being amended by this bill, I have been requested to move that it be recommitted to the committee on Judiciary.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Blaisdell, the bill was recommitted to the committee on Judiciary.

On motion by Mr. Heath of Guilford, it was voted to take from the table the first unassigned matter, H. P. 1622, H. D. 640, bill an act relating to county jails, tabled by that gentleman March 12th, the pending question being second reading.

Mr. HEATH: Mr. Speaker, I move the House Paper 1622, House Document 640, be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Heath, now moves that bill an act relating to county jails be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Mr. HOLMAN of Farmington: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the members of the House what this act is. The act was put in by Mr. H. H. Hastings, a member of the Prison Commission, and it is the present law as the law now stands with one exception. Under the present law the Prison Commission has to go in a body to inspect the jails in the State.

Under this system only one of the Prison Commissioners would

have to go, unless they found a condition that might need the attention of all the Board. This, to me, is simply keeping the law as it is, except it is an economy measure to the State, so all three Commissioners won't have to travel around the State together to investigate all the jails. It is quite a proposition to take the Commission all over the State. I cannot see any reason why this should be indefinitely postponed. It just simplifies the present law, and it is brought in here, as I have said, for the Commission to save money for the State, and the law will be the same as it is now, and the jails will have all the attention they need under this law. I hope this motion will be lost.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Monroe: Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House: I wish to oppose this law in that it classifies the small jails and ships the prisoners around, and also the Commission has the power to say when the County Commissioners should build a new jail.

Now we have a small jail in our county which I think is sufficient to take care of it, and if we should be obliged to build a new jail, it would cost us from seventy-five to one hundred thousand dollars, and we are not able to do it. I therefore hope that the motion of the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Heath, to indefinitely postpone, will prevail.

Mr. HOLMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman who has just spoken does not understand the proposition. If he is not in favor of the law, he would want to come before this House with a different bill, because the law, even if the motion that is made by the gentleman from Guilford, Mr. Heath, prevails, will remain the same as it is now, so I think this act should have a passage, and the motion to indefinitely postpone should not prevail.

Mr. TAYLOR of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, I, myself, am not in favor of the law now pending. Now this is the situation in our county: We have a small jail down there located in one of the better residential sections of the town, and the house connected with the jail, and under the present enforcement of the law

the jail is sometimes occupied by those who are more unfortunate than otherwise, which results in taking in those who have fallen into the clutches of the State. And I fear that this act, at the present time, unless I fail to understand the remarks which have been made, might work a great hardship on the citizens of our county, almost to the extent of building over the whole jail, which would be a big burden on the people.

The situation, as it stands today, is such that we are able to take care of our prisoners, and the morale of the prisoners, I believe, is good. If they were transported around to some other part of the State, they would be thrown into contact with the prisoners of different sections. For that reason I would like to have this bill retabled and specially assigned for Tuesday morning next at ten o'clock.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the bill was retabled and specially assigned for Tuesday next.

On motion by Mr. Allen of Sanford, it was voted to take from the table the eighth unassigned matter, H. P. 1633, H. D. 656, bill an act relating to the salary of the Municipal Court Recorder of Sanford, tabled by that gentleman on March 13th, the pending question being second reading; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was recommitted to the committee on Salaries and Fees.

Mr. ALDRICH of Topsham: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that inasmuch as I said I would take that order of mine from the table this morning, I ought to do it at this time in order to make the record clear, but since the other order was passed I would therefore move that I be permitted to withdraw this order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich, asks leave to withdraw the order introduced by him earlier this morning. Is there any objection to the gentleman withdrawing the order? The Chair hears no objection, and the order is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the rules be suspended and that I be permitted to introduce a resolve in relation to the completion of the seventh revision of the Public Laws and that a Commission be appointed therefor.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Williamson, moves that the rules be suspended, and that notwithstanding the order passed, the gentleman be allowed to introduce a resolve relating to a revision of the statutes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: May I explain the motion?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman desires to explain his request.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: This resolve is to provide for the seventh revision of the laws. I understand that the committee on Appropriations has set off an amount which provides for this purpose. The request to enter this resolve comes in at this time so that we may know where we stand on the matter. It could not have been put in earlier because it required a great deal of study to find out the expenses of the revision.

