

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

Tuesday, April 15, 1947.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Shibley D. Malouf of Hallowell.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

From the House:

Bill "An Act to Provide a Town Council and Manager Form of Government for the Town of Old Orchard Beach." (H. P. 20) (L. D. 11)

(In the Senate on March 19th, 1947, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.)

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

In the Senate, House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A was read and on motion by Mr. Davis of York, the Senate voted to recede from its former action whereby the bill as amended by Committee Amendment A and by Senate Amendment A was passed to be engrossed; and to further recede from its action whereby Senate Amendment A was adopted.

Thereupon, on further motion by the same Senator, House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment A, and by Senate Amendment A as amended by House Amendment A thereto, was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

House Committee Reports

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve, in Favor of Procuring Testimonials for the Purpose of Marking the Unmarked Graves of the Soldiers of the Revolutionary War." (H. P. 1497) (L. D. 1122) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Appropriating a Fund to Repair and Recondition the Lot and Monument of a Former Maine Governor." (H. P. 1016) (L. D. 649) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of the Belfast Home for Aged Women." (H. P. 153) (L. D. 118) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of the Maine Historical Society," (H. P. 152) (L. D. 145) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Education on "Resolve Relating to Teachers' Pensions for Certain Persons." (H. P. 237) (L. D. 166) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Trapping of Foxes." (H. P. 1022) (L. D. 653) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Permit the Town of Scarborough to Take Advantage of a Proposed Government Project." (H. P. 1657) (L. D. 1352) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Meetings of Certain School Districts." (H. P. 1654) (L. D. 1347) 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 Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve Providing Water Facilities for the Passamaquoddy Indians at Pleasant Point." (H. P. 1535) (L. D. 1166) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Creating a School District for the Oakfield-Merrill-Smyrna-Dyer Brook Community." (H. P. 1627) (L. D. 1301) 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.

Communication

STATE OF MAINE
House of Representatives
Office of the Clerk
Augusta

April 11, 1947

Honorable Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate
of the 93rd Legislature
Sir:

Pursuant to Joint Rule 8, the Senate is hereby notified that Bill "An Act to Regulate the Sale of Fireworks" (H. P. 1189) (L. D. 756) which the Senate had passed to be engrossed, was indefinitely postponed in the House today.

Respectfully,

HARVEY R. PEASE,

Clerk

Which was read and ordered placed on file.

First Reading of Printed Bills

Bill "An Act Relating to Trapping of Beaver." (S. P. 508) (L. D. 1398)

Bill "An Act Relating to Fees for Registration of Motor Trucks and Basis Therefor." (S. P. 509) (L. D. 1397)

Bill "An Act Creating an Agency to Rehabilitate the Atlantic Sea Run Salmon." (S. P. 510) (L. D. 1396)

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

Senate Committee Reports

Mr. Williams from the Committee on Welfare pursuant to Joint Order (S. P. 443) submitted its report.

Which report was read and on motion by the same Senator, the report was tabled for printing and especially assigned for this afternoon.

Order**(Out of Order)**

On motion by Mr. Williams of Penobscot, it was

ORDERED that the supporting data accompanying the report from the Committee on Welfare (S. P. 516) be printed in pamphlet form.

Senate Committee Report

Mr. Batchelder from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Change the Charter of the City of Calais." (S. P. 490) (L. D. 1356) reported that the same ought

to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A."

Which report was read and adopted and the bill read once.

Mr. Murchie of Washington presented Senate Amendment A to Committee Amendment A and moved its adoption:

"Senate Amendment A to Committee Amendment A to S. P. 490, L. D. 1356, bill, An Act to Change the Charter of the City of Calais. Amend said amendment by striking out in the 4th and 5th lines of said amendment the words 'to be elected from each ward from the registered voters of each ward' and inserting in place thereof the following words: 'of whom shall be a resident of Ward 1 or Ward 2, one of whom shall be a resident of Ward 7, and 5 of whom shall be elected at large.'"

