

# 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-Third Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1947

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

## SENATE

Wednesday, March 12, 1947

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Merle Golding of Augusta.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Papers from the House referred in concurrence.

From the House: Bill "An Act Relating to Municipal Planning and Zoning." (H. P. 453) (L. D. 269)

(In the Senate on February 21st, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" in concurrence.)

Comes from the House, engrossing reconsidered, House Amendment "A" read and adopted, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, that Body voted to recede from its former action taken on February 21st whereby the bill as amended by Committee Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed; House Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the House: Bill "An Act Relating to the Issuance of Dealer's Registration." (S. P. 218) (L. D. 571)

(In the Senate on February 21st, passed to be engrossed.)

Comes from the House, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, the Senate voted to recede from its former action taken on February 21st whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed; House Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

## House Committee Reports

The Committee on Education on "Resolve in Favor of George E. Leatherbarrow of Saco," (H. P. 112) (L. D. 638) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to State Aid to Certain

Educational Institutions," (H. P. 1374) (L. D. 995) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Amending Subsection (e) of Section 5 of Chapter 69 of the Private and Special Laws of 1941, Relative to Eminent Domain Proceedings," (S. P. 1181) (L. D. 897) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the State School for Boys," (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 848) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Unfair Sales of Cigarettes," (H. P. 1355) (L. D. 956) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Sidewalk Construction in the City of Portland," (H. P. 1277) (L. D. 937) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Palmyra School District," (H. P. 1287) (L. D. 948) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Circuses and Traveling Amusement Shows," (H. P. 450) (L. D. 266) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Portland," (H. P. 1276) (L. D. 946) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Library on Bill "An Act to Amend the Library Law," (H. P. 1077) (L. D. 733) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Providing for the Purchase of Seventy-Five Copies of 'Maine Province and Court Records, Volume III,'" (H. P. 454) (L. D. 302) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Mercantile Affairs and Insurance on Bill "An Act Relating to the Cumberland Mutual Fire Insurance Company," (H. P. 1305) (L. D. 910) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act Relating to Regulation of Contract Carriers," (H. P. 1515) (L. D. 1138) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Create the Searsport Water District," (H. P. 1470) (L. D. 1074) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Van Buren Light and Power District," (H. P. 508) (L. D. 329) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Fees for Permits and Plates for Motor Vehicle Carriers," (H. P. 1516) (L. D. 1139) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Towns on Bill "An Act Relating to Location of Children of Paupers for School Purposes," (H. P. 1330) (L. D. 923) reported that the same ought to pass.

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

The Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Instructing the Commissioner of Education to Establish and Grant State High School Equivalency Certificates," (H. P. 1264) (L. D. 935) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Limitation of Actions for Tort," (H. P. 916) (L. D. 613) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to the Town of Fort Fairfield School District," (H. P. 1278) (L. D. 938) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the Farmington Village Corporation," (H. P. 1285) (L. D. 940) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Brunswick Sewer District and to Transfer to It the Sewers of the Brunswick Village Corporation," (H. P. 342) (L. D. 215) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

The Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Corinna Water District," (H. P. 686) (L. D. 442) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Naples Water Company," (H. P. 177) (L. D. 151) reported that the same ought

to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which reports were severally read and adopted in concurrence, and the bills read once; Committee Amendments "A" were severally read and adopted in concurrence, and the bills as amended were tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Education on "Resolve Granting a Pension to Annie M. Adams of North Edgecomb," (H. P. 6) (L. D. 637) reported that the same ought to pass.

Comes from the House, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A".

In the Senate, the report was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading; House Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act Creating the Ashland Water and Sewer District," (H. P. 683) (L. D. 439) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Comes from the House passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto.

In the Senate, the report was read and adopted and the bill was given its first reading; Committee Amendment A was read; House Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence; Committee Amendment A as amended by House Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Majority of the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act Relating to Incorporation of Kittery Water District," (H. P. 72) (L. D. 52) reported that the same ought to pass.

(signed)

Senators:

BATCHELDER of York

NOYES of Hancock

Representatives:

PALMETER of Charlotte

COLLINS of Caribou

DeSANTIS of Madison

MARSHALL of York

ROSS of Brownville

DANIELS of Gilead  
WIGHT of Bangor

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought not to pass.

(signed)

Senator:

HOPKINS of Kennebec

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and adopted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate:

Mr. HOPKINS of Kennebec: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, it is embarrassing for a legislator always to rise and defend a report on which he stands alone. It is especially embarrassing when on the same day the next item on the calendar finds the same legislator standing on a Minority Report with only one other signer. I am indeed embarrassed. But I feel that I must follow through and move the acceptance of the Minority Report. I also want to thank the Senator from York (Senator Batchelder) for allowing me to speak on this measure first and to make this motion.

The Kittery Water Company is one of the older and better water companies in the state of Maine. It has been very successfully financed, paid off its obligations, has been accumulating a surplus and now comes to the legislature with this request to amend its charter to permit the taking of up to 50% of the accumulations from the reserve from year to year and diverting it to the treasury of the town of Kittery for general purposes. One of the interesting things about this request is the fact that the principle customer of the Kittery Water Company is the U. S. Navy Yard and we were told at the hearing that the real purpose of this request is that it will permit the maintenance of the present rates, thereby diverting money from the federal government to the treasury of the town of Kittery.

Obviously the indicated action on the part of the Kittery Water Company should be a reduction of rate. That raises the question of principle, whether a public utility corporation can be used in this manner. Twenty-seven years of experience in connection with public utility corporations, never in the management of public utilities but always close enough to observe and be somewhat of a student of public utility operations, leads me to think

that that may be an objectionable use of public utilities.

