

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Legislative Record

OF THE

Eighty-Ninth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1939

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

## HOUSE

Tuesday, April 4, 1939.

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

The Lord's Prayer was repeated in unison by the House, led by Mr. Thompson of Castle Hill, a member of the House.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

### Senate Bill in First Reading

Bill "An Act relating to Exemption of Homes from Claims in re Old Age Assistance" (S. P. 124) (L. D. 114)

Bill was read twice and tomorrow assigned.

### Senate Bill with Committee Amendment in First Reading

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Motor Vehicles on Bill "An Act relating to Dealers in Motor Vehicles" (S. P. 385) (L. D. 786) reporting "Ought to pass" when amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Comes from the Senate, report read and accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the House: The bill had its two several readings. Committee Amendment "A" read by the Clerk and adopted in concurrence, and the bill was assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

### Orders

Mr. LaFleur of Portland, presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the commissioner of inland fisheries and game be directed to carry on an investigation into the advisability of establishing a system of game preserves based upon the need of the same as a means of conserving and perpetuating game, and to report his findings to the 90th Legislature together with such recommendations as he may deem expedient, and to carry on a biological investigation of all existing game preserves or sanctuaries, and recommend to the 90th Legislature the discontinuance of any

game preserves or sanctuaries which do not produce results in the conservation and propagation of game which would warrant their continuance.

The order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. LaFleur of Portland, presented the following order and moved its passage:

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that the commissioner of inland fisheries and game be directed to carry on a ichthyological and biological survey of all waters for which screen resolves were introduced into the 89th Legislature, and such other waters as he may deem advisable for the purpose of ascertaining the advisability of screening said waters, and to report the findings of said survey together with such recommendations as he may deem advisable and expedient to the 90th Legislature.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Clerk to read that as the 90th Legislature, where the resolves were introduced? I did not know the 90th Legislature had yet convened.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman that the order reads "89th".

The order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Bubar of Weston, it was

ORDERED, that the Rev. Zebedee Andrews be invited to officiate as Chaplain of the House of Representatives on Thursday morning, April 6th.

### Reports of Committees House Divided Reports

Majority Report of the Committee on Salaries and Fees reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Reducing the Compensation of State Officials and Employees" (H. P. 1716) (L. D. 892)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. LEWIS of Lincoln  
HARKINS of Androscoggin  
SPEAR of Cumberland  
—of the Senate.

McGILLICUDDY of Houlton  
FORD of Saco  
CHURCHILL of Brewer  
FERNALD of Levant

—of the House.

Minority Report of same Com-

mittee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DOWNS of Rome  
DOUGLAS of Gorham  
—of the House.

Mr. FERNALD of Levant: Mr. Speaker, I move that the "Ought not to pass" majority report be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Levant, Mr. Fernald, moves that the House accept the majority report "Ought not to pass" on this bill. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I desire to speak against the motion of the gentleman from Levant (Mr. Fernald), not only because of the fact that I introduced this particular measure but because I believe the bill itself has some merits and that the motion just made should not prevail.

In the first place, in 1933 a similar bill was introduced and passed the Legislature of this State, differing from this bill only in that the minimum was established at a ten per cent cut and it ran to thirty per cent. In this particular piece of legislation it runs from five to thirty per cent. I might say that the bill passed in 1933 effected a saving of \$340,000 for the State of Maine.

It seemed to us when we convened here in session this year that we faced a crisis that was not much different from the one facing the State in 1933, and it was for that reason and for that reason only that this bill was introduced.

I recognize that it is perhaps the most unpopular bill that has been presented on the floor of the House, especially if we confine our activities to the State House itself.

I recognize full well that the merits of this bill are not going to be properly presented when one with my limited ability attempts to present those facts. But certainly, if a bill has been introduced and it does possess any merit, there must be some reason back of it, and I wish to submit to you the reasons in brief, why I believe that the State was facing a crisis when this Legislature convened and that that crisis still exists as a matter of fact.