Which amendment was adopted; Committee Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A was adopted without reading, and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A thereto, was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Relating to Construction of Dormitories at the University of Maine." (H. P. 193) (L. D. 138)

Bill "An Act Relating to Close Time on Scallops." (H. P. 471) (L. D. 276)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Public Loan Corporation of Augusta." (H. P. 1675) (L. D. 1388)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Family Finance Corporation." (H. P. 1676) (L. D. 1387)

Bill "An Act Relating to Pollution of Streams." (H. P. 1677) (L. D. 1389)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Casualty and Surety Insurance Rate Regulation." (H. P. 65) (L. D. 50)

Bill "An Act to Provide for an Increase to be Paid for Clerk Hire in the Office of the Register of Deeds in the County of Cumberland and Salary of Deputy Register of Deeds." (H. P. 180) (L. D. 128)

Bill "An Act Relating to Inheritance Taxes." (H. P. 1024) (L. D. 655)

Bill "An Act Relating to Auctions and Auctioneers." (H. P. 1289) (L. D. 943)

Bill "An Act Relating to Trial Justices." (H. P. 1636) (L. D. 1316)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Fire, Marine and Inland Marine Insurance Rate Regulation." (H. P. 64) (L. D. 49)

Bill "An Act Relating to Open Season for Scallops in Certain Waters." (H. P. 1550) (L. D. 1180)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Cleaves of Cumberland was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. CLEAVES of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would like to have you consider with me for just a moment the thinking of the Appropriations Committee on all of these appropriation bills that we have reported out either "ought to pass" or "ought not to pass."

Our problem, as I stated before here in the Senate a month ago, was which comes first the hen or the egg, and that problem still exists. That problem now is being passed on to the Legislature. We haven't arrived at the answer as yet. Now, in all of these appropriation bills, we had three problems that confronted us: First, should we consider these bills from a monetary standpoint? Second, should we consider them from their merits? Third, if we considered them from their merits, would we not be confusing the legislature if we passed them out "ought to pass" by making the legislature feel that we, in our opinion, felt that these were good bills, and that in some way we could find the money to take care of them.

We tried all three methods at the start, and finally we landed back to the monetary consideration. The dollar sign was always in front of our eyes, just exactly the same, Members, as it would be before your eyes. You can not spend money if you haven't got it. So, we passed

a lot of these bills out "ought not to pass."

That, in effect, is telling you, Members, that we can not see the money that will go with these bills. We, ourselves, feel that the merit of a lot of these bills is excellent, and that they should be passed. The chances are about even that members of this committee who have voted "ought not to pass," in the end will vote "ought to pass."

So, what I am arriving at is this. The problem is still before us, which came first the hen or the egg. If we hold these papers on the table awaiting the tax bill, and the tax bill awaits our ultimate decision on the actual dollar value that we have to place on this whole legislative situation, we can dillydally along for a long time to come.

I am going to ask the Senate if they won't consider these bills entirely from their merit alone. Let's assume that the money is there. If you feel that they should be passed, pass them and let's get them out, and when they come back for enactment, some member of the Appropriations Committee will table them at the enactment stage, until we finally have the picture from our proposed tax bill.

If we don't get the tax, we will have to indefinitely postpone them. If we do get the tax, we can move them on. It is a rather mixed-up situation, and if you would do that, I am quite sure that we will hasten this legislation.

Thank you.

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

On motion by Mr. Bishop of Sagadahoc, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to Instruction in Scientific Alcohol Education in the Public Schools (S. P. 343) (L. D. 976) tabled by that Senator on April 10 pending passage to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Savage of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Providing for the Perambulation of the Maine and New Hampshire Boundary Line (H. P. 850) (L. D. 506) tabled by that Senator on March

13 pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same Senator, under suspension of the rules the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, and that Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its passage.

"Senate Amendment A to H. P. 850, L. D. 506, An Act Providing for the Perambulation of the Maine and New Hampshire Boundary Line. Amend said bill by striking out in the 2nd line of section 4 thereof the words, 'two thousand dollars' and inserting in place thereof, the figures '\$2,500.'"

Mr. SAVAGE of Somerset: Mr. President, I will say in explanation of that amendment that in 1937 when this work was done before, it cost \$2400 and so we have come to the conclusion that it will cost at least \$2400 to \$2500 to perform that work again. New Hampshire has already provided \$2400. I move that the Senate adopt the amendment and pass the bill to be engrossed.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment A was adopted and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Dube of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report "Ought Not to Pass" from the Committee on Legal Affairs on bill, An Act Relating to Marriage After Intentions are Filed (S. P. 213) (L. D. 574); tabled by that Senator on February 27, pending adoption of the report.