There are other matters which may be of interest to you in connection with this particular bill. The Kittery Water Company serves most of the town of Kittery but not all of it, and it also serves a small part of neighboring towns. The water users in the district are not in every case the same people as the taxpayers in the town of Kittery so that if this bill is passed, some of the rates charged for water to the people served in the neighboring towns will be diverted to the general use of the town, which again might be objectionable to you. There is no provision in this bill to divide the accumulation with the neighboring towns. We were told at the hearing that it was believed that the selectmen of the town could get together and decide on a division, but I think the Senate would agree with me that there is no legal right under the charter so that that division could be made and you can feel sure that no division ever would be made. If it were to be made, obviously a very bitter wrangle could develop if the selectmen of the two towns were not in agreement.

I have told you the principal reason why I object to this bill. I don't think the we want to use our municipally owned public utilities in the state of Maine in the manner in which this bill would permit. I think we want to keep those corporations as separate entities, to keep their finances straight so their rate will reflect cost, and I think that when a public utility is in sufficiently good financial position so that it can reduce rates we should insist that it do just that, and reduce its rates.

I have been told that these corporations, and I think that perhaps you might find that some of these municipally owned corporations or public service corporations are using their funds at the present time in the state of Maine in ways which are not prescribed by their charters, but I don't think the legislature should place its stamp of approval on that kind of financing by the corporation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I present this motion for the consideration of the Senate and I say to you that I signed the Minority Report simply to give you the information which you may not previously have had.

Mr. BATCHELDER of York: Mr. President, I am glad that this point has been raised. I think it is something which should be given a little consideration. Now, as I understand it, this Kittery Water District, serving three different towns, principally Kittery, takes in part of the towns of Elliott and York. I understand they have gone to quite a little expense in order to serve some patrons in the town of Elliot and some in York but in so doing it is my understanding that the rate that has been furnished to them has been furnished at the expense of the town of Kittery. At the present time Kittery has one of the lowest rates of any district in this state. It was somewhat disturbing to think that probably one of the greatest patrons in the town of Kittery was the Kittery Navy Yard. We recognized the fact that the Kittery Navy Yard pays no taxes to the town of Kittery although they are one of the heaviest users. As a matter of fact the federal government spent a tremendous amount of money, and called upon everybody for payment of taxes and so forth. That doesn't disturb me in the least but I think without doubt we should pass this particular bill.

As I understand, they have accumulated tremendous assets. The Kittery Water District is out of debt and has some accumulated assets which they could use, which they do not need for the adding on of any additional units to furnish further service. They have this money in the treasury which is available and could be used.

Now, I understand that in some of the water districts that have been created in the past, legislation has been enacted so that they could use that money for that particular purpose, I also understand they have done that very thing in certain cases. We are not setting up any new legislation for authorizing any water district to use money for any particular purpose and I believe that if Kittery has any problems which may be facing them that with money available it should be used for that purpose.

The question has been raised whether or not we should permit them to do that. And I will say that if there are any patrons who figure they should not be paying such large rates they have the privilege of coming before the Pub-

lic Utilities Commission on petition and having those rates reduced but until such time as they do petition and request that those rates be reduced I do not see where any particular patrons that have had service have been hurt. For these reasons I ask the passage of this bill and the adoption of the Majority Report.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President and Members of the Senate you have heard this bill referred to by the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Hopkins, as affecting a water company and the Senator from York, Senator Batchelder, has referred to it as a water district. There is a difference between the two, and this happens to be a water district in Kittery owned by the people in that district. The Senator from York has told you substantially that evidence given us at the Committee hearing and he points out, and I would again point out to you, that the Kittery Water District has one of the lowest rates of any district in the state of Maine. The revenue that they derive comes largely from the town of Kittery, that means the more thickly settled part of the district and more particularly do they derive a substantial revenue from the Navy Yard. In that manner they are able to serve those two other towns, or parts thereof at this particularly low rate. As a method of collecting taxes, the Senator from Kennebec disagrees and theoretically I think he is right, but if the people of that district prefer to do it in this way I can't see anything wrong with it. In fact we have already voted on a bill here this morning, the Van Buren Water District, a light and power district, allowing them to do the same thing.

I hope the motion of the Senator from Kennebec (Senator Hopkins) does not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Hopkins, that the Senate adopt the Minority "Ought Not to Pass" Report of the Committee. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being had  
The motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Batchelder of York, the Majority "Ought to Pass" Report of the Committee was adopted and the bill was

given its first reading and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Majority of the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Lubece Sewerage District," (H. P. 465) (L. D. 271) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

(signed) Senators:

BATCHELDER of York  
NOYES of Hancock

Representatives:

ROSE of Brownville  
DANIELS of Gilead  
PALMETER of Charlotte  
COLLINS of Caribou  
DeSANCTIS of Madison  
MARSHALL of York

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought not to pass.

(signed) Senator:

HOPKINS of Kennebec

Representative:

WIGHT of Bangor

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and adopted, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

Mr. BATCHELDER of York: Mr. President, I move the adoption of the Majority Report of the Committee "Ought to Pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

Mr. HOPKINS of Kennebec: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, this is a bill for the creation of the Lubece Sewerage District. The town of Lubece is entirely out of debt. It has a valuation of one million, seventy-five thousand dollars, according to the information given to the committee. The district would serve 73% of the property in the town and two thousand of the population, according to the information that was furnished us. The bill provides for an indebtedness of two hundred fifty thousand dollars. The reason for the Minority Report was to invite the attention of the legislature to the very high indebtedness with respect to the valuation of the area.