Going back to 1903, we find that the valuation of this State at that

time, the assessed valuation, was approximately \$305,000,000 and that the tax rate was .02025. Now we find that in 1938 that had grown to \$524,000,000, and that during the same period of time the tax levied by the State on the towns and cities had multiplied approximately two and a half times. What has been the result of that inequitable system of taxation? Just this:

In the County of Androscoggin we find that in 1938 they have unpaid taxes of more than \$512,000 from the cities and towns of Androscoggin. In the so-called prosperous county of Cumberland, we find a total of \$958,000 in unpaid taxes, while in Aroostook we find \$1,370,000 in unpaid taxes, not including 1938. That leaves us but one conclusion, namely, that the taxpaying ability of the people of this State has already been passed in trying to maintain the State government and local government as it now exists. I would also like to call your attention to the fact that there are at the present time delinquent State taxes to the extent of \$587,000.

Now all these things have come about, and we recognize that many of our towns are just on the border line between being able to pay their own way and going into insolvency. We maintain that thousands of our citizens in this State have already passed the time when they can continue any longer to pay or to even maintain the present demands made upon them.

It is for this reason that this bill was introduced and it is upon those grounds that we maintain it has some justification. We are making our appeal for the thousands of people in this State with whom we have come in contact. We know that during these trying years men and women with small bank accounts representing the savings of a lifetime have year after year been called upon to meet the obligations of the towns and counties to the State, and we know that today they have reached a point where there is no revenue and no opportunity for that class of citizens in this State.

We want to point out to you that we have in this State a vanishing frontier insofar as agriculture is concerned, and we want to say that the same thing applies to industry. They are both with their backs to the wall, and no matter how much we may advertise and play up the

idea of the recreational opportunities of this State, we have got to decide, when that is all over, that unless this State has a reasonably prosperous agriculture and industry that is able to pay its way, we are not going to have the type of prosperity we need, if we are going to maintain and preserve this top-heavy system of State government—and that is exactly what we have in this State.

Now, in closing, we maintain that this bill would save the State more than \$300,000, probably nearer \$400,000. It would not reduce a single employee of the State to the ranks of the W. P. A.—I mean to their wage scale. It would not add a single citizen of this State to the relief rolls. It would not reduce the efficiency of the State government and it might very possibly result in economies. We maintain that for all the vacancies created because men would not be satisfied to continue to serve the State at the new wage scale, those positions could be filled just as soon as the Governor of this State had an opportunity to post the names and the Council to confirm those appointments. Any statement to the contrary is entirely out of order, we believe.

So we offer this bill, not as a solution of the financial problems of the State but as something that fits into this picture. We maintain it was justified when it was introduced, because we were facing a crisis, and even though the Economy Committee is bringing in some excellent recommendations which may effect a saving of more than half a million dollars to the State, we still maintain that an emergency exists, because since the Legislature convened the Governor, in a special message to this body, has informed us that the Health and Welfare Department alone has overrun its estimated expenditure by more than half a million dollars. So our problems are still with us.

We recognize that it is unpopular to make any suggestion that looks like a reduction in wages, but we maintain that during the last five or ten years every citizen of the State, regardless of the position that he holds and regardless of his walk in life, has had to make some sacrifice, and we maintain that in this emergency not even those who are employed by the State, and who themselves possess a degree of se-

curity that the average citizen does not possess, should be exempt and immune from paying their part. That is all we ask.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I was much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Richardson, but I take exception to the side that he represents.

In the first place, this is class legislation pure and simple. I do not see why we should particularly pick on the employees of the State and say that they should take care of these taxes.

Another reason that I oppose it is that there is no consideration whatever of the merits of the bill. Some of these employees need every cent they are now getting to get along. I do not think it is a fair proposition, without giving every consideration to the particular facts, to say that we are going to slash these people right and left.

We are trying to be economical, and I am most interested in this Legislature trying to get money to take care of the old age pension. I believe we can do it. The thing I am afraid of is that in our efforts to keep down expenses everywhere and anyhow we are going to do a great deal of injustice. I do not think it is necessary for us to do such an injustice. The State of Maine may be poor, but it is far from being bankrupt. I think we are amply able to take care of our needy and to pay our employees what their services are worth. I therefore favor the report of the majority.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to bring the attention of this body to the action that was taken on the proposal to levy a tax of one per cent on all employees in the State of Maine, one per cent upon all those who labor for a weekly or a daily wage or for a salary.

Now when this bill was reported back to the House it had no consideration whatsoever; the only speaker for it was the proponent of the bill and he admitted singing only the swan-song or at least he only sang a lullaby to put it to sleep. He would lay the bill away and bring it forth at such time in the closing hours of the Legislature as it was felt absolutely necessary to levy such a tax.