Mr. DUBE of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I now move that the bill be substituted for the "ought not to pass" report, and I wish to present an amendment.

I have received several letters on on this matter within the past two months since I tabled this bill, and I would like to read one or two letters which I now have in front of me.

"Dear Sir: The writer notes with interest an article in this morning's Bangor Daily News, which states that you are presenting a bill requiring a waiting period before divorce is effective in this State.

"This is a similar statement to one made by Judge Mahoney of the

Portland Municipal Court a few weeks ago, and I agree with both of you that the divorce rate in this State and Country is appalling."

Here is another quotation from another letter. "Think your proposed revision in the marriage laws is very good. Believe, as you say, it will cut down on the number of divorcees, and they could certainly stand being cut down. Noticed in the newspaper recently that there were more than 200 divorcees granted in this particular county. Isn't that awful? Evidently, people don't understand each other—have no common interests—before they're married. It's hard enough to make a go of marriage when both are 'pulling together' but it's practically impossible when the two are antagonistic to each other."

I have here a clipping that I found only two days ago. It says, "Divorces end 28 marriages. Decrees awarded to 24 wives—custody of 29 children involved."

When I appeared before the Committee, members of the Senate, they told me that 90 days would be a little bit too long a waiting period for such a law. We now have a five-day waiting period in the State of Maine. I was told that if I could cut that down to 30 or 45 days, the bill might have some consideration. Now, the only purpose of my bringing up this matter is that I feel the State can not afford any more expenses in helping to bring up the children of people that are being divorced at the present time.

In other words, during the war, and at the end of the war, too many quick marriages were performed, and now too many people are being divorced. I feel that if this thirty-day period was enacted into our five-day law, it would change the trend. Instead of increasing the number of divorcees, it might decrease them.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this proposal will not affect most of us to be sure. It may help the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Dube when he makes up his mind to get married. I will state, however, that in the state of California, they have a waiting period of six months, I believe. The statistics show that more than half of the filed intentions never materialize and because of that they

have cut down their divorce rate materially. It seems to me it is a good move and that the bill has a lot of merit.

Mr. BATCHELDER of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, as I understand it, this bill calls for a waiting period of ninety days on the filing of intentions of marriage. At the present time, our law calls for five days. The purpose of that is so that if there is any reason why people should not be joined in marriage there is a waiting period of five days. I don't see where extending that waiting period is going to give us any further reasons why these people should not be joined in marriage. I don't think this bill has anything to do with the waiting period after a divorce is granted, such as they have in some states, where they can't enter into another marriage for a period of a year.

Immediately following a war—and the same thing happened after the last war—we always find that there have been a great many hasty marriages and later these result in divorce. I think we are probably going through a period of that sort at the present time. I think this matter will straighten itself out. I hope the motion of the Senator does not prevail.

Mr. DUBE: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this amendment which I wish to present, cuts the waiting period from ninety days to thirty days. I am sincere in thinking that if some young couple who have known each other only a short time decide that they will be happy together for the next fifty or sixty years and get married hurriedly, it may not work out. That is why I have had some backing on this matter. I still think that if you don't want to make it 90 days, at least a 30 day waiting period to decide such an important matter, is not too long a time.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Dube that the bill be substituted for the "Ought Not to Pass" report of the committee. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being doubted.

A division of the Senate was had.

Eleven having voted in the affirmative and sixteen opposed, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Batchelder of York, the "Ought Not

to Pass" report of the committee was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Dunbar of Washington

Recessed until four o'clock this afternoon.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

First Reading of a Printed Bill Out of Order

Bill, "An Act Relative to Operation of Boats" (S. P. 513) (L. D. 1403)

Which was read once, and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Senate Committee Report

Mr. Leavitt from the Committee on Public Health on bill, "An Act Relating to Persons Handling Food" (S. P. 340) (L. D. 964) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which report was read and adopted.

The President laid before the Senate, Report from the Committee on Welfare pursuant to Joint Order (S. P. 443) submitting its report together with supporting documents, and the President recognized the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, because of the importance of this report which your committee on Welfare presented this morning, I think it might be well to make a few brief comments upon this report. In no respect do I expect to touch upon many of the important points but simply to give you some idea as to the high points of this report as we see them.