At the time the report was written it was thought that an effort might be made to amend some of these charters so as to place some control on this high indebtedness. At the present time it is apparent that that cannot be done, there are so many different types of charters,

five or six different types of charters being heard before a number of committees.

Next week I shall ask for the privilege of speaking to you for a few minutes on the indebtedness being created by these public corporations. I do not oppose this bill but I would like the privilege of having it tabled until some time next week and I move that the bill and accompanying papers be laid upon the table.

Thereupon, the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Batchelder that the Majority Report of the Committee "Ought to Pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" be adopted.

The Majority of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to the Sanitary Water Board," (H. P. 1068) (L. D. 681) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(signed) Senators:

DUNBAR of Washington  
CLOUGH of Penobscot  
BARNES of Aroostook

Representatives:

SILSBY of Aurora  
PEIRCE of Augusta  
McGLAUFILIN of Portland

WILLIAMS of Auburn  
HASKELL of Portland

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

(signed) Representatives:

PERKINS of Boothbay Harbor  
MILLS of Farmington

Comes from the House the Minority Report read and adopted, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

In the Senate:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot: Mr. President, I move that the Senate adopt the Minority "Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" Report be adopted in concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion by Miss Clough of Penobscot, the reports and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Williams, to adopt the Minority Report.

### Referred to Committees

Pursuant to Joint Order, the following Bills were transmitted by the Revisor of Statutes, and on recommendation by the Committee on Reference of Bills, were referred to the following committees:

#### Judiciary

Mr. Williams of Penobscot presented Bill "An Act Establishing a State-wide Probation System." (S. P. 455)

(Fifteen hundred copies ordered printed.)

Sent down for concurrence.

#### Taxation

Mr. Bishop of Sagadahoc presented Bill "An Act to Exempt all Veterans of Certain Wars from Real Estate Taxes." (S. P. 456)

(Ordered printed.)

Sent down for concurrence.

#### Ways and Bridges

The same Senator presented by request Bill "An Act to Remove Tolls on the Richmond-Dresden Bridge." (S. P. 457)

(Ordered printed.)

Sent down for concurrence.

### Referred to Committee

Mr. Williams of Penobscot was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I have a duty this morning for which I do not always like to rise, and that is to ask unanimous consent to introduce a measure. For some years there has been in Penobscot County, a movement to create a better water supply for several towns and cities, including Bangor, Brewer, Veazie, Orono, Hampden and other towns. In this present session there has already been other legislation introduced which is a bill to create the Penobscot Valley Water Commission and it has lately developed that it will be necessary, if anything is done along that line, to enact another bill creating the Orono-Veazie Water District in order to tie them all in together. So at this time, in order that all this legislation may be considered by this legislature and then passed on to the voters in those several communities if desirable, I ask unanimous consent to introduce this bill.

Thereupon, unanimous consent was granted the Senator from

Penobscot, Senator Williams to introduce bill, An Act to Create the Orono-Veazie Water District, which bill was received and referred to the Committee on Public Utilities.

(Ordered printed.)

Sent down for concurrence.

### Order

Mr. McKusick of Piscataquis presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that the Commissioner of Health and Welfare be requested to furnish to the Senate the following information:

1. The names and residences of all persons receiving Old Age Assistance; and also the names and residences of all persons receiving Aid to Dependent Children, together with their monthly allotments, arranged by towns and counties.

2. The names and residences of all applicants who have filed applications for Old Age Assistance and Aid to Dependent Children, and have been investigated and approved, together with the amount of monthly allotments approved, arranged by towns and counties.

3. The names and residences of all applicants who have filed applications for Old Age Assistance and Aid to Dependent Children, and whose applications have not been allowed, approved or denied, arranged by towns and counties. And be it further

ORDERED, that this information be furnished by the filing of a copy of the required data with the Secretary of the Senate, for the purpose of permitting members of the Senate, only, to review the allocations of Old Age Assistance, and Aid to Dependent Children allotments.

On motion by Mr. Welch of Aroostook, the Order was laid upon the table pending consideration.

### First Reading of Printed Bills

"Resolve Relating to Teaching Service of Frank Kent, of Guilford." (S. P. 201) (L. D. 1256)

"Resolve in Favor of the Town of Palermo." (S. P. 453) (L. D. 1257)

Which were severally read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

### Senate Committee Reports

Mr. MacKinnon from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and



Game on "Resolve Closing of Carpenter Pond, T. 7, R. 11, W. E. L. S., Piscataquis County," (S. P. 157) (L. D. 386) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Closing of Snake Pond, T. 7, R. 11, Piscataquis County to all Fishing Except Fly Fishing," (S. P. 156) (L. D. 397) reported that leave be granted to withdraw the same.

Which reports were severally read and adopted.

Mr. Cross from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Bill "An Act Relating to Maintenance of Third Class Roads," (S. P. 89) (L. D. 115) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 458) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

Which report was read and adopted and the new draft laid upon the table for printing under the joint rules.

