

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-first Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE



1943

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

SENATE

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Herbert Al-drich of Augusta.

Journal of yesterday, read and approved.

Communication**STATE OF MAINE**

Senate Chamber
Augusta

April 5, 1943

To the Senate
91st Legislature
Augusta, Maine.

Dear Sirs:

Pursuant to the Joint Rules, I herewith submit a list of bills and resolutions. These were presented by me to the President of the Senate for his signature at 12:25 P. M., April 5, 1943. These bills and resolutions were signed by the President at 2:10 P. M., April 5, 1943. These bills and resolutions were presented by me to the Governor at 2:20 P. M., April 5, 1943.

Respectfully yours.

ROYDEN V. BROWN,
Secretary of the Senate

Accompanying List of Enactors

Bill "An Act relating to Transfer of Insane Persons having Settlements in this State from out of the State Institutions." (S. P. 213) (L. D. 325)

Bill "An Act relating to Fingerprinting of Pupils in Public Schools." S. P. 356) (L. D. 646)

Bill "An Act relating to Trial Justices and Judges of Municipal Courts." (S. P. 458) (L. D. 806)

Bill "An Act relating to the Salary of the Register of Probate of Sagadahoc County." (H. P. 118) (L. D. 72)

Bill "An Act relating to Clerk Hire for Clerk of Courts in Androscoggin County." (H. P. 600) (L. D. 369)

Bill "An Act Granting Increase in Salary for Clerks in the Office of Probate in Androscoggin County." (H. P. 832) (L. D. 399)

Bill "An Act relating to Dairy, Breeding, and Show Cattle." (H. P. 924) (L. D. 478)

Bill "An Act relating to Clerk Hire in Probation Office in Androscoggin County." (H. P. 1160) (L. D. 615)

Bill "An Act to Create the Office of Clerk in the Office of the Treasurer of Androscoggin County." (H. P. 1232) (L. D. 730)

Bill "An Act relating to Tuition for State Wards." (H. P. 1310) (L. D. 839)

Bill "An Act relating to Employment of Females and Minors." (H. P. 1311) (L. D. 840)

Bill "An Act relating to Malt Beverage Taxes on Government Reservations." (H. P. 1313) (L. D. 842)

Bill "An Act Prohibiting Throwing of Bottles, etc. on Highways." (H. P. 1324) (L. D. 843)

Bill "An Act relating to Appropriations for Private and Public Hospitals for Medical Treatment." (H. P. 1315) (L. D. 845)

Bill "An Act relating to Jurisdiction of Trial Justices in Certain Parts of Aroostook County." (H. P. 1316) (L. D. 846)

"Resolve to reimburse H. W. Brooks of Portland." (S. P. 462) (L. D. 829)

"Resolve in favor of Northeast Airlines Inc." (S. P. 463) (L. D. 827)

"Resolve granting his Soldier's Bonus to Frank W. Hughes of East Machias." (H. P. 1197) (L. D. 848)

"Resolve in favor of Central Maine Sanatorium at Fairfield." (H. P. 1309) (L. D. 847)

Which communications and accompanying list were read and ordered placed on file.

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Elliot of Knox, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Order Relating to Tabled Matter, tabled by that Senator on April 1 pending passage; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Order was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Batchelder of York, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report from Committee on Motor Vehicles "Legislation inexpedient" on bill "An Act Permitting Use of Vehicles to Transport Observers to Observation Posts without Registration" (S. P. 362) (L. D. 641) tabled by that Senator on March 9 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator the report of the Committee "Legislation Inexpedient" was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Elliot of Knox, the Senate voted to take from the table bill "An Act to Provide Tonnage Tax on Commercial Fertilizer" (H. P. 1226) (L. D. 712) tabled by that Senator on April 5 pending passage to be engrossed in concurrence; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will announce the Senate conferees to the Committee of Conference on bill An Act Relative to Licensing Dealers in Livestock, H. P. 1347, L. D. 882 as follows:

Senators:

Hall of Franklin
Bishop of Sagadahoc
Washburn of Washington

The PRESIDENT: The Senate is proceeding under Orders of the Day.

On motion by Mr. Emery of Hancock, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, Majority Report "Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A", Minority Report "Ought Not to Pass" on bill "An Act Relating to Audit and Use of Funds of Maine Forestry District," (H. P. 1070) (L. D. 559) tabled by that Senator on April 5 pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. EMERY of Hancock: Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the Minority Report, and would like to make a few statements in substantiating this motion. Going back briefly over the history of the district and why it was set up, the purposes and so on,

For fear of diverging somewhat from the subject, I have made some notes to which I shall refer. The Maine Forestry District was devised by the timberland owners as a method of raising funds through a tax on themselves, the proceeds of which were to be spent for the protection of timberland through the Forestry Commission. Through the years the administration has been very successful and entirely satisfactory to the timberland owners and it seems too bad at this time to do anything which might cause any friction between timberland owners and the Forestry Commission.

Chapter 216 of the Public Laws of 1941, known as the administra-

tive "Code" purposely exempted the sub-division of the Forestry Department known as the Maine Forestry District from the regulations which included other state departments. When the Personnel Law was enacted in 1937 the Maine Forestry District was again purposely exempted from its regulations.

The successful operation of the Maine Forestry District depends wholly upon the particular and specific regulations under which it operates. When this bill came before the Committee, Representative Hutchins who introduced the bill appeared in favor of it, and Mr. Peabody who, I understand is connected with the Eastern Corporation also appeared in favor of it. Senator Sterling appeared in opposition. Both the proponents and the opponents of the measure agreed that the operation of the Forestry District has been perfectly satisfactory under the present arrangement.

Representative Hutchins made the statement that this measure was offered to anticipate and forestall irregularities which might occur in the control and management. Senator Sterling contended that any change in control and management would interfere with the successful operation of the Forestry District.

The Commissioner of Forestry did not appear at the hearing.

It was stated that about 70% of the timberland owners favor this bill. I do not know whether that 70% refers to the number of timberland owners or the amount of land that was held. I can't question this statement, in view of some personal contacts which I have made with timberland owners or which may have been made with me since the hearing.

The field men of the timberland owners do not feel that this is a constructive measure neither do the supervisors of the Forestry Commission and it is my feeling that the timberland owners, while they may not openly oppose the bill are certainly not very enthusiastic about it. There is only one that I can really find who actually wants the bill and that is the State Auditor.

The Maine Forestry District is very closely associated with the War Department at the present time. Much more closely than any of us

realize. In view of the fact that it has operated so successfully over the last twelve years since it was set up as it was under the "Code" I feel that any measure that would in any way interfere with its continued successful operation should not be passed at this time. I hope that my motion for the acceptance of the Minority Report will prevail.

Mr. WORTHEN of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, it is my understanding that the timberland industry representing about six million acres in the Forestry District in the State of Maine is on record as being in favor of this measure. I know that they have held conferences, several of them, and I might give you the names of some of the timberland owners who are on record as being in favor of the bill: The Eastern Corporation, P. F. C., Great Northern Paper Co., Hollingsworth and Whitney, Blaine Viles and Coe and Pingree. I think it is known that they are in favor of the bill. I have certainly no personal interest, I just brought this up so that you would have an understanding.

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

A division of the Senate was had. Fourteen having voted in the affirmative, and fifteen opposed, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Worthen of Penobscot, the Majority Report "Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A" was accepted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading. Committee Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Emery of Hancock, the bill was laid upon the table pending assignment for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Varney of York, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Salaries and Fees "Ought to Pass" on bill "An Act Relating to the Compensation of the State Personnel Board" tabled by that Senator on March 30 pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. VARNEY of York: Mr. President, I tabled this bill because it is fixing the salaries of the State Per-

sonnel Board which could have been fixed by the Governor and Council if the General Salary Bill, so-called, had passed.

As it is now apparent that it probably will not pass, I am going to let this go along and if by any chance the General Bill should pass this could be indefinitely postponed at a later time. I move the acceptance of the "Ought to Pass" report of the committee.

Thereupon, the "Ought to Pass" report of the committee was accepted and the bill was given its first reading.

On further motion by the same Senator, the rules were suspended and the bill was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Varney of York, the Senate voted to take from the table Joint Order Relative to the Research Committee Studying the Tax System," etc., (H. P. 1363) tabled by that Senator on April 5 pending passage.

The same Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption:

"Senate Amendment A to Joint Order Relative to Instructing the Research Committee to Study the Tax System of the State and bring in a Report to the 92nd Legislature. (H. P. 1363)

Amend said Order by striking out all after the word 'concurring' in the 1st line thereof and substituting in place thereof the following: 'that the Research Committee be and hereby is requested to study the Tax System of the State of Maine for the purpose of presenting to the 92nd Legislature for its consideration suggestions and measures aimed at broadening and improving the tax system, if in their opinion it is advisable.'

Senate Amendment A was adopted and the Order as so amended was passed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Townsend of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Claims "Ought Not to Pass" on Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Millinocket for Support of Charles Roy and Fam-

ily, tabled by that Senator on April 5 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator the "Ought Not to Pass" report was accepted in concurrence.

Mr. WASHBURN of Washington: Mr. President, in my desire to co-operate in clearing our calendar I am ready to tackle even the sheep and dog question and I move that the Senate take from the table the 9th tabled and unassigned matter, tabled by me on April 2.