I would take it from that that this body did not see fit to place

the burden of this very worthy object of obtaining money for the aged on the sixty-five thousand employees of the State.

Now surely if we did not feel we should apply a direct tax on labor as a whole in this State, most assuredly we should not select this very small segment of labor, and, to use the vernacular, sock it to them just because we are in a position where we can apparently reach out and take it. I trust the motion to accept the majority report, "Ought not to pass," will prevail.

Mr. DOUGLASS of Gorham: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: As a signer of this minority report, I feel it my duty to explain to you the reason why I signed it.

The first time this bill came up and was voted on in the committee, the vote was five for and five against the bill. It was held over to the next meeting, and the vote was then two for and seven against the bill.

I believe this Legislature is an economy Legislature, and I believe the people want us to find ways and means of reducing the expenses of the State. We showed our good faith in the beginning by reducing our expenses on newspapers; instead of having three, we reduced that number to two. The next thing we did was to cut out the bounty on porcupine. The small boy who had the privilege of going out and shooting a porcupine and getting 25 cents for it, we pounced on him and took that 25 cents away from him. That is statesmanship.

Now today we are facing this proposition of finding extra money to pay old age assistance. Under this bill as amended we would be able to save \$238,000 — and I have an amendment I would offer if this bill is not killed.

Now do you realize that State employees are paid more money in salaries than the entire tax on real estate and personal property combined? The real estate tax is \$4,872,000, and State employees are receiving over \$5,000,000 in salaries. If we are to save anything for old age assistance, we will have to save it where it is being spent. For that reason, I hope that the majority report will not be accepted.

Mr. FERNALD of Levant: Mr. Speaker, as a signer of that majority report, I wish to state that

while I am in favor of some things in the bill, we have an Economy Committee composed of some of the ablest men we have in the House, who are studying into the situation of the departments and suggesting such changes as they see fit. I consider this committee one of the most able committees, and where we gave this matter just fifteen or twenty minutes in the hearing, they are making a thorough study of it. For that reason, I am in favor of the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report.

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the arguments on this question, and I hope that the members of this House are not going to be willing to ask the State employees to contribute to old age assistance if we are not going to do it ourselves.

Mr. DOWNS of Rome: Mr. Speaker, as one of those two who signed the minority report, I think it is no more than fair perhaps that I should state my position.

We all realize the value of the services of those who would be affected by this cut, as I will call it. We have no criticism in the least and only words of commendation to make in regard to their services. But, somehow, since coming here, I have arrived at the conclusion—in fact I think I have been reminded of it several times by some of the members of this House—that we were facing an emergency. I have seen recently nothing which would lead me to believe to the contrary. We are still perplexed as to where the means for the maintenance of old age assistance is coming from. We are equally perplexed as to where the funds to finance other worthy causes are coming from. I know of no yardstick by which you can measure public service. My idea in signing this minority report was simply to ask of these people that they join with the rest of us in assisting a little in a financial way. It appears to me that labor has already made its contribution. When you bear this fact in mind—that the average income of the average family throughout the United States is something, if I am correct, like \$700 per annum, it does seem to me that some of these salaries might be reduced for the benefit of the whole people.

As I said before, we have not the

slightest criticism of these employees, but we are asking at this time if they would not be willing to contribute to the less fortunate a part of their salary.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Levant, Mr. Fernald, that the House accept the majority report of the committee on Salaries and Fees, reporting "Ought not to pass," on Bill "An Act Reducing Compensation of State Officials and Employees". The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. McGillicuddy, asks for a division. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Levant, Mr. Fernald, that the House accept the majority, "Ought not to pass" report, will rise and stand in their places until counted and the Monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-eight having voted in the affirmative and 40 in the negative, the motion prevailed and the majority report, "Ought not to pass," was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### House Divided Reports

Majority Report of the Committee on Federal Relations on Memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (H. P. 376) reporting "Ought to be adopted"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CONY of Kennebec  
—of the Senate.  
SYLVIA of Danforth  
Mrs. LATNO of Old Town  
Messrs. WILLIAMS of Bethel  
POULIN of Waterville  
SLOSBERG of Gardiner  
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to be adopted" on same Memorial.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. KENNEDY of Hancock  
MORSE of Waldo  
—of the Senate.  
PAYSON of Portland  
GRUA of Livermore Falls  
—of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the Memorial.