At the beginning of this session of the legislature, I think you will all recall we felt we were probably facing a very difficult financial problem of raising money necessary to carry on state government, and probably for that reason as much as any, a great many members of this legislature were asking this question, "Is it necessary for the Department of Health and Welfare, especially those functions of that department that have to do with public assistance, to expand to the

amount that was projected in the request of that department?"

As I was appointed chairman of the Committee on Welfare, I became interested in this problem and before anything was said publicly about it, I went about the legislature to quite an extent asking different ones what they thought of the Department of Welfare, and the answer that I received very commonly from a lot of members of both branches of the legislature was, "I thing something ought to be done about it. We should find out why they are spending so much money." Probably with that feeling more than anything else, your Committee on Welfare started in a very modest and humble way to try to find out something about this department.

First we had public hearings in which the department was called in to explain many of their functions and in which I believe they did a good job. The public was also there but it appeared as time went on that in order to do a good job we really should find an answer to this question and perhaps that it was something more than a Committee of the Legislature could do. In fact, there was so much feeling among members of the legislature regarding this department that they reached a point where I think the Committee on Welfare felt that in fairness to the department and in fairness to the taxpayers of the state of Maine and in fairness to all concerned some outside practical investigation of this department or a study of its functions should be undertaken.

So with that in mind we secured, after a Joint Order was passed without opposition in this legislature, the services of Stanley Bird, an attorney of Waterville who had had experience with the FBI, to carry on an examination of what was actually going on in the field in the matter of a spot check, and also secured the services of Ernst and Ernst, who are a widely known accounting firm.

Now in this document which you see before you which I think many of you have scanned over somewhat this afternoon, which will give in the first place somewhat of an introduction which covers the scope of this investigation, the personnel employed to go into the field to do the investigation and the procedure carried out. So I think, because there has been a lot of discussion

before the examination or study was really started, those who felt it was unnecessary in the state of Maine said we had made a mistake on the cases we had chosen. That is a question for the members of this legislature to decide. In this report is a summary of all those cases which were reviewed and so I believe it now becomes the province of this legislature to decide whether or not it was a mistake. I will read under this section the procedure that was adopted under which these cases to be checked were chosen.

"In selecting the cases to be checked, a warrant was obtained from the Controller's Office which contained the names of all the recipients for the month of February, 1947. In the Old Age Assistance cases the warrant indicated those cases which were new grants. Names were taken from the new grants because it was believed that a study of the new cases would indicate the present activities of the department. A selection of 250 names was made by making a check mark opposite names at random. An effort was made to make the selection evenly over the entire state keeping in mind the relative density of the population in different areas. In the Aid to Dependent Children cases the warrant did not indicate the new grants. A selection of 150 names was made at random as in the Old Age Assistance cases. For the purpose of this study no cases were utilized which were not in this selection."

At this time I think maybe our committee should make an apology to members of both branches of this legislature who have brought in names to the committee asking that they be investigated. It was our original intent that as soon as these names taken under this system were investigated to try to take up all the names possible, and in fact we did investigate a few of them in one section, and in that case the judgment of the legislature was upheld, so to all those who spent, as I know a few members of the legislature did, a week-end in trying in their own cities to see whether a good job was being done. I am sorry we could not make that check, but had we taken simply the names of folks whom you and I thought were receiving too much of a grant under Old Age Assistance, it would not have been a fair

check and so if we had taken names by that system, the result which you have before you today would certainly be classified as "witch hunt," but I am convinced as more and more of those names have been brought into the committee that if the Department of Health and Welfare would investigate those names a lot of money could be saved at the present time.

I think a very important feature regarding this investigation, and one which I should mention now is that in this investigation there was brought out no fraud or anything of a scandalous nature being found on the part of any employee of this department and I hope there is not one anywhere which did not come to our attention.

You see in this book under "Interviews" it states at the beginning that the interviewer's notes were of a round table discussion with a district supervisor and four field workers. The report was carried out and the interviewers after locating those cases in the field, went into nearly every branch office and checked with the field workers what they thought regarding this work and this particular discussion here, this round table discussion of a district supervisor and four field workers was taken as it was very typical of the remarks made in all these cases. True, in not every case, we are told, did our investigator find that the supervisor and field workers would agree with everything in this interview but in general, the points they agreed to were very much the same, and so this can be taken almost as a composite idea of the field worker and many of the district supervisors.