The motion prevailed and the Senate voted to take from the table bill "An Act For Better Protection of Livestock and Poultry" (H. P. 1349) (L. D. 887) tabled by that Senator on April 2 pending passage to be engrossed.

Mr. WASHBURN: Mr. President, I have only a brief statement to make in support of the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill which is in effect another chapter in the laws providing for the protection of sheep and domestic animals from dogs. What I may have to say is in no sense an attack on the excellent work of the Committee on Agriculture. It is rather, perhaps, in the nature of an assurance to the members of the Senate and the people of our State that we already have pretty good laws governing this point and that these laws are working effectively.

Through a great many sessions of the legislature over a great many years we have considered this problem of controlling dog damage to animals and particularly to sheep and it has been a serious problem because we know that it is one of the most discouraging things that can happen to a sheep husbandman when his flock is broken into and destroyed. But we have been rather conservative in our action. Many times we have brought together our Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game, and our Committee on Agriculture and the one influence has mellowed and tempered the other. We have never gone all out for the sheep man or jumped entirely off the deep end to protect man's great favorite the dog, and I think we have worked out a very good law.

Coming down to the time a few years ago when the Committee on Agriculture of a former session, at-

tached to this bill that a license plate should be placed on the dog so the people could know whether it was licensed or not, that had two good effects. It made the owner of the unlicensed dog plainly a violator and it stirred up in the minds of the young folks, the boys of the family, who usually have something to say about the dog, a desire to have a license tag and to have the dog licensed just as Father's automobile had to be licensed. And I think I shall prove in a moment that that had a good effect in cutting down the losses from damage to sheep because after all it is the unlicensed dog, it is the wild dog that nobody owns or has any responsibility for, that does the damage. I think that perhaps there are some loose spots in the construction of the bill before us. To me the idea of letting a dog roam at large and still keeping him within sight is fantastic. Now let us look at the present statutes which say that "Any Inland Game warden or deputy warden, sheriff, deputy-sheriff, or constable may at any time lawfully kill any dog he may find in the act of hunting or chasing moose, caribou, or deer, or he may find worrying, wounding, or killing, any domestic animal, when said dog is outside of the enclosure or immediate care of its own keeper. Any owner of sheep, or any member of his family, or any person to whom is entrusted the custody of any sheep, shall have a right to kill any dog attacking any of said sheep. Any person having any evidence of any dog hunting, or chasing moose, caribou or deer, or of any dog kept and used for that purpose, or of any dog worrying, wounding, or killing any domestic or fowl, when said dog is outside of the enclosure or immediate care of his owner or keeper, may present said evidence to any trial justice or judge or recorder of any municipality, which said trial justice, judge or recorder shall have power to issue a warrant against the owner of said dog, ordering him to appear before him and show cause why said dog should not be killed; and upon hearing the evidence in said case, said court may order said dog killed. Any person may lawfully kill a dog which suddenly assaults him or another person when peaceably walking or riding."

That seems to be perhaps sufficient legislation. Now as to the

effect. I have the figures of the number of sheep killed by dogs here in Maine for the past ten years. Starting in 1933 we lost 2296. The next year it was 2287. It goes down, 19, 17, 15, 10, 11, and in 1941, 838 and in 1942, 934. So that in the ten year period the losses to the sheep flocks of Maine have been reduced from practically 2300 down to 900. Evidently some of this legislation is working and we might say that the number of sheep owned in the state is also being reduced but that reduction from 52,000 ten years ago is only 41,000 at the present time. The reduction in the number of sheep population is only 20 per cent and the reduction in killings is from 2300 to 900, and I haven't figured the percentage and the sheep population is today again on the rise. I think we have got an excellent sheep specialist. I think he is doing a good job and perhaps after all what we need is a little more shot-gun or rifle in the sheep pastures; we need a little more backbone in some of our town officials. But you can't legislate to meet all the conditions which we have to face. I am very confident that we have legislation enough and that as we go on we will see this reduction continue and the present laws will take care of the situation.

And for those reasons I move the indefinite postponement of the measure.

Mr. BRAGDON of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, in view of the fact that the dog population of the state of Maine greatly exceeds the sheep population, I am afraid that my defense of this bill perhaps will be a little mite weak. I do feel, however, that I should point out to the Senate the thought that was behind this bill.

It was evidently the intention of the framer of this bill to provide a measure whereby notice could be given to the owner of the dog or dogs when it was felt that there was a possibility that they might cause damage. Perhaps I can better explain that by mentioning a specific instance that happened in my own community. A number of dogs got into the habit of roaming around over the town, five of them in a group, and everybody said, "These dogs are going to do some damage," and there was nothing under the present law so that anybody could

do anything to stop their roaming around on anybody's property or in anybody's sheep pasture as long as they didn't do any damage. Well, the fears of the community were evidently well grounded because one morning it came to the attention of everybody that a flock of sheep in the neighborhood, half of them had been killed and these dogs were responsible. The framer of this bill thought that some measure could be provided so that notice could be given to the owners of such dogs as this that if he allowed them to run after having this notice that he would be subject to fine if they got on to my property and I objected to it. This bill may not take care of the entire situation but I do think it has some merit and I support it.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. President, I am opposing this bill for three reasons, first, because I consider the law unnecessary, secondly, because I think it is entirely unfair to the owner of the dog and third, because I think it is unfair to the dog himself.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I imagine you wonder how I stand on this bill. I wish to say here if the members of the Legal Affairs Committee can vote unanimously in committee for a bill then come here to the Senate and vote to kill it, certainly a man on the Committee on Agriculture has the same privilege. This bill was discussed very thoroughly at the hearing and in committee. I was not in favor of it. It was remodeled several times, and finally, as chairman of the committee, I called for a vote upon it. The vote was unanimous. I must say sentiment was luke warm. Being the chairman, I did not have to vote. With a fine committee such as I had to work with, on Agriculture, it seemed somewhat out of place for the chairman to oppose them on too many measures. That I did on the bill to license livestock dealers. But in this particular bill I did not oppose it by signing of the minority report. I do think, however, the Senator from Washington, Senator Washburn, has told you very emphatically as I told the Committee, that we have more dog laws now than we are able to enforce. I do not think this law is essential.

Mr. DUNBAR of Washington: Mr. President, as Ex-Governor Smith

has said, "let's look at the record". Keep the record clear. I rise in defense of the Legal Affairs Committee. Senator Bishop of Sagadahoc I am sure doesn't mean the Legal Affairs Committee. He must mean the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BISHOP: Mr. President, I do apologize to the Legal Affairs Committee but they are so closely allied to Judiciary that to a farmer it is hard to distinguish between them.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator Washburn for indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. VARNEY of York: I am opposed to this bill, Mr. President and members of the Senate, for the same reason the Senator from Cumberland, Senator McGlauffin expressed. He didn't point out how the bill was unfair to the owner of the dog and also to the dog. I want to point out in the provisions of the bill if my little beagle who would not kill even a rabbit, wanders over to my neighbor's land or even if he doesn't go onto the land, if my neighbor doesn't happen to like dogs, she goes down to the selectmen, I believe, of the town and requests them to send me a notice that my dog has been roaming on her land. They do not have jurisdiction to decide whether my dog has been on her land but the moment she makes the request they must send me a written notice that my dog has been roaming on her land and if he does it again I am subject to fine not to exceed \$25.00. I say it is both unfair to me and to my dog.

Mr. DOW of Oxford: Mr. President, carrying it along a little further, the latter part of the bill provides that whoever violates the provisions of the section is subject to a fine of \$25.00. It is not clear to me whether it is the owner or the dog.

Mr. SANBORN of Cumberland: Mr. President, I admit I have had a substantial increase to the regard I have always entertained as to the perspicacity of the Senator from York, Senator Varney. He seems to find in this bill a provision that the notice shall be given to the owner to the effect that the dog is roaming on the land of another person. I confess I was unable to find out what was going to be included in the notice. If the Senator from

York, Senator Varney, can show me where it says that the notice shall state that the dog is roaming on someone's land, as I say, it increases my regard for his keenness. So far as I am able to see, the notice has no effect whatever. I do not think there is anything in the bill which points out what the notice shall contain. To my mind, that alone is enough to kill the bill.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator Washburn, for the indefinite postponement of this bill, Legislative Document 887. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being had, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair cannot refrain from commenting that he feels the Senator from York, Senator Varney has unjustly maligned his beagle. The Chair never saw a beagle that would not kill a rabbit if he could catch the rabbit. (laughter)

On motion by Mr. Owen of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table, Senate Report from the Committee on Judiciary, "Ought Not to Pass" on "Resolve Relating to Number of Voters Necessary to Initiate Referendums" (S. P. 420) (L. D. 720) tabled by that Senator on March 12th pending acceptance of the report; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, I am a bit reluctant to inject my views upon you, and I am not going to make any motion in regard to this bill; but I do wish to speak on it for just a moment.

There are three reasons why I hesitate to air my views: First, when I attempt to analyze the conditions existing within my own county there is a feeling that I am personally prejudiced and have an axe to grind. Second, if I attempt to discuss a matter pertaining to another county it is felt it is none of my affair. Third, in an attempt to upset a unanimous committee report, I hesitate to do it. A unanimous committee report is a sacred thing to me.