MEMORIAL TO THE HONORABLE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED PETITIONING FOR THE PASSAGE OF THE TOWNSEND ACT.

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 89th Legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas, recent financial upsets have destroyed the savings of many of our old people, and

Whereas, a large majority of our old people are not able to save sufficient funds to protect themselves in their old age, and

Whereas, the Townsend Plan, so-called, seems to offer the best method of protection of our older citizens, now therefore be it

RESOLVED: That we, your Memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge that the Townsend Act, so-called, or one based on the Townsend Plan, be passed; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the proper officers and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress.

Mr. PAYSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the minority report "Ought not to be adopted."

In support of my motion, I wish to say to the members of this House that I was not elected by the people of my city to pass upon this type of measure. I was elected to come down here and pass upon laws and methods of taxation and pass upon appropriations for the people of the State of Maine. If my neighbors had wanted me to determine national policies, they would have elected me to an office in which I could have voted effectively on such measures.

On such a matter as this, the peo-

ple did not elect men or any other State legislator to represent them. My neighbors and your neighbors elected Members of Congress for the specific purpose of passing upon these national matters. The voters of Maine have elected men to Congress. Those men have stated in advance of their election the policies for which they stood, and they were elected upon those statements.

It is the right of every citizen of Maine as a citizen to write directly to his Congressman, urging that Congressman to vote for any measure that that citizen favors or urge an action upon any measure that that Congressman promised in his campaign, if he has not performed it. It is neither my duty nor my right as a State Legislator to say to any man that I represent the sentiment of my community upon any measure which is national in scope and not confined to the jurisdiction of this State.

If I were a Congressman, I would resent the futile impudence of a State Legislator or any group of State Legislators who attempted to tell me how I should vote in Congress upon any matter; and, in the same way, as a member of this Legislature, I would resent a memorial from Maine's delegation in Congress telling me how to vote upon any matter purely within the State's jurisdiction.

These reasons aside, there is a still stronger one why I would never vote for the adoption of this memorial, and that reason is simply this: I would not urge a Congressman to vote for a measure which I would not vote for if I were in his place in Congress. (Applause)

If that were all that was involved in this memorial, I would not delay this House in the real and serious work of this session; I would simply sit quietly and allow the publicity seekers to attain the only object for which this measure was introduced. But there are two things in this matter that stir me to speak.

To me there is nothing lower in the scale of humanity than the professional agitator for this type of legislation. Compared to him, the man who steals pennies from a dead man's eyes is merely a petty thief, because, after all, the dead man has no use for the pennies. This professional agitator, however,

steals pennies from the living and pennies from those old living persons who need every cent that they can hoard to keep body and soul together. From the mass of these pennies, these professionals live in comfort and even in luxury, and in return for the widow's mite they hold out fugitive promises of enormous pensions, which they never expect to redeem. They steal from the poor and the aged.

The old people of this State are the same as you and I in most ways. They are good; they are bad; they are indifferent. They have lived their lives in honesty, integrity and frugality, or in dishonesty and profligacy. But, in one respect, the aged differ from us: Ambitious life is behind them, and only a pathetic hope lies ahead. The boy who was taught in school and believed that he too might some day be President of this country, is now the old man who knows that only the husks of life are left to him. The fire and the fight for achievement are gone and only the desire for peace and comfort are left. I think it must have been such aged men and women that Shakespeare had in mind when he wrote:

"Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow  
Creeps on this petty pace from day  
to day

To the last syllable of recorded  
time;

And all our yesterdays have lighted  
fools away to dusty death."

Before such aged poor people run this will-o'-the-wisp of Townsend Plenty; and from such people are the pennies and dimes stolen, and to such people comes the heartbreak of disillusion as these false Gods fall. (Applause)

Mr. FARWELL of Unity: Mr. Speaker, I wish to convey to this House a message which I received within the past week or so:

"Representative Sam Farwell,  
Augusta, Maine:

"We wish to state that as a club we do not approve of the Townsend Bill that is presented by Mr. Bubar.

"Thanking you again, we are

Sincerely,

Searsport Townsend Club No. 1,  
(Signed) R. Whitcomb, Secretary."