I think it would be very good if every member of the legislature would give some real study to that section of our report under "Interviews." Now the Statistical Report which was prepared was taken directly from the cases that were investigated in the field. I always a little bit fear statistics because often we can prove our point on about anything from statistics, so I hope you will all go over this very carefully. There is a summary in the report and the first of it is a theoretical summary which would show if this investigation, under the way it was built up, if the department could work perfectly, that amount of money should be saved.

I don't think any of us expect any department as large as this one to show perfect results, but in discussing these summaries, I want to give you a few thoughts.

This is referring to the last summary on the last page, the Practical Summary:

It is the conclusion of this summary of Mr. Bird that by hard headed business administration that savings which are shown in the practical summary could be effective. This could come about without any citizen of the State, who is in actual need, being deprived of aid from the state. Your Committee report, probably somewhat on the conservative side, has stated that the savings to the state could amount to several hundred thousand dollars annually.

Your attention is called that in all the figures shown in these summaries, there is no division between State, Federal and Municipal funds. For example, in the last figure shown on the page of the Bird Practical Summary Report of \$2,721,866.84, this would be divided as follows: State, \$1,453,354.97; Federal, \$1,176,593.31; Municipal, \$91,918.56.

As a comment upon these figures, it appears quite obvious that had the department wished to do so; the deficit bill of \$149,000.00, which was defeated in the Senate early in the session, could have easily been taken care of by the department, by reviewing cases where mistakes in grants had been made; as was suggested by the Appropriations Committee. If this had been done, the drastic methods as adopted by the department would not have been necessary.

I submit those summaries for your consideration, and I think in studying them you will agree with our committee when we say that conservative estimate would be several hundred thousand dollars could be saved under efficient administration. I would like to make one comment on these figures. To me, it appears quite obvious that had the department wished to do so, that the deficit bill of one-hundred forty-nine thousand which was defeated in this Senate earlier this session could be easily taken care of by the Department by reviewing cases where mistakes in grants had been made, as was the suggestion of the Appropriations Committee.

If this had been done, the drastic methods as adopted by the Depart-

ment would not have been necessary. At the back of this book you will find the forms which were used in this investigation.

Now, in the report of Ernst and Ernst which we do not have as yet printed and placed before you, but under the order passed this morning will be printed soon, they have given a detailed report of what they considered could be accomplished by revising the administrative setup of this Department. And I want to say regarding this report that I have been told by Mr. Wilkinson of Ernst and Ernst that he considered that this report was just as complete as any that they could have given, regardless of how much time they had had to make this survey. They have had the man available, and they have come on here and made a survey which they believe is as good as their company could make at any time.

I hope that when these are printed that you will all read them. I have a report here with a few maps and graphs in it. Members of the Committee have a similar one which I hope you will borrow and study, but the subject matter will be in printed form.

Now, in this Committee Report which was presented to you this morning, you will find in that summary of this report which was given to this Committee by Ernst and Ernst, and we have this to say regarding it.

Regarding the report of Ernst and Ernst, we wish to submit the recommendations as given to the Committee in a summary of their special investigation. These recommendations are supported by their regular report and by their supplementary report, which is submitted as supporting data to this Committee Report. The committee has examined these recommendations and accompanying reports, but has not had the time for study sufficient to determine the desirability of all these recommendations and submit them for your consideration.

I think you will recall in this report that Ernst and Ernst thought that there was a possibility of saving in administration of this department by reorganization \$92,250. In order to do that, there would have to be some change in law. I want to call your attention that what we save in administration will be an annual saving. And besides

that, although, as some have mentioned to me today \$92,200 did not appear very impressive to them, when you consider that the Department this year, for the first year of the biennium, is asking for \$964,000—the budget did not recommend that amount, the departmental request was for that—I believe that \$92,500 is certainly a sizeable amount of money.

These two reports were made independent of each other, and yet there is one—or in many features they come to somewhat the same conclusions, but in one they are very emphatic, and that is the most money over a long term can be saved by the Department by the simplification of forms, records and reports. It might be well to mention that Ernst and Ernst started with the head offices and went down through the other field offices in their investigation. The Bird investigation started in the field and worked in through the field offices. They did not go beyond that point. But they believe that what is taking so much of the field workers time, today, and all connected with the Department is the matter of lengthy, prose reports and records. Many of those run to eight or ten pages. They have both made the same recommendation, and that is that forms be prepared where the worker in the field can check the answers so that the form will be nearly complete when it reaches the office. In some very difficult cases, which would be out of the ordinary, for which a form could not be prepared to cover, they recommended the use of dictaphone machines to take the facts, and then they could be recorded in that manner, which would save a lot of time.