I do wish to just briefly explain the reasons why I presented this bill to the legislature. Back in 1908 this referendum law was added to our constitution. At that time it required 10,000 signatures to initiate a referendum. Back in 1906 there were 113,000 in the state; 113,000 voted for governor in 1906. In 1920 the woman's suffrage law was enacted and the vote increased to 205,000. In 1936 the total vote for governor was 310,000, nearly three times the 1906 vote. All the while it took no more signatures to initiate a referendum. In the past 30 odd years there have been 28 referendums initiated by the people to cover and vote upon legislation passed by previous legislatures. In that time 13 have supported the legislature, and 15 have voted in opposition. That, in itself is conclusive proof that the people are wide awake and looking after things very well. A referendum election costs in the neighborhood of \$25,000. It seems to me after a legislature has studied a problem, worked on it, held public hearings on it, and then voted as a body for or against it, in most cases the people should be satisfied with the vote of their representatives. It was my feeling, if they were not satisfied, rather than to initiate a referendum, it would be better to send back a new representative next time.

It seems to me that 10,000 signatures is by far too little. At the hearing one of the opponents to my measure made the statement that on one occasion there were 68,000 signatures on petitions asking for a referendum, which is conclusive proof that it is not too difficult to get 10,000. As a matter of fact, a small minority, a small organized minority can, in a few days, in most any city in the state, get 10,000 signatures. It does not seem, with the pressure groups we have, it is wise to inflict upon the state the expense of a costly special election to satisfy the whim of some small organized minority. I think the number of signatures on a petition should be stepped up. I do not wish to take away the right of referendum; but I think they should have to get more signatures, cover a wider area, and then if you can get enough signatures to initiate a referendum you will have more people thinking about the matter—a better informed electorate.

Two years ago a referendum was initiated. They received plenty of

signatures. It was not difficult, but when it came fall, only a few months after the referendum was filed, a special state election was called. Less than nine percent of the voters came out to vote on the measure. That I believe, is more conclusive proof that people in so short a span of time, do not have opportunity to study a question sufficiently or thoroughly. The organized minority on the other hand, with plenty of funds, can buy plenty of radio time, can buy newspaper space, can hire expensive speakers to go out and sell the idea to the people who care to listen and convince them. Usually, the members of the legislature who supported the measure have no funds to go out and educate the people as to the true facts in that short time. I felt it was justified to step up the number of signatures required on a petition to initiate a referendum. I was given a fair hearing on the bill. The members of the committee were very friendly to the idea. It however was reported "ought not to pass" and that will be explained to you by the person who signed the "ought not to pass" report, Senator McGlauffin.

I did feel that any number above 10,000 would be an improvement over the present set-up; but I do not propose to make any motion at this time.

Without making a motion, I now yield to the Senator from Cumberland, Senator McGlauffin.

Mr. McGLAUFFLIN of Cumberland: Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on this matter, first for myself and then for the Judiciary Committee. I was one of the men who favored the idea of this referendum at the time it came up in 1908. Since that time many changes have taken place. At that time, as has been pointed out by Senator Bishop, the number of voters was very much less than at the present time. At that time we had no radios. At that time telephones were limited in number. At that time we had no good roads as we have today, and at that time automobiles were practically in their infancy, so in 1908 it was quite a difficult job to get 10,000 names on a petition of that kind, but with the increase of the automobile and the radio and good roads and the telephone, it has now come to be a comparatively easy thing to get names on such a petition when there is some

interested party, interested enough to finance the movement.

Since coming to the legislature, and this is my fourth term, I have found,—at least it is my judgment—that the referendum is likely, under its present form, to prove much more detrimental to the welfare of the state than it is to be useful. I say that for this reason, this legislature comes up here and has measures presented to it which it carefully considers through committees and then debates on the floor and then passes after mature consideration, and then because there is some faction that happens to be opposed to what this legislature does, they are able to bring about this referendum and create an artificial sentiment against the work of the legislature and sometimes they get the people to vote down matters that we have passed here and which, in all fairness, ought to stand. Therefore, by experience here, I feel that the referendum vote may sometimes be more detrimental than good for the welfare of the state, and for that reason I would gladly see an increase in the number of votes necessary to get a referendum.

Now, speaking for the Judiciary Committee, I feel every member of the committee had the same feeling toward this matter that I have. If they didn't, at least they didn't express contrary views. When we considered it, we decided the bill as presented, would hardly do, for this reason: It provides that you must get 25% of the voters of the preceding election. Now, if there were 300,000 votes, that would require 75,000 names to get a referendum and it is very evident to anyone that would completely kill the referendum for any future use whatsoever. The committee did not feel that would be wise, and therefore we considered the advisability of cutting down the number to 25,000 or 20,000, but we finally unanimously decided to report this bill "ought not to pass" for these two reasons. First, because at this time we have a great many of our voters in the Service and we felt that it was not perhaps a proper time to submit this to the people. Second, because we felt with the present state of public opinion, that a motion to take this out of the hands of the people would be voted down from a prejudiced point of view, and therefore, it would be better to present such a

matter at a time when the public were a little more informed as to the need of the change than they are at the present time.

I therefore move the acceptance of the report that the bill ought not to pass.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, I think the argument in regard to boys in the service is not very strong; because, this measure would have to go back to the people and the people who are at home would, by their own vote, choose for or against the measure thus you would get a fair cross-section of the people within the state to vote upon it; but, in case the Senate does not see fit to accept the Committee report, then later in the day I will present an amendment with a decreased number of names (less than 25%) to be offered for your consideration.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator McGlauffin, that the "Ought Not to Pass" report of the Committee on L. D. 720 be accepted. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being had

The "Ought Not to Pass" report was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Order

On motion by Mr. Elliot of Knox, out of order and under suspension of the rules, it was

ORDERED, that beginning with the afternoon session of April 6, 1943, all matters now upon the table be laid before the Senate Under Orders of the Day in the order in which they were placed upon the table and until disposed of shall have precedence under Orders of the Day.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further Orders of the Day, the Secretary will read the notices.

On motion by Mr. Elliot of Knox Adjourned until four o'clock this afternoon.

Afternoon Session

The Senate met according to adjournment and was called to order by the President.

First Reading of a Printed Bill

Out of order and under suspension of the rules:

"Resolve Providing for Construction of a Building for Employees at the Pownal State School." (S. P. 487) (L. D. 90)

Which resolve was read once, and under suspension of the rules, read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Senate Committee Reports
(Out of Order)

Mr. Hodgkins from the Committee on Education, submitted its Final Report.

Mr. Washburn from the Committee on University of Maine, submitted its Final Report.

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Dunbar from the Committee on Legal Affairs to which was re-committed, bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Lewiston," (S. P. 117) (L. D. 43) reported the same in a second new draft (S. P. 488) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the bill and report were laid upon the table pending acceptance of the report, and were especially assigned for tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair notes at this time the presence in the Senate Chamber of his twin brother. As our paths vary you will frequently run across my twin brother and possibly some of you will figure that he doesn't know you. In order that you may identify him I am asking the Sergeant at Arms to escort my brother to the rostrum.

Thereupon, the Sergeant at Arms escorted Mr. Charles L. Hildreth to a chair at the right of the President.

The Majority of the Committee on Legal Affairs to which was re-committed Bill, "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Lewiston," (S. P. 177) (L. D. 238) reported the same in a second new

draft, "A", (S. P. 489) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(Signed) Senators:

SANBORN of Cumberland
DUNBAR of Washington
PETERS of Androscoggin

Representatives:

PAYSON of Portland
HASKELL of Portland
BARTLETT of Portland
ANDERSON of New Sweden
WARD of Millinocket

The Minority of the same Committee to which was re-committed the same subject matter, reported that the same ought to pass in New Draft "B" (S. P. 468) (L. D. 837) under the same title, as originally submitted.

(Signed) Representative:

DONAHUE of Biddeford

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the bill and accompanying reports were laid upon the table pending acceptance of either report, and especially assigned for tomorrow.

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature, on Bill "An Act Relating to Compensation of Department Heads," (H. P. 598) (L. D. 356) reported that they are unable to agree.

Which report was read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Bragdon from the Committee on Salaries and Fees, on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game," (S. P. 374) (L. D. 630) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Commissioner of Insurance," (S. P. 373) (L. D. 631) reported that the same ought not to pass, as the matter is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Buck from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Chairman of the Liquor Commission," (S. P. 372) (L. D. 632) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Commis-

sioner of Labor and Industry," (S. P. 398) (L. D. 674) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Bragdon from the Committee on Salaries and Fees submitted its Final Report.

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Farris from the Committee on Judiciary submitted its Final Report.

Which report was read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. BROWN of Aroostook: Mr. President, I would like to inquire if bill "An Act to Provide for Post War Planning" Senate Paper 178, Legislative Document 242 is still in the possession of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT: It is.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Brown of Aroostook, the Senate voted to reconsider its action of yesterday whereby bill "An Act to Provide for Post War Planning" (S. P. 178) (L. D. 242) was passed to be enacted.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. President, I now move the indefinite postponement of this bill, and I yield the floor to the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hildreth.