Mr. BUBAR of Weston: Mr. Speaker, I have not the mastery



of the English language that some of my colleagues have here and maybe I have not such a vivid imagination as the gentleman who has spoken before me.

The order was presented at the request of many of the Townsend Clubs of the State of Maine, and the reason that this order was presented was to show, if possible, the sentiment of the people of the State of Maine and to show that they were interested in doing something for the old people. It has been shown by the different speakers here this morning on other measures that it seems to be uppermost in the minds of this Legislature to do something for the old people. In fact, that seems to be the tenor of nearly every speaker we have had this morning. These measures they have tried to put through have had that in mind, to do something for the old people — increase our gasoline tax, cut salaries of the State employees and several other measures.

Now this morning I would, in brief, say to you: Are we in earnest in our efforts, or are we going at this with our fingers crossed?

I would like to see this memorial adopted and passed on to Congress, and show that the people of the State of Maine are behind this movement and that they earnestly believe that something should be done, not only for the old people of the State of Maine but for the youth as well.

Mr. McGLAUFLEN of Portland: I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am greatly surprised to find that there is a majority report on a measure of this kind. I am opposed to such a memorial. It makes me think of the mass of petitions that we receive from time to time from some ladies' club or some organization that knows very little about the matter that they have sent their petitions on.

Here is a matter where we are called upon to send a memorial, instructing Congress and instructing the President of the United States what to do, when we ourselves have not been over this measure at all except as it has been considered in committee. It seems to me that this is a matter, if of any importance at all, that has enough importance to be discussed pretty carefully in

this House before such a memorial is adopted.

One reason why I am opposed to this is that the Congress of the United States or the President himself will pay absolutely no attention to such a proposition.

There are in this State at the present time a large number of men and women who, through unfortunate circumstances, have placed themselves where they are longing for some way out, and in that desire to see that they are taken care of in their old age, they reach forth to such a measure as the Townsend Plan or the Bubar Plan that was suggested here some time ago, not because it is a possible solution of their trouble but because they hope that it may bring relief.

Now, under these circumstances, we members in this Legislature, realizing that longing in the breasts of our old people to in some way be taken care of, and to lift that tremendous care and anxiety that hangs over them,—realizing that, I say, we have come here to expend every effort in our power to try to raise money to take care of the old age relief, for which both of the major parties in this State pledged their support. And now at a time when we are using every effort to save money and to raise money and in some way to solve this problem, we have presented here a measure that is so utterly absurd in comparison with what we are trying to do that I, for one, cannot see any merits in it at all. I am not objecting to a man being a Townsendite if he thinks this is a solution. Frankly, I cannot see it, and it looks to me as though it was just building up the hopes of the old people of this State to have them shattered later on. It means catastrophe and disaster. It cannot be done that way.

I am glad to agree with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, when he says: "I do not want Congress to vote for something that I would not vote for myself."

I feel, members of the House, that it is ridiculous for us to try to pass such a memorial. Memorials to Congress should only be in cases of considerable emergency. There is not any emergency that calls for this memorial. I think it simply makes the State look ridiculous down in Washington to have us, every few days, sending down some

memorial to tell them what to do. I hope this House has sense enough and backbone enough to defeat this measure.

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure sometimes to take a stand for a matter which most everyone else is against. I find myself this morning on the side of my friend, the young man whom I helped crucify the other day, the gentleman from Weston, Mr. Bubar. I hardly know how to approach this proposition, considering the words of my good friend from Portland (Mr. Payson) who spoke first, and especially after my good friend from Portland (Mr. McGlaulin) has spoken this morning facing the Speaker, when on several occasions he has been granted permission to talk to us. (Laughter) You see you are in sort of a maze at times at the attitude of some people on some questions.

Now I wish to take issue with those that have said that they did not have respect for the judgment and opinion of every person in the State of Maine. Perhaps you do not have as much respect for some as you do for others, but it makes me think of what the person said when he said: "It is all good, but some are better than others." I wish to say at the outset that I have every respect for the judgment and the ideas and the conclusions of every citizen within the confines of this great State of ours. We have just accepted a majority report seven to two and now this one is six to four, and still one of my colleagues says that he marvels at the display of judgment of the six. As I looked them over, they seemed to stand for things in my mind, and so I wish to approach this question from a little different angle. My colleague from Portland, the first speaker, told us of the pennies that were on the dead men's eyes, etc. That makes me think of a little story that I want to tell you about, the way some of my colleagues feel and the attitude they take in the voting in this House on Old Age Assistance, and then make application of it.