As you have heard many times, in the operation of this Department for several years past, a worker spent, usually four days, or four and a half days of their five-and-a-half-day week in the field. Now, it has reached a point where they do not plan to spend more than two days in the field, due in a large measure, they tell us, to the forms, records and reports that are required of the field workers. In this report, I think that a great deal of this interview of workers and supervisors is in a discussion of that very point.

Both reports spell out in big letters the lack of administrative ability from the top to the bottom of the Department as one of the big

weaknesses. If administration can be strengthened, or put on a comparable basis with administration by a business corporation of similar size, the conditions of the Department that are worrying members of the legislature would not exist.

Inefficient management is depriving many needy citizens of the assistance of the State that they are entitled to. There is now a waiting list in Old Age Assistance of over 1500 cases, and if you believe the facts as presented in these reports are true, there should be money available to care for those on this list who are in actual need, if the funds are distributed on an equitable basis.

I want to say that the Committee is having prepared all the changes in law which have come to the attention of Stanley Bird and Ernst and Ernst that are needed to bring about these reforms in the department that have been suggested. It is the plan to have next Thursday of this week a public hearing on bills now before the Committee in new draft, and I hope that this legislature will take an interest in those bills and present their views to the Committee at that time.

It would seem that there might be a great many things in these reports that members of this legislature would be interested in discussing more fully with the gentlemen who prepared it. So, for that reason, Mr. Wade of Ernst and Ernst will be here for at least two more days this week to discuss the report of his company with any who wish to discuss it with him, and after tomorrow, Mr. Bird will be available for as long as he is needed to discuss this report.

At this time, I would like to thank for the Committee all of the members of this legislature who helped out in the conducting of this study. I know that many have gone to great length to prepare ideas and suggestions for the Committee and for the investigators. I want to specially mention the help that His Excellency the Governor has given in this study, not from the viewpoint of directing the legislature what to do, but in the fact that time has been so important in this investigation, that often we have had to call upon the prestige of his office to secure the folks that were needed to do some of the jobs, and especially when we were trying to start this investigation and it ap-

peared rather difficult to bring in the right men to conduct it. Some of the attorneys who travel around these halls, at times have been very helpful to members of the Committee like myself who have not had a legal training.

I think if anything shall come from this investigation, that this is the time for us to decide whether we wish this theory, which some have called that of doing all things for all people, to continue in this Department. We have in the Department of Health and Welfare a great many folks that are fine citizens, whose hearts are overflowing with human kindness for all mankind. I think we are fortunate that so many of the employees of this Department are of that type. It appears what is necessary is to flavor the Department with a few people of strong business ability, and in that way we might have a strong Department.

Any ideas which appear foreign to the principles of the State of Maine that have crept into this Department, I want to state emphatically are not the product of this particular year, but they are the product of several years, creeping in until that philosophy which has not been that held by the State of Maine during most of its life, has come to be the ruling force behind this Department.

So, I believe that it is time, maybe, for the legislature of the State of Maine to act as to what they believe the underlying philosophy of the Department of Health and Welfare should be.

Thereupon, the report was received and ordered placed on file, and sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Bishop of Sagadahoc, the Senate voted to take from the table, bill, An Act Relating to Reimbursing Towns for Tuition for Pupils Attending Secondary Schools (S. P. 501) (L. D. 1369) tabled by that Senator on April 9 pending passage to be engrossed and that Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

"Senate Amendment 'A' to S. P. 501, L. D. 1369, Bill 'An Act Relating to Reimbursing Towns for Tuition for pupils Attending Secondary Schools.'

Amend said Bill by striking out the 21st, 22nd and 23rd lines of that part designated 'Sec. 99' and

inserting in place thereof the following underlined words:

'Add the amounts paid for teachers' wages, fuel, janitor service, text-books, supplies, ordinary minor repairs, premiums paid on insurance and 3 percent of the insured value of the school for depreciation; (2) from this amount subtract state and, or federal subsidy paid on teaching positions,

courses, or per capita aid on account of this school:'"

Which amendment was adopted and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Batchelder of York

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.