The PRESIDENT: Will the Sergeant at Arms please escort the Senator from York, Senator Varney to the Rostrum?

The Senator from York, Senator Varney was escorted to the rostrum and was handed the gavel by the President who retired to the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tem: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Brown, that Legislative Document 242, An Act to Provide for Post War Planning be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HILDRETH of Cumberland: Mr. President, it is with considerable reluctance that I inject myself into this debate on this bill. Reed's rules on parliamentary law say that the presiding officer always has the right to speak and vote, but these rights should both be used sparingly. I ask the Senate to recall that this is the first time that I have

either in public or in private, worked for or against a bill, or spoken for or against a bill. But in view of the debate which occurred here yesterday afternoon, it seemed to me that there were some things left unsaid that ought to be said. Furthermore, I find that because this bill was unsigned by me after its passage to be enacted last night and held up for 24 hours at the request of the Senator from Aroostook that it is commonly said, at least in the halls of the legislature, that I have been making political capital out of this issue. I did only what the rules require me to do but having been subjected to the criticism, for two reasons, because I was tempted anyway to say some things that I thought ought to be said, and because I was receiving criticism without a chance to explain my position, I decided that this was an important measure, and an exception which might prove the rule, and would justify my speaking from the floor.

This is a million dollar bill. A million dollars is small in the national picture today but it is still a large amount of money for the state of Maine. It amounts to something over a dollar a person for every man, woman and child in the state of Maine. It is not, however, upon the financial aspects of this question, or the financial importance of the question, to which I wish to address my remarks. It is the principle behind this bill.

This bill is, to my way of thinking, what I call blank check legislation.

Now there will be those who are unkind enough to say that these remarks of mine today are made purely for political purposes but I would remind the Senate that a little over a year ago I stood on the floor of this Senate and made substantially the same argument that I am going to make today. I did it in the face of overwhelming legislative opinion and some said of public opinion, and I lost my argument. Obviously that was not done except because I had strong convictions on the subject of this sort of legislation, namely, what I would call blank check legislation.

It, in substance, is an executive department bill which says, in layman's language or even simpler than layman's language, "If you

will put at our disposal a million dollars we will take good care of it; we will not spend more than \$50,000 on planning and the balance will be spent on carrying out our plans."

Now that is the sort of legislation which the Dew Deal has been passing for ten years in Washington. It is the sort of legislation which has brought into disrepute, to the lowest state in the lives of two generations, our own Congress and our legislative Bodies, because the Legislative Bodies have in substance been saying, "We are not capable of coping with this question. Therefore we will abdicate, we will surrender and turn over the purse strings and our responsibilities to the executive department." And then the legislative department of our government, particularly our federal government, has individually gone with its hat in its hand almost on bended knees, to beg for some of the money that they bid goodbye to with blank check legislation. I believe that at this stage of the game when we see our own Congress beginning to turn the other way and stop this blank check legislation, that it is not the time for Maine ten years later to embark upon a ten year old policy which is now falling very rapidly into disrepute.

Now, before going any further, I would like to have it clear that as much of the argument as I heard, and I think I heard it all, that was made in favor of this bill yesterday was made on the basis that planning is a good thing, post war planning is a good thing. I doubt if there is any person in this room who would deny that statement. Planning is a good thing. I am in favor of planning. But there was an extract read from the report of the Legislative Research Committee in which that committee, of which I was a member, said that Maine was behind the times in planning and we should have more foresight and more planning. But the portion of the Legislative Research Committee report from which that came was the recommendation of that Committee that permissive legislation be passed allowing towns and municipalities to set up reserves and make their own plans so that if occasion arose they could spend the money. But that permis-

sive legislation applying to towns did not say nor recommend that that money should be set up now and left at the disposal, an undefined disposal, of the authorities of those municipalities. It did not say that selectmen John Jones and Bill Smith should have \$10,000 to spend when and if they saw fit for any purpose that they thought in order. It simply made it possible for them to put it into the "kitty" and when the time came and they developed a plan then the money was there if the municipal authorities approved it.

Now that is the sort of planning that I think the state of Maine should do and I would be thoroughly in accord with it. If this planning bill said, "Give us \$50,000 and we will draw up some plans and then when we have what we believe are the right plans we will submit them to the legislature for approval." Then I believe we would have the plans and the legislature would have abdicated from its responsibility and its duty. I repeat, the life blood of any legislature, state, national, United States, Europe or anywhere else, is control over the purse strings and when any legislature abdicates its control over the purse strings it is giving up the very thing that is most important to that legislature and to the life of that nation.

Now, turning for a moment from the principle, to which I am opposed, to a few practicalities, I would like to point out that almost every economist whom I have read in the nation's financial magazines and papers believes that following this war there may be a very short period of transition where there will be maladjustments and that the country will be in for the greatest boom it has known for many years. If you will stop and recall what happened after the last war, there was a short period of maladjustment and then we entered upon a period of prosperity such as I believe no country has ever known. And you will recall how much more favorable the circumstances are for a pick-up and a boom this time with the soldiers being mustered out of our service much more slowly than they were after the last war, because we are going to have a long and hard policing job to do, then it gives anyone

thinking, considerable pause to say that we want to set up a million dollars now and earmark it for an undefined purpose.

It was pointed out here on the floor of the Senate yesterday by other members of the Senate what the prospects were for prosperity following this war. If the legislature of Maine believes that it is a good thing to plan and to have the Development Commission submit plans, I have no objection to that but I would call the attention of the members of this Senate to the fact that even with our present Development Commission which bi-annually receives, around \$300,000, the legislature saw fit to put certain restrictions on that money say that some of it should be used for agriculture, some for industry, some for recreation. It wasn't left as an entirely free fund by the legislature. Therefore, how much stronger is the case when we have a million dollar fund to have the legislature have some say about the expenditure of that fund.

I would like to point out one other fact. It has been said ever since we came to Augusta that we should pass legislation authorizing the re-issuance of some bonds, bonds which on a long range financial program were supposed to be called in a regular schedule. Because there was not enough money to remove the snow and renew these bonds then it was felt advisable to reissue the bonds. And yet we have a million dollar fund, or at least we see in sight a million dollars which we are earmarking, setting aside and saying, "This is going to be used by the Governor and Council, when, as and if they decide some plan recommended by the Development Commission is advisable and the exigencies require it."

How much sounder policy would it seem to be to retire these bonds instead of reissuing them and then when a specific plan was put forth which met the approval of the legislature, reissue bonds then. Is not that the best possible plan that we can adopt for a future contingency, the putting of our house in the best possible financial condition. And when we have a specific problem before us, then we are no worse off

if at that time we have to issue some bonds than we would be if we earmarked this fund now.

I trust that the members of this Senate and of the legislature will feel that there is nothing personal in these remarks. This money, if the bill should pass, is not going to be spent for some time. I do not believe that any member of this legislature feels that by my remarks I am showing any lack of confidence in any incumbent of the Governor's office, be he the present incumbent or a future incumbent, but I submit that it is human nature, no matter which person might occupy the Governor's Chair or might occupy one of the Council chairs, as we hope the proponent of this bill will do in the near future, if you have a million dollars slapped down on your desk, the temptation to find a way to spend it is far greater than if the need first appears clearly and then you have to go out and get the money. It affects human judgment and it is impossible for it not to do so.

In conclusion, I would like to repeat that my real objection to this bill is the principle that the legislature would abdicate its authority and responsibility to the extent of a million dollars for something not specific which may possibly arise in the future, by signing a blank check.

I hope that the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Brown, will prevail but I want to assert in closing that I want no person to vote for this bill or against this bill because I have spoken against it, but only because they are convinced, because of something that I may have said or someone else may say here, that the passage of that bill is inadvisable.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN of Cumberland: Mr. President, it is with some hesitation that I follow the President of this Senate and take a different view. I heartily agree with what he says about the principles involved, but we are not working under ordinary circumstances. We are trying to provide for extraordinary circumstances that may arise in the future.

After hearing the discussion, it seems to me that this is an exception to the very wise rule and principle laid down by the President

and I for one shall vote for this measure and I shall do so with more confidence since our President has spoken because as I look into the future, I see the possibility of that same man sitting in the Governor's Chair when this matter and money is to be considered, and with the attitude he takes that that money will be in safe hands.

Mr. BROWN of Aroostook: Mr. President it was not so long ago in this Senate that I heard the honorable Senator from Cumberland, Senator McGlauffin arise and say "Consistency, thou art a jewel." He now tells us that he is thoroughly in sympathy with the objections that have been made here, that he agrees with the argument and the idea that we should keep control of the purse strings, but this is an extraordinary occasion and therefore we should depart from this principle. Now, if a principle is right under ordinary conditions, it should be right under extraordinary conditions. I do not consider that this is an extraordinary condition or that we are faced with an extraordinary condition, in a certain sense.

I did, two years ago when we were called in here in an emergency, when war had been declared and when many of us believed or were led to believe that we were in imminent danger of being invaded and our cities destroyed and there was a necessity for setting up civilian fense. That was an extraordinary condition and we waived the principle which has held this democracy together that the legislative Body should keep control of the purse strings. We waived that privilege and gave to the Executive Department money which they could spend as they saw fit in the emergency. But that is over and now under the same guise of emergency they have attempted to project into the future another million dollars of the people's money to be spent when the time may arrive when they think it should be spent. Now, as I said yesterday I can conceive of no condition under which this money should be used or would be required to be used before another legislature sits here, or if the war should end suddenly, a special session of the legislature could be convened in seven days and then the legislature facing that emergency and knowing what it was would then have the

time to meet in an orderly manner and specify the purposes for the various projects for which the money was needed.