The SPEAKER: Is there any objection to the gentleman being allowed to introduce the resolve under the circumstances stated? The Chair hears none, and the resolve is received. Does the gentleman make any motion with reference to the reference of this resolve to any committee?

Mr. WILLIAMSON: I do not, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what the custom has been in the past. I should think it might be well to refer it to the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

On motion by Mr. Williamson the resolve was tabled pending reference.

In motion by Mr. Foster of Ellsworth, it was voted to take from the table the sixth unassigned matter, H. P. 1625, H. D. 643, resolve to assist in defraying expenses for National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, tabled by that gentleman March 13th, the pending question being third reading.

Mr. FOSTER: When this matter came before the Military Affairs Committee, the proponents suggested that there be appropriated

\$15,000 for this purpose, and we understood it was unanimously passed by the Military Affairs Committee in that amount. When it arrived in the Appropriations Committee, the word "twenty" had been substituted for the word 'fifteen'. I would now move that the word "twenty" in the second line be changed to the word 'fifteen.' This is the full amount the proponents asked for and the Appropriations Committee has not cut it down in any way, and we feel there has been an error made.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman submit his amendment in writing?

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, wishes to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CHASE: Would the motion be in order, Mr. Speaker, to substitute the original bill for the new draft, to save the necessity of an amendment?

The SPEAKER: Such a motion would be in order if it accomplishes the same result, I believe. The Clerk will read House Amendment A.

House Amendment A to H. P. 1625, H. D. 643.

Amend said resolve by striking out the word "twenty" in the second line and substituting in place thereof the word 'fifteen'.

Thereupon, House Amendment A was adopted; and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve received its second reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further business under Orders of the day?

On motion by Mr. Crawford of Houlton, it was voted to take from the table the eleventh unassigned matter, H. P. 413, H. D. 124, bill an act relating to the property of extinct or disbanded Baptist or Free Baptist Churches, Parishes or Societies, tabled by that gentleman on March 13th, the pending question being passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Carleton of Portland, it was voted to take from the table the eighteenth unassigned matter, H. P. 1378, H. D. 459, resolve in favor of C. J. Thomas, compensating him for the loss of a cow, tabled by that gentleman March 13th, the pending question being final passage; and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was finally passed.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further business under Orders of the Day?

Mr. CRAWFORD of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the twenty-third unassigned matter on the calendar is correctly assigned.

The SPEAKER: The twenty-third unassigned matter is assigned for Tuesday next, and it should so appear on the calendar.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House reconsider its vote whereby it voted to assign this resolve for hearing on March 19th. Is that correct? What is the date?

The SPEAKER: March 19th.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Crawford, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the matter printed incorrectly as the twenty-third unassigned matter, was assigned for March 19th; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the gentleman stating that the reason for tabling had been taken care of in another way, the resolve received its final passage.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further business under orders of the day?

Paper from the Senate received out of order and passed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Williamson of Augusta, it was voted to take from the table resolve in relation to the completion of the seventh revision of the Public Laws and that a commission be appointed therefor; and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was referred to the committee on Judiciary.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further business under orders of the day? If not, the Chair will make the following statement relative to the state of legislative business at the close of this, the eleventh, legislative week:

There were 955 bills pending in committees on Tuesday last as against 920 on the previous Tuesday, March 5th. In the intervening week bills were referred or recommitted faster than they were reported out so that progress in that week was of a negative character. Of the number of bills so pending 751 had been heard and not reported, 165 had been advertised but not heard, while only 39 had been neither advertised nor heard. Eighty-four bills have been reported since Tuesday last, but it is

evident that until committee reports can be received in much greater volume, progress towards final adjournment must be extremely slow. The Chair will renew its suggestion that the utilization of a few evenings for executive sessions might prove helpful in the despatch of business.

On motion by Mr. Patterson of Freeport,

Adjourned until Monday, March 18, at 4 P. M.