It makes me think of a town years ago that wanted telephone service; everybody wanted telephone service. The telephone people came and they had a town meeting for the adoption of the proposition, and at that town meeting they actually got into a hand to hand combat. I think

there are some who will remember something about this story. You know they could not agree on which side of the street of the village to have the poles set. All of them on one side wanted telephone service but they wanted the poles on the other side of the street, and vice versa, and they actually got at it hand to hand. At last a good doctor in that town got up to try to throw a little oil on the troubled waters, and he said: "My friends"—not "Ma friends"—there is a difference. He said: "My friends, let's consider this thing with some little degree of care. We want the service and if we accept the service the poles must be placed somewhere. Let's leave this to a committee." "Why," he said, "you make me think of a patient of mine who once came to me suffering with the same ailment that Job suffered from—sore boils—and I doctored him for some little time until at last I saw him no more. The last I saw of him was on the street one day and I says: 'How are you, friend Jones, how are your boils?' He says: 'They are all gone but one.' I says, 'Where is that one?' He says: 'That one is on the hired man.'" (Laughter) So it makes a difference, a big difference. However, the town got the service.

Now we have just accepted the majority report "Ought not to pass" where we might have gotten the benefit of thousands and thousands of dollars in this economy Legislature, that blows hot on one proposition and cold on a similar proposition.

Now this memorial does not cost anything. My colleague from Portland talks about the expense. This memorial does not cost anything. But where do we find ourselves today.

In 1929 to 1932 this whole country was swept off its feet, wasn't it? You will all agree with me on that. I want to approach this proposition from a little different angle.

We were all swept off from our feet and for six years we have tried every panacea that the human mind might conceive of. We have taken all the patent remedies that could be conveyed down to Washington, but you know we never have found a man or a woman in the entire six years that was in Congress, the same body the first speaker referred to, that could pick out of the hat

of prosperity and recovery the imaginary rabbits they sought to take out for our benefit. There wasn't a real political professor of legerdemain down there. How do I know? We went from the last days of Calvin Coolidge, that little fellow you frequently heard referred to as careful, calculating Cal Coolidge, and he cut our national debt down to sixteen billion dollars. And today, after six years of trying to take to our breast some idea that might lead us out of the political wilderness, we are now talking about forty-five billion dollars as being the limit of our national debt. Since six years ago we have gone from sixteen billion dollars to talking about forty-five billion dollars.

Now along comes the Townsend Recovery Plan or whatever they call it. Some are for it, and some are against it. Some make fun of it and some malign it, and we still are wandering in the wilderness with no relief. Am I right about that? There is no question about it. Which of the two are we going to vote for? Which of the two—just a memorial to Congress representing the majority report of this Legislature, or say that we want more time to see if we cannot extend that limit of forty-five billion dollars? Call it Townsend Plan or call it any other plan you like, but you cannot do any worse a job than has been done in the last six years. And it might save the country. All of us know where we stand today, where we stand, particularly in this State. Some of you, when we are arguing Sunday movies, talk about our Puritan ancestors and our Puritan forefathers. We know that those good people dug holes in the ground, stoned up cellars and sent some of us to what little schooling we got, and now we cannot afford to pay the taxes on what they built for us. Isn't that so? Of course it is so.

Now the result is that the taxes on real estate today amount to almost confiscation and, in many instances do, because the tax collector, back in the days of old, in the book my esteemed colleague reads a great deal more than I,—they used to talk about the tax gatherer—the dreaded tax gatherer. Now the dreaded tax gatherer is gathering in much of our real estate today, gathering it in for taxes. It amounts to confiscation, nothing more or nothing less. This

proposition might save us from economic disaster. It might save us from a Dictator, and that we abhor. It might save us from something still worse and that is sliding head first into a bed of Communism. Some will say Communism—why we have not any Communism in the State of Maine. If you will send to John Wanamaker's and get some books I can give you the names of, they will tell you about Communist parades in the different cities with hundreds of thousands and even millions of people. This might save us from that bed of roses as advocated by that class of people. I believe whatever the result is, whatever the result might be from the Townsend Plan, it might be the means of saving some of the youth of this country. It might be the opportunity for the middle aged people to have a real job for more prosperous days. It might take care of the old people who a few years ago were so familiar with that little piece we used to read in the reader "Over the Hill to the Poorhouse,"—"Over the Hill to the Poorhouse." Yes, and there is another one, "Speed up when the hearse comes back." If this will do one quarter or one half of what they say about it, I am not just sending a memorial to Congress—just sending a memorial to Congress. We can be economic; we can express our views on the situation, and I want to record my vote with the gentleman from Weston (Mr. Bubar).