Mr. Leavitt from the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act Relating to Dentists and Dental Hygienists," (S. P. 102) (L. D. 198) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. MacKinnon from the Committee on State Sanatoriums on "Resolve Permitting Central Maine Power Company to Erect Pole Line Across Property of Western Maine Sanatorium, in Hebron," (S. P. 185) (L. D. 518) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and adopted, and the resolves read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

#### Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Register of Deeds in Sagadahoc County." (H. P. 184) (L. D. 132)

Bill "An Act Relating to Clerk Hire in County Offices in Sagadahoc County." (H. P. 185) (L. D. 133)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Recorder of the Brunswick Municipal Court." (H. P. 187) (L. D. 135)

Bill "An Act Relative to the Salary of the Judge of the Brunswick Municipal Court." (H. P. 469) (L. D. 303)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Recorder of Eastport Municipal Court." (H. P. 509) (L. D. 330)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the County Attorney in Sagadahoc County." (H. P. 625) (L. D. 385)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Sheriff of Penobscot County." (H. P. 687) (L. D. 443)

Bill "An Act Relating to Profits and Losses of Loan and Building Associations and/or Savings and Loan Associations." (H. P. 1144)

Bill "An Act Relating to Capital Stock of Loan and Building Associations and/or Savings and Loan Associations." (H. P. 1145) (L. D. 745)

Bill "An Act Relating to Inspection of Motor Vehicles." (H. P. 1193) (L. D. 781)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Excise Tax on Motor Vehicles." (H. P. 1195) (L. D. 821)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the County Attorney and Assistant County Attorney in Penobscot County." (H. P. 1203) (L. D. 823)

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

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the County Treasurer of Sagadahoc County." (H. P. 183) (L. D. 131)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Sheriff in Sagadahoc County." (H. P. 626) (L. D. 386)

(On motion by Mr. Bishop of Sagadahoc, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Register of Probate in Sagadahoc County." (H. P. 627) (L. D. 387)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Judge of Probate in Sagadahoc County." (H. P. 628) (L. D. 388)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Kenduskeag Development District." (H. P. 924) (L. D. 560)

Bill "An Act Authorizing Loan and Building Associations and/or Savings and Loan Associations to Adopt Pensions and Retirements." (H. P. 1143) (L. D. 743)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Appointment, Term of Office and Removal of the City Clerk of the City of Lewiston." (H. P. 1531) (L. D. 1114)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Courts

Ordering Care of Child Pending Hearing." (S. P. 280) (L. D. 810)

Bill "An Act Relating to Unclaimed Corporation Dividends." (S. P. 282) (L. D. 807)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Registration in Optometry." (S. P. 291) (L. D. 818)

(On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.)

### Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate, Senate Report "Ought Not to Pass" from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, An Act Appropriating Money for 1946-47 Appropriation Deficiencies in Aid to Dependent Children, World War Assistance, Board and Care of Neglected Children, and Indians (S. P. 358) (L. D. 1027) tabled by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot on March 11th pending acceptance of the report, and today assigned.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, earlier this morning you heard the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Hopkins express his embarrassment in defending a minority report. My embarrassment ought to be more complete than the Senator's because I shall attempt to explain to you why I think a unanimous Appropriations Committee report ought to be upset, and in attempting to offer those reasons to you I am privileged to tell you that the chairman of that good committee has expressed to me the hope and desire that this matter have full debate and full consideration as a means of possibly guiding that committee in their consideration of what the legislature desires on this and other related problems.

The bill itself provides for an emergency appropriation of \$149,000 for the Health and Welfare Department to carry certain of their activities from now until the end of June, the end of the fiscal year. They find themselves deficient in these amounts for these activities: In aid to dependent children they are \$137,000 short. For board and care of committed children they are \$92,000 short. I would ask you to remember that \$32,000 of that \$92,-

000 is to provide for an increase in rates paid to those homes where you have committed children. The third is the world war assistance program \$35,000. The Indian program is \$15,000 short. The addition of the sums is \$279,000 and that represents their gross shortage.

To assist in making up that deficiency the Department has \$110,000 more than will be required in the old age assistance program. You have appropriated \$10,000 more than is needed for administration and appropriated \$10,000 more than is needed in the aid to the blind program so the department has available \$130,000 with which to reduce this gross deficiency of \$279,000 down to a net deficiency of \$149,000.

Now, I think the legislature faces two very clear paths. One is to acknowledge this deficiency and accept the department's request, and the other is to deny it, and I would ask you to consider what the department must do if the appropriation request is denied. As evidence of that I will read into the record the administrative order that must be issued by the department if the legislation fails of passage, and the tentative order has been prepared in a letter by Dr. Bristol, the Commissioner, to Mr. Haines, the director of the Bureau of Social Welfare, and Dr. Bristol's tentative administrative order is this:

Mr. Frank W. Haines, Director  
Bureau of Social Welfare  
Department of Health and Welfare  
State House  
Augusta, Maine

Dear Mr. Haines:

Preparatory to possible legislative denial of the Department Deficiency Bill, you are hereby directed to take such preparatory steps as may be necessary to effect the following economies:

1. The General board rate schedules for children in foster homes shall remain at present levels. Those requesting board allowance increases are to be advised that no general increases are at present possible.

2. No new grants and no increases in present grants in Aid to Dependent Children shall be authorized after March 15, 1947. In addition to this, (a) cuts of 10% in grants to recipients of Aid to Dependent Children for the months of March and April, and (b) cuts of

20% in May and June 1947, shall be put into operation.

3. No new grants and no increases in present grants in assistance to dependents of veterans under the World War Assistance program shall be authorized after March 25, 1947. In addition to this, cuts of (a) 10% in grants to recipients of World War Assistance for the months of March and April, and (b) cuts of 20% in May and June 1947, shall be put into operation.

I regret the necessity of this action, but if this procedure becomes necessary it will reflect the considered judgment of the Ninety Third Legislature. Immediately upon Legislative action, if that final action is negative, you will be advised to release the orders tentatively described above. I would ask you to submit to me, for my approval, such public notices, department bulletins, and notices to recipients as you may prepare in contemplation of effecting these ordered economies.

Sincerely yours,

LEVERETT D. BRISTOL,  
Commissioner.

That, I submit to the Senate is a rather harsh treatment in the solution of this problem.