I think it is poorest kind of legislation, a thing which we have no right to do except in an actual emergency, to give up the prerogatives of the legislature, the duty of the legislature, if you please, to allocate money as it thinks best, not to give it to somebody to be spent when they think it ought to be spent or on what projects it needs to be put, or on what projects they think it needs to be put, but that the money should be especially allocated by the legislature. I believe there is ample time for that and that we are not facing at this time any extraordinary situation that the legislature cannot in the future deal with in its regular line of work.

It seems to me that we are taking a million dollars of the tax payer's money and locking it up in a fund and depriving future legislatures, when the time may come when they need to spend it, depriving them of the right to spend it as they in their wisdom see fit. And I therefore hope that my motion to indefinitely postpone will prevail.

Mr. HANOLD of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate inasmuch as my name appears on this bill as the father of the bill, I think I would be remiss in my duty if I didn't at least get up and correct two statements which were made by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hildreth, one of which, sir, was the statement to the effect that the Maine Development Commission had \$300,000 a year. If you will refer to the bill now before this legislature, you will find that it is only \$161,000. And in reference to the bill itself, if I understood the Senator from Cumberland correctly, the Governor and Council shall act upon recommendation made by the Maine Development Commission. May I quote from the bill: "The Governor and Council shall consider the report of the Maine Development Commission" and as I interpret the bill, we do not under the bill make any recommendation whatsoever.

It is not necessary for me to repeat what I said on the floor of this Senate yesterday except to say that had I not believed in post war planning I certainly would not have put my name on the bill.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tem: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook from Cumberland, Senator be indefinitely postponed. The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Hanold has asked for a division. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A division of the Senate was had

Twenty-one having voted in the affirmative and ten opposed, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

At this point the President resumed the Chair, Mr. Varney of York retiring amidst the applause of the Senate.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, in order to move matters faster, I move that the two bills I tabled today be printed in new draft.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher, moves that the two bills he tabled be taken from the table to allow printing. Is this the pleasure of the Senate? It is a vote.

Mr. VARNEY of York: I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator may state his point of inquiry.

Mr. VARNEY: Mr. President, I would inquire as to whether an order was not passed in the Senate this morning requiring all matters on the table to be removed from the table automatically this afternoon?

The PRESIDENT: The point raised by the Senator from York, Senator Varney, is correct.

Thereupon, the President laid before the Senate Joint Order Creating a Committee to report on legislative purchases and expenditures (H. P. 53) tabled by the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Clement, on January 26 pending passage.

Mr. CLEMENT of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I now move the indefinite postponement of House Paper 53.

Mr. DOW of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, you will remember that this order came into this Senate and was put on the table on January 26, the very first part of this session. I don't

wish to tire you with any anecdote from ancient history but before this motion prevails, as it probably will, I would like to make a few remarks concerning this order.

At the very first part of this session, there was an order introduced by the Legislative Research Committee, an order, wisely or not, which would have attempted to do substantially what this order purports to do. Considering that this order has been on the table since January 26 some of the things that this order would do have not been accomplished by virtue of the order. At the beginning of the session after the order was introduced, and I introduced it and I was questioned whether it was wise or not, but that makes no difference now, considerable discussion took place regarding the order. And I want to say in all fairness that probably lobbying was done against it. In fact, I was accused by a number of people of impeding the progress of the legislature and I was told that probably the legislature would stay in session a month longer because of the order, and because certain animosities were raised I withdrew the order.

This is not my order. This comes from the other end of the building. I think it had in it some real worthwhile things that it would do but as time has gone by, the best part of the order, the composition of the committee, seems to have gone by, the purchases have all been made, and that takes care of the second part of the order. The standing committees and how they should be handled has been taken care of, so the only thing left in this order that I would like to see adopted is an inventory of legislative equipment. It would seem to me to be good business that when we leave here we should know what we have in the way of legislative equipment and have some idea of what we have bought.

I think this order has been on the table over two months and has accomplished more than it would have if the order had passed because no Senator has picked up his calendar since January 26 without reading Item One on the table and those members of the House who receive these Senate Journals have noticed it also, so I think possibly this order has accomplished something after all.

I don't oppose the motion of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Clement, but I did want to make these few remarks in passing.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate, realizing full well that my remarks may be somewhat unpopular, because I know that the opponents of this order feel that it is not worthy of discussion and should not be honored by debate, I still feel, however, that a few brief remarks are in order.

As you have all heard, this order was lobbied against, not by a registered lobbyist but, among others, by one whom we pay a very good salary to serve the legislature. And I ask you, why? Why should any employee of this legislature object to such an order?

As a member of this Senate, of two terms, I have not been asleep within this state house nor without it. For the moment, I do not propose to refer to any specific figures. I am simply going to relate some rumors that I have heard. Perhaps you have heard them within this building, as well as outside in the city of Augusta. I have been told that after each legislative session, people, not one but several, have seen trucks back up to this building and drive away with loads of equipment. Whether or not that is true I am not at this time going to say. There is an old saying, however, that, "Where there is smoke, there may be fire."

I have here a list of expenditures of the 90th legislative session. I am not going to read these to you because this is public material. This is material that was found and compiled by the Legislative Research Committee. There are some interesting figures in it, however, and anyone interested may come to my desk and read them. But again I wish to say that I have not been asleep these past few years. I have done a little cruising about on my own. I have been down into the Department of Finance and asked from them a list of the legislative materials purchased over a period of years. These are my own findings, and I ask leave to read some of them. I will take them up year by year and compare them as they go across the paper, item for item.

In 1933 there were nine desks bought at a figure of \$402.10.

In 1935 there were 16 desks bought at \$369.87. In 1937 there were 50 desks bought at \$1390.98. In 1939 there were 30 desks bought at \$934.54. In 1941 there were 17 desks bought at \$348.10. A total, over this ten year period, of 122 desks at a total figure of \$3,445.59. That is one item. I have a desk down in my home that I have had for twenty years and it hasn't worn out yet and here we buy a new batch of desks every year! What becomes of them?

The next item I will take up with your permission is typewriters. In 1933 we bought 29 typewriters for \$2,326.12. In 1935, 25 typewriters at a cost of \$2,039.63. In 1937, 22 typewriters at \$1399.30. In 1939, 20 typewriters at \$1608.22. In 1941, 28 typewriters at a cost of \$2132.94. Making a total over a ten year period of \$9,506.41 for 144 typewriters. The last session, the 90th legislature, we were in session in the longest of any session in the history of the state of Maine. Even in that long session I don't think there was one typewriter worn out. And so it goes, cabinets, filing cases, card index cases. Down near the bottom of the list is a very interesting item, Dip A Day pen sets, 20 at a cost of \$109.50 in 1933; in 1935, at a cost of \$40.50 and in 1937, one at a cost of \$10. I don't know what became of those. I never had a chance to dip into one of those pen sets. Other items, such as lamps. I will read a few figures on lamps. Thirteen lamps in 1935 at \$36.56. In 1937, 17 lamps at \$107.03. In 1941, one lamp at \$22.05.

I simply submit these, Mr. President and members of the Senate, to bear out the statement of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Dow, that I believe an inventory would be very sound business. We as legislators recommend to other departments that they clean house. I think that we had better clean house here first.

Mr. VARNEY of York: Mr. President, I am just prompted to say a few words for the fear that the remarks just made by the Senator from Sagadahoc would be misinterpreted by the public at large, who, generally speaking, know nothing about legislative procedure. Now it may look bad for the public or anyone who knows nothing about the way we proceeded to read in the record that in 1933 or in 1937 we purchased 50 desks. That insinuates without some explanation that the

members of the legislature in 1937 lugged home 50 desks. Now, I know in regard to that particular item—I won't say for the year 1937 though I think this applies to the year 1937—I know it applies to all of the years when I have had anything to do with the legislature, that after the legislature has adjourned those 30 desks have been taken by other departments in the state where they are now being used and if you bear in mind that since the years 1933 the state of Maine has expanded tremendously through such new agencies as the Liquor Commission that came into existence about that time, the Unemployment Compensation Commission and several others, that it has been the custom here for the different department heads through as I understand it, the superintendent of buildings, after we have gone, if there were 20 desks here that no one was using, to take those desks into those different departments and use them, and when the next legislature arrives, they find that the desks have gone and therefore they buy some new desks and at the end of the session, those desks go to the different departments again.