Mr. BROWN of Caribou: Mr. Speaker, I would like the privilege of saying just a few words in regard to the memorial. It is true that we are not passing the Townsend Act here, but if we go on record in favor of presenting this memorial to Congress we are taking the stand of representing to the world and to Congress that we are in favor of the cock-eyed plan known as the Townsend Plan. The gentleman does not tell us we are going to ask Congress to pass this bill which would mean a tax upon the people of the United States of twenty million dollars a year. If that is going to help youth, if that is going to help the working man, if that is going to help the people who have got to bear the burden, I fail to see it. If there is anything, to my mind, that would drive us into Communism any quicker than this, I don't know what it is. It places a

tax which the wage earners must pay of about twenty million a year. Surely that would drive us into Communism. I think a great many people here are actuated by what they think their political prospects might be.

I think the honorable gentleman from Belfast (Mr. Buzzell) is something like one of our Congressmen whom I saw a few days after he came out and endorsed the Townsend Plan. I called him by name, which I will not do now, and I said to him, "You do not believe in this plan any more than I do." He kind of smiled and said, "Well, a lot of people want it." I said, "Yes, you want the vote, and it is my opinion that if there was a Nudist colony in the State of Maine you would be running around without any pants on to get their vote." (Laughter).

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Hinman.

Mr. HINMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Hinman, moves the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it requires the affirmative vote of one-third of the members present.

Mr. SMITH of Thomaston: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a ye and nay vote on this motion.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the previous question will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the Monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third of the members having arisen, the question before the House is, shall the main question be put now? Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, that the House accept the minority report "Ought not to be adopted" of the Committee on Federal Relations on Memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled. The gentleman from Thomaston, Mr. Smith, asks that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays. In ac-

cordance with the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered at the request of one-fifth of the members present. All those in favor of taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand in their places until counted and the Monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Obviously less than one-fifth of the members having arisen the yeas and nays are not ordered. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, that the House accept the minority report "Ought not to be adopted" on this memorial will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the "Ought not to be adopted" report of the committee was accepted, and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time will invite the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Fellows, to come to the Speaker's desk and designate him as Speaker pro tempore.

Thereupon, the Sergeant at Arms conducted the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Fellows, to the Speaker's desk, amid the applause of the House, the members rising, Speaker Philbrick retiring.

#### Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Payson from the Committee on Federal Relations on Memorial to the Congress of the United States relative to Completion of the Quoddy Project (H. P. 238) reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Varney from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Embezzlement" (H. P. 1620) (L. D. 916)

Mr. Jewett from the Committee on Pensions reported same on Bill "An Act Exempting Life Insurance Policies from Old Age Assistance Requirements" (H. P. 787) (L. D. 376)

Mr. Dennison from the Committee on Ways and Bridges reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Dover-Foxcroft (H. P. 1069)

Mr. Stilphen from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Thorndike (H. P. 353)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

### Inexpedient

Mr. Burgess from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Resolve Authorizing Additional Issue of Highway Bonds (H. P. 1755) (L. D. 903) reported legislation inexpedient.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Building a New Bridge over the Navigable Waters of Casco Bay in Portland (H. P. 1754) (L. D. 902)

Mr. LaFLEUR of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be laid on the table. My reason for making this motion is because of the fact—

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may not debate his motion. The gentleman has already made a motion to table.

Mr. LaFLEUR: Mr. Speaker, may I withdraw the motion in order that I may make a few remarks?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may withdraw his motion if he wishes.

Mr. LaFleur: What is the procedure, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman wish to withdraw his motion? He may renew it afterward.