I realize it is the sense of this legislature that the Department of Health and Welfare are spending more dollars than you are able to raise and appropriate for them. I realize this legislature will very carefully consider the appropriations you make available for this department during the next biennium. I realize you may also wisely consider basic changes in these programs. You may read the general wording of the legislation that supports those programs and be impressed that generally it is this,—the amount of assistance shall be sufficient to provide the recipient with reasonable assistance comparable with decency and health. You may wisely conclude it should be changed. You may say, "Let's limit our grants to an amount sufficient to maintain the recipients in the same standard of living they are accustomed to."

You have on the books today, and have applicants coming to the office every day and I cannot believe the amounts received by the A D C program and World War Assistance program can in equity and fairness and justice be substantially cut during the next four months. The

cuts necessary to do this are substantially more than the \$149,000. For instance, in order to save \$88,000 to the State the Department must cut A D C recipients \$143,000 because of the federal grants. In the Board and Care \$32,000 is a direct State cut, and World War Assistance—that being an entirely State program—it is a straight cut, but you are taking away from about 8,000 mothers and youngsters in the A D C program and about a thousand or 1100 mothers and youngsters who have world war connection — you are taking from them the equivalent of 60% of the grant. Many may say, "We believe the grant is too high." Let's analyze what it is. Of the youngsters and mothers in the A D C, do you realize it is \$4.95 per week with which the mother must feed, clothe and house the family? In World War Assistance, do you realize it is \$5.95 for the average mother and two youngsters? Certainly a substantial cut in that program operates a distinct unfairness. I would remind the Senate that one of the first things you did when you got here, and you did it unanimously by an emergency bill, was stand up and assure the 3500 State employees they would continue to get their \$30 a month increase. I wonder how sincere we are going to be considering our action with our own employees, to meet this problem by putting these substantial cuts into this program.

I have had four separate sessions with the department. I tried to get the basic background of the bill from the department. I presented it to the Appropriations Committee. I discussed it at length with the department and some members of the committee since then, and I believe there can be a cut made in the request and it is in the \$32,000 item which is the sum required to increase the board from \$20 to \$25 in foster homes. I think there is a great deal of justice in the department's request and I have seen evidence of demands made by foster home owners that the board rate be increased, but I cannot believe the emergency is so serious it can't be postponed until our action is determined on the Appropriation bill, and so if on that remote chance the Senate will vote to substitute the bill for the report. I will prepare an amendment and submit it on the bill's second reading, which

will reduce the \$149,000 by \$32,000; and then let the Appropriations Committee determine in the appropriation bill whether this shall be a basic increase for next year.

In closing, I move the substitution of the bill for the report.

Mr. CLEAVES of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, the assignment that you gave your Appropriations Committee in this 93rd Legislature is not an easy one. You have in effect said to us, "Tell us which comes first, the hen or the egg." In other words, we dislike to pass out a bill "ought to pass" when we know that the money is not there to back it up. On the other hand, we dislike to pass out a bill "ought not to pass" when it might be one of the finest bills that could come before the legislature. Hence, we have only one alternative, and that is to hew straight to the line, to the budget. We cannot do anything different, gentlemen. It is impossible. We have no assurance this legislature is going to pass any revenue. We hope it does, but with the rules we are working under, we have got to know where we are at, and when we face a deficiency bill from the Health and Welfare Department or any department in the State of Maine, it is naturally embarrassing to the entire Appropriations Committee in their projection of the financial picture.

Now, to be sure, we can take our responsibilities easy and pass out "ought to pass" bills to you for your consideration and let you make your decision as a guide to us, or we can take our responsibilities heavy and dig into the mass of evidence that is before us and give to you our best judgment for your further consideration.

Gentlemen, this committee is far from convinced but what there is an equitable solution to this horrifying pyramiding of cost that is going on in the Health and Welfare Department. Whether it be change in administration, in the administration itself, or in the change of law cannot be determined at the present moment, but I will assure you of the Senate that before this legislature adjourns there will be presented to you for your consideration what we think would be an equitable solution.

Let's look at the picture. I think you gentlemen all realize very keenly that the Health and Welfare De-

partment takes 41.3% of our general fund and that is also rising. Our administration costs for this year will be \$794,510 to dispense that \$10,954,000 and this projected administration cost for the coming year is going to be \$962,190. For this particular year ending June 30th, the fiscal year of the State, we allotted to them \$5,629,365. At the special session they found they were shy. We passed a deficiency bill for \$500,000 and they took \$88,000 from the contingent fund. Following that, they had what we call a windfall from Uncle Sam of \$422,000 and now they are in asking for a deficiency bill of \$149,000 on top of that, making a total over and above the budget allotted to them of \$1,115,000.

Gentlemen, I as an individual have all the sympathy in the world for our relief needs in the State of Maine. We want to see them taken care of but there is a bottom to the barrel and we are scraping the bottom at the present time. I would like to see a discussion of this in the Senate. We would like to have you men tell us what we are to do. It is not an easy chore. It is not pleasant for us to pass out "ought not to pass" on a deficiency bill in any department. It is a hard thing to do, gentlemen. We don't like it but it is what we call good business to do it. We were unanimous in the report and we feel that somewhere along the line the axe must cut in the rising costs in all departments of the State.

I would like, gentlemen, to hear a discussion on it, and I hope the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, will not prevail.