I am not saying that I favor such procedure. I am perfectly willing that we should take an inventory of what is left when we get through but I am here to say that if we should take an inventory now we would find that practically everything except perhaps a few pencils, and now and then a spittoon or ashtray are right here in the legislature available for the use of the state of Maine and I believe it has always been so. If we want to take an inventory, I do not object to that at all.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President I did not mean to infer anything, but I think the remarks of the Senator from York Senator Varney, helped to substantiate the argument in favor of an inventory and if there are false rumors I believe it is security and a bond to those under suspicion to be protected by an inventory. I believe it is good business.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Clement for the indefinite postponement of H. P. 53, Joint Order Creating a Committee to Report

on Legislative Purchases and Expenditures. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being had

The motion prevailed and the order was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate, Senate Report from the Committee on Welfare, Majority Report, "Ought Not to Pass", Minority Report "Ought to Pass" on bill, An Act Permitting Certain Aliens Who Have Applied for Naturalization Papers to be Eligible for Old Age Assistance (S. P. 107) (L. D. 76) tabled by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Good, on March 31 pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. GOOD of Aroostook: Mr. President, I would like to be granted the privilege of having this item retabled until Item Six is disposed of and then I will know better how to act on Number Five.

Thereupon, the bill and accompanying reports were retabled pending acceptance of either report.

The President laid before the Senate House Report from the Committee on Welfare, Majority Report "Ought to Pass Under New Title," Minority Report "Ought Not to Pass," on Bill "An Act Relieving Towns from Board and Care of Neglected Children" (H. P. 1342) (L. D. 881) tabled by the Senator from Hancock, Senator Emery pending motion to accept the Majority Report.

Mr. EMERY of Hancock: Mr. President, I tabled this bill at that time because of the fact that we hadn't arrived at that point in our budget figures where totals could be ascertained with reasonable correctness. It was only last night that we concluded the totals insofar as they could be set up from the figures at our disposal and without going over the entire list of figures which is quite long and perhaps wouldn't be particularly pertinent I might refer to the difference between the estimated revenues and expenditures for the next biennium according to the figures as set up in the Appropriation bill.

We have estimated revenues of \$13,313,800 and total expenditures exclusive of the war emergency fund of \$12,763,283.96. Subtracting the

emergency war fund of \$300,000 leaves a total of \$250,516.04.

Now, pending legislation which now has been taken care of in a large measure although there are some minor adjustments to be made, would leave an estimated difference between the current revenues and expenditures in this year of the biennium of \$170,000 and in the next year \$160,000. The estimate of the cost of board and care of neglected children which would be provided by the state under this bill is \$250,000 a year. I believe it is safe to state that should this amount be taken from what appears to be a reasonably accurate estimate of the amount remaining when the appropriations are subtracted from the expenditures, the total appropriation would to some extent exceed the budget figures and leave the account in the red.

I would simply like to call attention to the fact that if this measure does receive passage provision should be made either for revenue to meet it or provision should be made as to where the money will be taken from. But estimating the amount of current revenue is rather an unsound financial proceeding as I understand it and the amount which is left is in comparison is so small in relation to the total it would seem almost inadvisable to consider it in relation to this bill. There are possibly two other items of rather major importance which I might call attention to because while they are not in a sense companion measures I think would necessarily have to be taken from some source. The other two items are the bills that provide for aliens to come under Old Age Assistance and another proposal which has been suggested that a one-quarter mill might be taken from the state tax.

Mr. GOOD of Aroostook: Mr. President, as Chairman of the Welfare Committee which head this bill, I feel I should state the reason why I signed the majority report "ought to pass." We had a lengthy discussion on this bill and when the bill was introduced or a similar bill to this, it asked for aid to dependent children, board and care which would amount to a million dollars or a little over. I said to the sponsor of the bill that I was opposed to any bill that opposed

the financial structure or the plan of the legislature or would cause any more revenue by new taxes. We had the Commissioner of Finance, Mr. Mossman, in there and he showed us there was sufficient funds to take care of this bill if the sponsor of the bill saw fit to rewrite it, or amend it, and so there was a new amendment came to our committee or a new draft, aid to dependent children, or board and care to these dependent children which last year was \$214,160.62. Mr. Mossman said there was an accumulation from liquor tax or liquor revenue of over \$500,000 that had been unestimated in the last six months which, if it continued a year would amount to a million dollars, without doubt, over and above what was estimated of the revenue coming from liquor. Now, we assume without any doubt that extra money that had been derived from the liquor revenue would take care of this board and care of these dependent children.

You heard our good Senator say there was \$170,000 or such a matter of current revenue, yet in the sinking fund there is \$1,260,000. I do not know which side that million dollars for post-war planning is on, whether it would be a surplus now or not. Let that be as it may. If \$500,000 has been accumulated as extra revenue from the liquor fund, then it seems to me only fair we in the towns should be recognized and should be relieved of that burden. Now, it has been suggested there would be a mill tax of a quarter of a mill to be lifted or reduced, which possibly would give some aid. That sounds good and is good and we all recognize it. It is very easy to reduce the mill tax a quarter of a mill and raise the valuation a million dollars. It looks good but now this same amount of money or the same amount of tax—I have here some figures that have been compiled. In Caribou alone, the local valuation of that town was \$3,769,000. I will give round numbers. The Equalization Board raised it to \$4,103,000. In Nashville Plantation the local valuation was \$71,595 and they raised it to \$110,506. I have learned from a good senator from that section of the country that there are only a few buildings there, no new project whatever and the buildings

are practically falling down. I noticed in Portland, Maine, the local valuation is \$79,389,600 and the Equalization Board has valued Portland \$78,521,715, — a reduction in the valuation with all the housing program that has been going on there and the shipbuilding work that has been done there and the thousands and thousands of people that have congregated around Portland in the shipyards. That reduction I cannot understand. In South Portland the local valuation was estimated \$15,959,145, and the Equalization Board valued it \$13,895,295. A big reduction there. I do not know as I need to read any more. That is about the way it goes on.

It looks to me as though it would be very easy for the Equalization Board, if they see fit to bring up the valuation, if we are a little mite short of funds, and this quarter of a mill that has been reduced to offset it by bringing up the valuation just a little mite. Therefore, I am opposing such a program as that. I do feel if we relieve the towns of this situation it will be constructive.

I believe we are nowhere near the border edge of bankruptcy when the grand total on February 27, 1943 was \$11,389,917.69 in the banks in the state of Maine. We seem to have quite a lot of working capital in Maine at the present time. I feel it is only fair to lift this burden off the towns and give us a chance.

We have raised practically all the salaries of the county officers. We have raised practically all the salaries of state employees, which I am not questioning. Possibly it is all right. And those salaries of the county officers—no doubt that is all right. Now, to come here and see towns paying taxes when we have the money that has been accumulated but not estimated to take care of it, and then say we will not need it and use it for something else—I say it is not fair. I think the town should have this consideration. I believe firmly it will not upset the financial structure whatever. I do not think we have got to increase the taxes. I believe we have the revenue to take care of it. I feel the people who pay taxes in the towns should receive consideration.

I move the acceptance of the majority report, "ought to pass."

Mr. VARNEY of York: Mr. President, I made a few remarks the other day and I feel I must repeat them now, or part of them. In the first place, let me say I am in favor of this bill. I think it is a good bill. I do not question but what it would be giving back something to the towns. I do not question but what those 264 towns deserve it.

I said the other day it looked to me at the time like we were going to be confronted with the choice of giving back \$250,000 under this bill or giving back a little less sum—I forget the exact figures—in the form of a quarter of a mill reduction and if that were the case I prefer giving it back in the quarter of mill reduction for the reason it appeals to me that in that case every town and city in the state gets back a share or some part, while under this bill there are only 264 towns which share and 208 towns which do not share.

I want to correct one impression that Brother Good has given you, I am sure unintentionally. He says we could reduce the mill tax one quarter mill and there is nothing to prevent the tax commissioner from raising the valuation and getting the money back. That cannot be done because we are reducing the mill tax a quarter of a mill for the next two year period and the valuation has already been fixed for the next two year period so that—I believe you have that list before you now which gives the valuations which have already been fixed and it is upon the basis of those valuations your 7¼ mill tax will be placed and if we reduce it to seven mills it will be placed on those valuations. They cannot be changed for the next two years.

I repeat, if the majority of the Senate and House prefer to give the money back this way rather than by a reduction in the mill tax I am happy to go along on the "ought to pass" report on this bill.

Mr. SANBORN of Cumberland: Mr. President, as one who signed the minority report, I feel like making just a few observations. I am aware my information may be incomplete and any matters of finance have always been rather an

obscure field. I am free to say I was influenced largely by what appeared to be the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs and the judgment of the Commissioner of Finance. I gathered from both those sources that in their judgment this measure would be inconsistent with sound state finance.

It is true that, as has been said with some emphasis here on the floor of the Senate and as was said with some emphasis in committee discussions, there has been some considerable increase in revenue from sale of liquor, enough—I think very likely at the present moment—to take care of this whole situation, but while it is not a matter of certainty, it seems to be the prevailing judgment that we have no warrant that that increase will continue. The probabilities are rather in the direction of a decrease in revenue from that source and if we of this legislature embark upon a policy which rely upon that increase and that increase should fail to materialize, we would regret our action. So it had seemed to me it might not be wise to bank upon that probability to any great extent. On the other hand, if the increase should be permanent as I understand it—I may be wrong, as I say my information is incomplete—but as I understand it, if the increase continues it will be available for a further expansion of aid to the old, our old age assistance—a field in which I am sure we are all interested,—the adoption of that policy will not result in any decrease in the monies expended for the support for children. I would not be one to take any position which would be hostile to the interests of the children. They are taken care of and will be taken care of under the present basis. There is an opportunity while we adhere to the present policy that old age assistance will be further extended.