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

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, I hoped there would be more discussion on this bill. I think certainly it is time for us to look at the picture and determine who is to hold the purse-strings of government here in our State. As a member of the Taxation Committee, I am particularly interested in knowing how much money to provide, and if we are to continue to appropriate money and tolerate overdrafts in the various departments of State I can see but little sense in this legislature meeting here in Augusta. I would like to

quote from the Budget Message of January 11, 1945:

"Sound financial planning requires that estimated expenditures be within available revenues. Sound administration keeps actual expenditures within the estimates. At the outset, it should be very clear that the budget presented shows only a modest excess of estimated revenues over estimated expenditures. Accordingly, the Legislature should not adopt the proposed budget and also enact measures calling for substantial additional expenditures unless it provides additional revenue. The Legislature, of course, may change the proposed budget in any way it deems desirable but the total estimated expenditures must be kept within reasonable estimates of income or the administration is left no alternative other than a veto. If the Legislature so provides for adequate operation of the State's business, I would like it equally clear that the various departments and agencies will operate within the amounts provided."

Here, as the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Cleaves, has told you, since this message was received, we have a department with deficiencies which total more than a million dollars, and I, for one, will go on record as saying it is something we cannot tolerate, and I hope the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, does not prevail.

Mr. CLEAVES of Cumberland: Mr. President and Members, I neglected to bring out one important point, that this is not an overdraw, it is a projected deficiency as of June 30, 1947. We, in the Appropriations Committee, feel that the department can revise its financial picture and without cutting out too much, can carry out the program as set out in the budget.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I am hesitant in speaking a second time but I would like to attempt to review two general approaches. First, those arguments I have listened to by my two good friends seem to summarize arguments for a substantial cut in next year's budget. This bill has no relation whatsoever with next year's budget but by accepting this bill your hands are in no way tied in determining what your conclusions are to be for the next biennium. This bill relates only to the emer-

gency appropriation to go to June 30th.

I would like to answer the inference that there is some magic formula that can be applied in the Health and Welfare department. I have read to you the administrative order that will be issued and will be carried out. The economies you seek could only be effected by spreading the cut over other services. The department, I think, has made a wise decision that only those services that are deficient should take the cuts. You, in your wisdom, appropriated necessary dollars to support the old age program. They have more money than they need and it will be used to reduce this deficiency. It is unfortunate that deficiencies are in classes where the cuts will affect the youngsters. It is unfortunate that every dependent in the world war program will receive cuts, but it is where the cuts will be made and it is what you are going to say, and what the Appropriations Committee has told you, and it is what you will tell those youngsters when you vote to follow this plan.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, to substitute the bill for the "ought not to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot: Mr. President, being a member of the Appropriations Committee and also of the Welfare Committee, I have sometimes noticed the Welfare Committee or any committee somewhat supports the department they are supposed to be dealing with. I don't know as I should interject myself into this discussion but I was interested in being at the hearing when the deficit was placed before the Appropriations Committee. The point that impressed me most was the fact that the speakers for the bill maintained that under no consideration could or would there be any move in the line of economy in the department if the deficiency bill was turned down by the legislature.

I know it is an old fashioned idea to believe any money should be saved. The popular idea today is to try to spend money so we can have new taxes. I still think there are people in the State of Maine not clamoring for new taxes. You have heard today that the time to start economy is with the next budget. Now, if we are going to do any economizing in two years of

the biennium why would not it be a good chance for this department to find out what the word "economy" means in the next few months.

I submit to you \$149,000 is a pretty small economy when they still have for this fiscal year over \$3,000,000 to spend. Certainly if we are going to put into effect any economy in the next year of the biennium that would amount to any substantial saving in the State of Maine it will have to be a larger percentage than this particular deficiency bill. I know it is unfortunate that it is in these particular accounts, accounts which most of you know I have been exceedingly interested in during my terms in the legislature—board and care of dependent children and aid to dependent children.

All over the State there is a crying out, as a social worker expressed it to me—a social worker who has a lifetime of experience in private agencies—"This legislature must do something to save the State of Maine from the Welfare Department." I don't want to be on a "witch hunt", as some things I have done have been referred to, but I am going to read to you, because I want it to be verbatim, a report sent by the overseer of the poor in one of our small cities. I could go on and repeat the sentiments expressed by word of mouth and by letter, but here are six cases which have apparently been given investigation which I believe would prove that in A D C there could be some economies if the department was of that mind and not necessarily just as a whack at the legislature to come in in this cold-blooded way and get people off the rolls. Every time a remark is made in the Appropriations Committee or anywhere else where savings could be made they come and say that the way is by slashing people off the rolls.

I will read this report:

Mrs. A is a widow with three children, age 16, 15 and 12. The two oldest girls do not go to school. They are strong and healthy and could help support their mother. They dress well and are on the street most of the time.

Mrs. A's father is a widower. He is a mason by trade and earns good money and could help his daughter but will not do so as long as she is receiving money.

Relief money from the City in 1941 and 1942 averaged \$30.09 a

month which was all she asked for. The first A.D.C. allotment was on March 20, 1946 for \$114.00. August 20, 1946 she received \$123.00 and on February 20, 1947 she received \$136.00.

There is no reason why Mrs. A cannot do some kind of work or make the girls.

Mrs. B obtained her A.D.C. on desertion. Her husband is a good workman but will not support her. We do not think he is far from here and should be returned. She has four children, age 15, 11, 10 and 9. She always worked and her mother cared for the children but since she has received A.D.C. she has not worked at all. There is nothing that I can do about it as she is not considered a relief case and not under my supervision. We are informed that she has a boarder.

Mrs. B is one of the best dressed women on the street and often takes trips to Portland and other places, leaving the children to take care of themselves.

Her children are poorly dressed and often sent home from school because of bugs and not being properly dressed. They receive very poor care. Considering the money the state provides for them they should live in good health and decency.

When Mrs. B was on city relief she averaged \$45.00 a month for the four years. The first A.D.C. relief she received was in April, 1946 for \$104.00 a month. In November, 1946 she received \$170.00 and in February, 1947 \$175.00.

Mrs. C was divorced and married again. We have two children to support by the first husband, ages 10 and 9. Mrs. C is living in Bath, Maine. When she was in Fairfield, Maine, we were furnishing her \$26.00 a month relief. This was all she asked for as a relief case for four years. The first A.D.C. allotment she received was in April, 1946 for \$65.00. In November of 1946 she received \$96.00 and in February, 1947 she received \$122.00.

Mrs. D is a widow with five children, age 16, 14, 11, 9 and 7. She has been on relief for a good many years. She always worked until she got A.D.C. City relief averaged \$60.-90 per month for four years. The first A.D.C. allotment she received was December 20, 1946 for \$172.00.

Mrs. E. She has one son, age 16, and seven other children whose ages are not known to me. She has had several husbands and her last one is still living. She has always

been a relief case off and on since 1932. Her last husband worked at the Bath Iron Works during the war. I understand he is incapacitated at the present time. Three of her children are in the custody of the state. Her city relief averaged \$28.00 a month. Her A.D.C. allotment on March 20, 1946 was \$184.00 and on October 20, 1946 it was \$245.00. On January 20, 1947 she received \$307.00.

Mrs. F's husband is in State Prison at Thomaston. They have been a relief family for years. She has six children, ages 14, 12, 11, 10, 7, and 4. She should be under our supervision to see that the children are properly cared for. She has lived in the same house with her mother and there is no reason why she could not do some kind of work.

On March 5, 1947, she was summoned to the Municipal Court of Rockland for neglect of her children. The case was continued to give her a chance to take care of the children in decency and health.

Her average city relief was \$99.25 a month. Her first A.D.C. allotment was March, 1947, in the amount of \$187.00.

I am sorry to bore the Senate with reading that long list but I thought it showed in one city where the overseers are interested, the marked difference were A D C grants, at least, were doubled or trebled or more, what the city had paid in supporting these families. I bring those out with the contention there should be some economies. I know it is a comparatively small place in the State of Maine with a few cases, but is it not time we found out if we are not using the folks, who certainly we want to help if they need aid, a little too good? Are we not placing it like a gentleman I know who is trying to place his family on A D C, who seems able to work but he has a doctor's statement that he mentally and physically could not at the present time. He publicly made this statement, "If I can get my family on A D C it will be the best thing that ever happened to my family." I agree it would. Is it not time for us in this legislature to consider how far we are going along this line?

I believe if this motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, does not carry, it will be a directive from this branch of the legislature to the Department of

Health and Welfare that this legislature feels they should get busy and not take the cold-blooded idea of flushing a few people off the rolls, but go out and investigate and see if everything done by the department in the past was perfect; and from that angle, I believe the amount of space this department covers, this matter of \$149,000 could well be taken care of, and I think it would be an honor to this legislature and this department to find they were still working for the taxpayers of the State of Maine.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, I rise to ask a question. I am just a bit confused because of some of the practices we have been following at this session and I wish to ask the Chair or whoever wishes to answer that if we report unfavorably or accept an "Ought Not to Pass" report, does that kill the bill and keep it from getting any further consideration? Upon two other occasions here we have passed a bill in this Senate that was killed in the other branch and that finished it. One was also passed in the other branch and killed here and that finished that. It seems to me that we are not going at this in a way to give it full consideration if this action affects this bill in the same way as the other I have mentioned, I think the Senators ought to know it so that they may vote accordingly. I ask that as a question. If we accept the "Ought Not to Pass" report does that make the decision final?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state in answer to the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Bishop, that every bill and resolve must pass both branches of the legislature separately and every bill or resolve that is killed in one branch of the legislature is dead.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, might it not be well to also inform the Senator that a motion to reconsider would be in order at the proper time from the side that voted with the prevailing side on the question?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair assumed that the Senator knew that a motion to reconsider is always in order.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President, I was very much impressed with the figures that have been quoted regarding the Department of Health and Welfare. The Department of Health and

Welfare has three million dollars to spend between now and the end of the year. The amount of the appropriation they are asking in this emergency is about 5% of that amount, and yet they tell us that they are going to take 20% away from the children and the veterans who comprise about one-third of all the people the serve in that department. I am impressed with the arguments of the proponents on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, but I am also impressed with the figures that economies can be made that will make this appropriation unnecessary.

Mr. DUNBAR of Washington: Mr. President and Senators, I hesitate to inject myself into this debate. I didn't decide to do so until just a second or so ago. The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Williams has made out a perfect case for a full investigation of the Health and Welfare Department and at the proper time I feel that that department should be carefully looked into and if there is any fault with the personnel, from the lowest field worker to the Commissioner, let us do something to clean it up. If the overhead is too large let us do something to take care of it. But as I understand the measure before us today, introduced by the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, that is not the proposition. The proposition is what are we going to do to take care of the dependents on a program that they have already set up from now until the end of the fiscal year on June 30th.

The Senator from Penobscot says — and I have the highest respect for his integrity and ability, especially when it comes to a matter of handling figures — that there is now a deficit, or will be of \$279,000, of which they have \$130,000 available. Now, what are you going to do? Are you going to say that we are going to stop now and if the average amount that we are paying to those dependents is five or six dollars a week, are we going to say to them, "From now on until the end of June you cannot live on five or six dollars a week but you are going to have two dollars and a half or three dollars a week."

The Senator from Penobscot, Senator Williams has said — and I have the highest opinion of him — and he has cited to you certain iso-

lated cases — and there are outstanding cases that need and call for an investigation. But what are you going to do with those cases that do not stand in the same light? I believe in living within one's income. It was taught to me from necessity as a boy. But if a department is doing things that it shouldn't do let us investigate it and let us not cut these children off with just a little clothing and something to eat from now until June 30th.