Those were considerations which in my mind differed from other members of the committee, and I still think it would be unwise not to follow the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs and the advice of the Financial Department.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN of Cumberland: Mr. President, my reason for

favoring the bill seems to be on different grounds than those presented. I favor the bill because logically it seems to me that the state should take care of its neglected children just as much and for the same reason it takes care of the old people.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague, the Senator from York, Senator Varney, for correcting that impression I left with the people, but I was assuming the estimation of revenue had been made on a two year period and I also understand that the valuation—the Equalization board makes a recommendation or compiles figures on the value of every two years. So I was assuming two years from now if the Equalization Board wanted to raise the valuation it was completely up to them and no one else.

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

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Good, for acceptance of the majority report, "ought to pass." The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Good, has asked for a division.

A division of the Senate was had.

Twenty-two having voted in the affirmative and six opposed, the motion prevailed and the majority report of the committee was accepted in concurrence; and under suspension of the rules the bill was given its two several readings.

Mr. EMERY: Mr. President, I think it is only fair to call attention to the fact that if this bill is passed it should be amended to provide the source of revenue. For this purpose, I move it lie on the table until tomorrow morning.

The motion prevailed and the bill was laid upon the table pending passage to be engrossed in concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the fifth tabled and unassigned matter, Senate Report from the Committee on Welfare, Majority Report "Ought Not to Pass," Minority Report "Ought to Pass" on bill, "An Act Permitting Certain Aliens Who Have Applied for Naturalization Papers to be Eligible for Old Age Assistance" (S. P. 107) (L. D. 76) tabled on March 31st by Mr. Good of Aroostook, pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. GOOD of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill would call for the same amount of money as the bill already accepted. I told the committee if the Senate would accept this other bill, Item 6, I would be perfectly willing to go along with the majority report "ought not to pass." Therefore, I move the majority report "ought not to pass" be accepted on this bill.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, as Legislative Document 881, which was the sixth tabled matter, has not been accepted in both branches, I think it is premature to remove this matter entirely, and I would like to table this so we can go back to it should the other one be defeated.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. President, I thought it would have to come back to the Senate eventually and it might speed things up a little and we could catch it when it returns if things did not work out satisfactorily.

Mr. BOUCHER: Mr. President, I think it would be a long process to recall this measure if we accept the "ought not to pass" report and it would be much simpler if we wait final action on the matter.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that this being a Senate report goes to the House anyway. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher, that the bill be laid upon the table.

The motion prevailed and the bill and reports were laid upon the table pending acceptance of either report.

The President laid before the Senate the eighth tabled and unassigned matter, House Report from the Committee on Counties, Majority Report, "Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment 'A.'" Minority Report "Ought Not to Pass" on bill, "An Act Relating to Farm Bureau Assistance in Oxford County" (L. D. 565) tabled on April 2nd by Mr. Townsend of Penobscot pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. TOWNSEND of Penobscot, Mr. President, I move acceptance of the minority report "Ought Not to Pass."

Mr. WOODBURY of Waldo: Mr. President, in signing the majority

report, I feel I should defend the committee. We had a very good hearing on this bill. Around 30 people from Oxford County came to our committee hearing and told of their need for funds to carry on farm bureau work. There are sixteen counties in the state and fifteen of them have made their budget so that the farm bureau can continue its duties. I do not need to go into the story of what good work the farm bureau has done. I do not think anyone questions it. Because the county commissioners have allowed too small an amount for the farm bureau work in Oxford County, citizens and members of the bureau have come before the committee and asked for money in sufficient amount to carry on the work. I hope the motion does not prevail.

Mr. DOW of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill is not mine and if I have any right in it, is only by adoption. After I came to this legislature it was called to my attention there was a bill before the Committee on Counties asking for \$3,000 to be allocated to the Farm Bureau in Oxford County. I have been contacted at home by the county commissioners and by members of the farm bureau, both.

I would like to explain the situation as I understand it, the farm bureau on one hand and the county commissioners on the other. It seems if my information is correct, and this part I know is correct, the laws of 1941 there was an amendment passed to chapter 23 which is as follows: "Provided, however, that in those counties having the services of more than two extension agents, at the request of the county farm bureau made on the said date in December, the county commissioners of the county may allow an amount in excess of \$2000 but not exceeding \$4000, which shall also be included in the budget and for which a tax shall be levied." I want to report this as fairly as possible because I want to show what the result will be if the motion prevails.

I am informed the running expenses for the next two years for the farm bureau in Oxford County would be around \$3,000. I am informed that the county commissioners have not seen fit, for reasons of their own, to give not over \$2500 to date. If it is left to the

county commissioners they will find themselves with an appropriation of \$2500 and running expenses of \$3000. I understand a good deal of the increase in expense has been because they have been threatened with the loss of some help, and by expending a little extra, as we have done here to some people, they have kept some of the people who are quite efficient. I understand there is now a deficit of \$700. That is, they are approximately \$700 in the hole at the present time. If this amount of money were confined to \$2500 by the county commissioners there would be not much with which to carry on.

I do not want to take issue with the county commissioners generally because I know them personally, and the condition in Oxford County is such that we are in good shape and it is due to the honesty and diligence of the present county commissioners and those who have gone before them. Apparently there is a misunderstanding and they can not get together.

It seems to me when it was first brought to my attention this bill asked originally for \$3,000, taking away the prerogatives of the county commissioners and setting up \$3,000. I, at the time reluctantly went along with the idea. Later an amendment was offered raising it to \$3,500. I think the reason was it would cost \$3,000 to run the Farm Bureau and \$500 for each of two years, totalling \$1000 would take care of the deficit and leave \$300 for a buffer.

If this motion prevails there will be two alternatives left, I am informed. We have three extension agents. If this does not go through it will mean cutting out one home demonstration agent or dropping the 4-H club work. I find myself in a more or less embarrassing position. On one hand there is the farm bureau with their work, their home demonstration, canning, and other activities and everyone being urged to raise more produce, and the 4-H clubs stimulating the interest of boys and girls to stay on the farm. On the other hand are the county commissioners who are trying to be economical and they say this is costing too much. I would hate to see some things happen and that is why I oppose the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Townsend.

I am informed and I think it is true that Oxford County has the fourth largest enrollment in numbers. We are among the first four in number of members. I understand four counties receive \$4000 from the county commissioners, which is all the law allows. Oxford is among the first four in members but does not receive this amount.

I want to read a few remarks which influenced me and I would hate to see this motion go through because of the interest of the people and what these things mean to the people in that county. "In 1942 the boys and girls in Oxford County became well aware of the need for their services in the war effort. Their desire was shown by the large number of boys and girls who enrolled in 4-H club work. The enrollment in 1942 increased from 592 to 1047, which was almost double over the enrollment in 1941."

It seems to me the Committee on Counties heard the bill and by a vote of eight to two reported this out "ought to pass." I hate to see some of these things lost and so I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

Mr. TOWNSEND of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I'd like to call to your attention in 1919 a law was passed which declared that the county farm bureau should present to the county commissioners their budget for the year and in turn the county commissioners were obliged to pay to the farm bureau that amount of money. However, there was a limit that the funds should not be less than \$1000 and not more than \$2000. In 1941 that law was amended so that counties having more than two extension agents, the county commissioners in those counties were allowed to pay from \$2000 to a maximum of \$4000. They were not obliged to pay the amount the budget called for. It was left to the discretion of the commissioners. The plan has worked out successfully in every county in the state with the exception of one. Up there in Oxford County the farm bureau would like to have \$3500 but the county commissioners feel it is sound business if they are allowed \$2500.

The farm bureau has had some one present this bill which by law would compel the county commissioners to pay \$3500. I admit it is one solution but I do not think it is the best one.

I signed the minority report for these reasons: I do not consider this bill good legislation because it makes an exception of a general law as it applies to one particular county. Every other county, 15 others, would be left to the discretion of the county commissioners to pay from \$2000 to \$4000 and in one county alone they would be required to pay \$3500. Second, if we pass this bill in this legislature I feel without any doubt in future years you will find other farm bureaus coming here and presenting the same situation that exists in Oxford County now. They will have their justification and feel we should grant it if we do it in this case. Another reason: The county commissioners are elected to administer county funds and if we pass this we are overriding their decision and that doesn't seem fair to me. The bill concerns only county funds and if the majority of the voters feel they are not doing the right things, they can put in men in whom they have more confidence. I feel this is a local problem and the solution should be found locally. I would like to call to your attention the fact that there are 1100 adult members in this particular farm bureau. Each person pays \$1.00 a year for membership dues. I do not for a moment feel their work is unworthy. I know everyone approves of it. They are convinced themselves that it is of extreme value to them. If it is, I think they could work this out by paying \$1.00 a year more for dues which would result in \$1100 more a year income which is approximately what they would obtain through this bill.

For these reasons I signed the minority report and I hope the bill will not receive passage. If the Senate does accept the minority report "ought not to pass" and if, as a result of the vote, a committee of conference is set up, they could very easily solve this whole problem by amending the bill so the county commissioner must pay the amount requested but not exceeding \$4000 a year, and letting it apply to every county in that state and not one particular county.