We are sitting here today. We are all right. We are well fed and we are well clothed but if we stopped in the homes of many of the wives and widows and children throughout this state, we wouldn't hesitate to stand behind the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, this morning and vote to substitute the bill for the report of the committee. I shall be glad to so stand.

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, had my colleague the Senator from Washington County, Senator Dunbar, not spoken to you, I would have tried to make some remarks along the same line. I have been sitting here wondering just why this report came out of the Appropriations Committee and it has seemed to me, as the argument has developed, that it is an attempt on the part of the Appropriations Committee to spank a state department. In fact, one of the gentlemen who has argued against the motion of Senator Haskell has so indicated. I for one deeply resent an attempt to spank a state department when the blow misses it completely and falls sharply on the knuckles of young hands which are reaching out to the great state of Maine for subsistence. I hope the Senate will go along and substitute the bill for the Majority Report of this committee. It certainly seems to me to be the wrong place to spank a state department.

Mr. CLEAVES of Cumberland: Mr. President, I hate to rise in opposition to the statement of the Senator from Aroostook (Senator Barnes) of whom I think a great deal but I want this Senate to know that spanking a state department is the last thing the Appropriations Committee had in mind. I have presented to you a financial picture from which we had to make our decision and I am here to say that we have got to do something to cut these rising costs and that is what



we are trying to do before this Senate.

Mr. SAVAGE of Somerset: Mr. President, I hesitate to say anything. Senator Cleaves has said everything about the way the Committee feels but I would like to remind the Senators that no children's hands have been struck yet who are reaching out for food and there is no deficiency yet. It is just an anticipated deficiency. That department has on hand now three million dollars, and according to Senator Williams, he thinks there are ways to make economies. In the next three or four months with costs coming down these families are not going to need fuel or warm clothing and there is a way to get through. That is the way I think the department stands. They have said that is the way they have decided to do. But I think there is another way to do those things. I think there are ways to make economies and I hope the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell does not prevail.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot: Mr. President, if every time that a member of the Appropriations Committee says that they have got to cut a few dollars off from someone's department or someone's pet project, it is said that the Committee is trying to spank them, I want to go on record now that you will find I am going to do quite a lot of spanking before the session is over. I am very sorry that my good friend, the Senator from Aroostook (Senator Barnes) feels that I am trying to spank anyone. I believe the people of the state of Maine would appreciate a little economy, whether it is in the Department of Health and Welfare or any other department, if we on the Appropriations Committee think we can get along without producing that money. I think if we can't, a lot of voters in the state of Maine will have a good opportunity to spank us literally if we go back and say we never raised our voices and that we allowed the bureaucracy in Augusta to continue as it has been without standing up for the taxpayers of the state of Maine. There is an attitude around this state house which I don't particularly like. I know it is the trend in government for all bureaus and departments to feel that they are somewhat supreme. I admit that

some of those departments know a lot more about their subject than I do or maybe any member of the Appropriations Committee, but after all, we are the elected representatives of the people and I feel that we have a right, even though some of those departments might think we are trying to spank them, to watch out and see that those departments are kept in line with what the state of Maine can afford to pay for.

I don't know. Maybe we want to wait until next year to try any economy but I believe it should be pointed out to this department that economy should be started now and if I had here a list of the transfers of funds within this department during this biennium I don't think you would be too much impressed with the fact that a few accounts here are sacred.

There is one field worker in this department whom I don't know but who said in a letter explaining what she or he felt could be done with this department to help—I am not going to read the whole article—but this field worker was very much interested in the job and made these statements:

"They question the value received from Manuals of Instruction" which has required the entire time of one senior welfare worker at a salary of \$48 per week for three years and the continual expense of this worker in revising and rewording instructions found, upon application, to be unworkable. They question the necessity of expense for printing and paper used in changed forms, materials, etc. They question the value of a publicity department whose services so far have given little defense and have apparently not been effective in strengthening public relationship between municipalities and the Department of Public Welfare. We need publicity but we believe this can best be attained by satisfactory service and its recognition."

I don't know that it is necessary to go on. But I believe that this department—and I have confidence in the head of this department and the officials of it that if they are given directives from this Body to go out and try to save money that they could provide the \$149,000 and I don't believe it necessary that one child be taken from the list. In fact, I think they should go out and investigate and find a lot more needy

people whom they keep on this accursed waiting list which they delight in having in the line of old age assistance, as well as in the line of children, because there are people on those lists today who are in greater need than other people who have been placed on the receiving lists. I believe that what we need is economy and I think this department, if they had the right directives, could go out and do it.

Mr. MURCHIE of Washington: Mr. President, in spite of the remarks made by the very capable gentlemen here, I want to go on record now before the vote, as being opposed to the motion. The point I have is just this, we better have a little jolt now or else we are going to have a considerable crash which has got to come.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, that the resolve be substituted for the "ought not to pass" report of the committee.

A division of the Senate was had. Eight having voted in the affirmative and twenty-one opposed, the motion failed of passage.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Savage of Somerset, the "ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Miss Clough of

Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table, Resolve in Favor of a Special Recess Committee to Study the Creation of Domestic and Family Courts and Report to the Legislature (S. P. 283) (L. D. 806) tabled by that Senator on March 11th pending assignment for second reading; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Welch of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table, Bill, An Act Relative to Transportation of Deer (H. P. 828) (L. D. 478) tabled by that Senator on March 5th pending passage to be engrossed.

Mr. WELCH: Mr. President, I now move this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game, and I might say in explanation that I have talked with members of that committee and this motion is agreeable to them.

The motion prevailed and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.