That is all I have to say and in conclusion, I hope the minority report will be accepted.

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

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator

from Penboscot, Senator Townsend, that the minority report, "ought not to pass" be accepted. The Senator from Waldo, Senator Woodbury, has asked for a division. Is the Senate ready for the question? All those in favor of the acceptance of the minority report will rise and stand until counted.

A division of the Senate was had.

Four having voted in the affirmative and twenty-four opposed, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Woodbury of Waldo, the majority report "ought to pass" was accepted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading.

Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence. Under suspension of the rules the bill was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the tenth tabled and unassigned matter, bill "An Act Relative to Retiring Highway and Bridge Bonds" (S. P. 330) (L. D. 522) tabled on April 5th by Mr. Dorr of Oxford pending consideration.

Under suspension of the rules the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed on March 31st. House Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Passed to be Enacted

An Act relating to Loss of Membership in Indian Tribes by Marriage (S. P. 89) (L. D. 16)

An Act relating to Membership in Farm Lands Loan Commission (S. P. 197) (L. D. 280)

An Act relating to the Report of the State Auditor (S. P. 184) (L. D. 270)

An Act Revising the State Library Laws (S. P. 242) (L. D. 362)

An Act Granting Increase in Salary to County Attorney of Oxford County (S. P. 265) (L. D. 471)

An Act relating to the Salary of the Sheriff of Hancock County (S. P. 266) (L. D. 472)

An Act relating to the Salaries of Clerks in the Offices of Register of Deeds, Register of Probate and Clerk of Courts in Piscataquis County (S. P. 305) (L. D. 473)

An Act relating to the Terms of County Commissioners (S. P. 391) (L. D. 681)

An Act relating to the Salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture (S. P. 397) (L. D. 675)

An Act relating to Jurisdiction of Municipal Courts in Criminal and Juvenile Cases (S. P. 431) (L. D. 748)

An Act Providing for Experience Rating under Unemployment Compensation Law (S. P. 459) (L. D. 807)

An Act relating to Medical Examiners (S. P. 460) (L. D. 823)

An Act Permitting Bowling on Sunday (S. P. 464) (L. D. 828)

An Act relating to Refunding of Washington County Bonds (S. P. 469) (L. D. 850)

An Act relating to the Salaries of the Members of the State Highway Commission (S. P. 470) (L. D. 849)

An Act relating to Expenses of Maintaining County Roads (S. P. 471) (L. D. 851)

An Act relating to Notices of Changes of Locations of Certain Highways (S. P. 472) (L. D. 853)

An Act relating to Buyers and Sellers of Milk and Cream (S. P. 476) (L. D. 869)

An Act Amending "An Act to Create the Port of Portland Authority" as amended (S. P. 477) (L. D. 859)

An Act relating to the Salary of Various Officers of Waldo County (S. P. 478) (L. D. 861)

An Act relating to Attached Mortgaged Property (S. P. 479) (L. D. 868)

An Act relating to Compensation for Personal Injury to Employees (S. P. 480) (L. D. 869)

An Act Granting Increase in Salary to Judge of Probate of Piscataquis County (S. P. 481) (L. D. 867)

An Act relating to the Municipal Court of the Town of Farmington (S. P. 482) (L. D. 879)

An Act Exempting Certain Property of Agricultural Societies, and Farmers from the Regulations in re Motor Vehicles Used in Intrastate Traffic (H. P. 108) (L. D. 68)

An Act Appropriating Money for the State Soil Conservation Law (H. P. 125) (L. D. 105)

An Act Increasing the Compensation of Members of the Board of Registration of Voters (H. P. 344) (L. D. 201)

An Act to Clarify and Improve the Administration of the Liquor Laws (H. P. 586) (L. D. 352)

An Act relating to Permit for Cattle Entering the State (H. P. 921) (L. D. 475)

An Act relating to Proceedings in the Probate Court, Birth Records of Children Proposed for Adoption (H. P. 940) (L. D. 542)

An Act relating to Retirement of Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court (H. P. 947) (L. D. 539)

An Act relating to the Appointment of Guardians of Persons Resident out of the State (H. P. 1115) (L. D. 580)

An Act relating to City Ordinances on Licenses for Cinematograph, Moving Pictures and Operators (H. P. 1136) (L. D. 600)

An Act relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees (H. P. 1186) (L. D. 663)

An Act relating to the Hunting and Trapping of Foxes (H. P. 1240) (L. D. 739)

An Act relating to the Maine Development Commission and the State Geologist (H. P. 1266) (L. D. 775)

An Act relating to Employees in Military Service (H. P. 1269) (L. D. 780)

An Act relating to Mutual Fire Insurance Companies (H. P. 1273) (L. D. 779)

An Act relating to Membership in the Jointly-Contributory Retirement System for State Employees, Except Teachers (H. P. 1286) (L. D. 809)

An Act relating to Bonds to be Furnished by State Officials and Employees (H. P. 1304) (L. D. 832)

An Act relating to the Choice of Assessors and Compensation of Town Officers (H. P. 1312)

An Act relating to Conduct of Persons who have Communicable Diseases (H. P. 1317) (L. D. 844)

An Act relating to Salaries of Androscoggin County Clerks (H. P. 1318) (L. D. 855)

An Act relating to Membership of Persons Employed in the Federal Employment Service in the Jointly-Contributory Retirement System for State Employees (H. P. 1321) (L. D. 862)

An Act relating to Claims and Actions Against Executors and Administrators (H. P. 1323) (L. D. 864)

An Act relating to the Limitations on Sales by Licensees of Liquor, Malt Liquor, Wines, and Spirits (H. P. 1324) (L. D. 865)

An Act relating to Judges of Municipal Courts not to Act as Counsel (H. P. 1332) (L. D. 870)

An Act relating to Suspension of Licenses for Eating Places, Etc. (H. P. 1333) (L. D. 871)

An Act Permitting the State to Render Aid in Organized and Un-organized Territory (H. P. 1334) (L. D. 872)

An Act to Incorporate the Patten Water and Power Company (H. P. 1335) (L. D. 873)

An Act relating to Lands Owned by the State (H. P. 1336) (L. D. 874)

An Act relating to the Policing of State Parks, and Acceptance of Gifts for Improvements of State Parks (H. P. 1339) (L. D. 875)

An Act relating to the Milk Control Board (H. P. 1340) (L. D. 876)

An Act relating to Rebate of Registration Fees on Motor Vehicles Taken by Eminent Domain (H. P. 1344) (L. D. 883)

An Act to Incorporate the Vanceboro Water Company (H. P. 1345) (L. D. 884)

Resolve Authorizing Conveyance of the Interest of the State in Certain Land in Township Big W, N. B. K. P. in Somerset County (S. P. 203) (L. D. 282)

Resolve Creating an Interim Committee to Study the Tribal Rights and Needs of the Indians (S. P. 416) (L. D. 724)

(On motion by Mr. Varney of York, tabled pending passage to be enacted).

Resolve Closing Cobbossee Stream and Tributaries to Muskrat Trapping (H. P. 321)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Land to Enos Drumm, of Thomaston, Connecticut (H. P. 330) (L. D. 198)

Resolve in favor of the town of Bethel (H. P. 1083) (L. D. 858)

Resolve Authorizing the Sale of T. 1, R. 13, W. E. L. S., Piscataquis County (H. P. 1337) (L. D. 877)

Resolve Granting Authority to the Forest Commissioner to Cancel Deed Erroneously Recorded (H. P. 1338) (L. D. 878)

Emergency Measures

Bill "An Act to Provide for Re-issuance of State Highway Bonds." (S. P. 329) (L. D. 505)

Which bill being an emergency measure, and having received the affirmative vote of 27 members of the Senate and none opposed, was passed to be enacted.

Bill "An Act Relating to Compensation of Fire Wardens." (H. P. 829) (L. D. 396)

Which bill being an emergency measure, and having received the affirmative vote of 28 members of the Senate and none opposed, was passed to be enacted.

Bill "An Act Providing for the Maintenance of the Road Leading to Baxter State Park." (H. P. 1320) (L. D. 857)

Which bill being an emergency measure, and having received the affirmative vote of 28 members of the Senate and none opposed, was passed to be enacted.

Bill "An Act Relating to Licenses for Sale of Malt Beverages." (H. P. 1325) (L. D. 866)

Which bill being an emergency measure, and having received the affirmative vote of 28 members of the Senate and none opposed, was passed to be enacted.

"Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Relating to Adoption of Amendments to the Constitution." (S. P. 357) (L. D. 644)

Which Resolve being a Constitutional Amendment and having received the affirmative vote of 28 members of the Senate and none opposed, was finally passed.

Bill "An Act to Authorize the State Highway Commission to Co-operate with the Public Roads Administration of the United States in the Construction and Maintenance of Flight Strips and of Certain Classes of Highways, in Order to Facilitate the War Effort." (S. P. 346) (L. D. 520)

On motion by Mr. McGlaulin of Cumberland, tabled pending passage to be enacted and tomorrow assigned.

On motion by Mr. Emery of Hancock, the Senate voted to take from the table, bill "An Act Relieving Towns from Board and Care of Neglected Children" (H. P. 1342) (L. D. 881) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending passage to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Elliot of Knox Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.