Mr. LaFLEUR: How am I to proceed, Mr. Speaker? I am about to make a motion, and, before I make the motion, I wish to make this explanation.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Again, the Chair will have to rule the gentleman out of order until the motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LaFleur: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LaFLEUR: And, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to speak very briefly.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LaFLEUR: I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. The Cumberland County delegation has had this matter under investigation by Senator Sanborn on the part of the Senate, and on the part of the House by Representative Payson, and those two gentlemen have not yet reported back to the delegation. I assure the members of the House

that if they permit me to lay this matter on the table, I will take it off the table within the next day or two and I can anticipate what the action of the delegation will be. I now move, Mr. Speaker, that the report, together with the resolve, be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. LaFleur, moves that the House Report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Resolve Authorizing Additional Issue of Highway Bonds (H. P. 1755) (L. D. 903) reporting legislation inexpedient, together with the resolve, be laid on the table, pending acceptance of the report.

The motion prevailed, and the report, together with the resolve were so tabled.

### Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Bird from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the York-Cumberland Development Company" (H. P. 1159) (L. D. 387)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Creation of Tax Title Accounts on Real Estate Taken for Payment of Taxes" (H. P. 1630) (L. D. 720)

Mr. Hinckley from same Committee reported same on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Increasing the Limit of Municipal Indebtedness (H. P. 1640) (L. D. 724)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

### Report Tabled

Mr. Eddy from the Committee on Motor Vehicles reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Exempting from the Payment of Excise Taxes Residents of States Which grant Reciprocal Privileges to Residents of this State" (H. P. 1442) (L. D. 622)

(On motion by Mr. Poulin of Waterville, tabled pending acceptance of committee report)

Mr. Eddy from the Committee on Motor Vehicles reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Speed of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 1685) (L. D. 741)

Mr. Williams from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Motor Vehicle Registration and Operator's Fees" (H. P. 1696) (L. D. 926)

Same gentleman from same Com-

mittee reported same on Bill "An Act Regulating the Speed of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 1684) (L. D. 740) as subject matter is covered in another bill.

Mr. Hawes from the Committee on Pensions reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Old Age Assistance" (H. P. 568) (L. D. 200)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Holden from the Committee on Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Maine State Prosperity Payments" (H. P. 391) (L. D. 243)

Mr. BUBAR of Weston: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill "An Act relating to Maine State Prosperity Payments" (H. P. 391) (L. D. 243) lie on the table.

Cries of "No, No."

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Weston, Mr. Bubar, that the report of Committee on Pensions on Bill "An Act relating to Maine State Prosperity Payments" lie on the table. All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

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

The report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Holden from the Committee on Pensions reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Provide Local Investigation of Old Age Assistance applications" (H. P. 1334) (L. D. 541)

Mr. Jewett from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Old Age Assistance" (H. P. 567) (L. D. 201)

Mr. Mahon from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Retirement Pension" (H. P. 1701) (L. D. 757)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Crippled Persons" (H. P. 1702) (L. D. 869)

Mr. Ellis from the Committee on Taxation reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Taxation" (H. P. 1734) (L. D. 649)

Mr. Stilphen from the Committee on Ways and Bridges reported same on Bill "An Act requiring the State to Construct Sidewalks along State Highways" (H. P. 729) (L. D. 311)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

### Ought To Pass In New Draft

Mr. Churchill from the Committee on Salaries and Fees on Bill "An Act relating to the Western Hancock Municipal Court" (H. P. 1782) (L. D. 947) which was recommitteed reported same in a new draft (H. P. 2148) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted and the new draft ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

### First Reading of Printed Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Apportionment of Motor Vehicle Registration Fees Paid by Inhabitants of Swan's Island" (H. P. 1220) (L. D. 462)

Bill "An Act relating to Removal of Infected Persons and Goods and Securing Infected Articles" (H. P. 1601) (L. D. 912)

Bill "An Act relating to Impersonating Justices or Officers" (H. P. 1617) (L. D. 705)

### Amended Bill

Bill "An Act relating to Real Estate Brokers" as amended. (H. P. 1616) (L. D. 865)

Bill was read twice and tomorrow assigned.

### Passed To Be Engrossed Bill Tabled

Bill "An Act relating to Beauty Culture" (S. P. 144) (L. D. 129)

(On motion by Mr. Butler of Waterville, tabled pending third reading)

### Passed To Be Engrossed (Continued)

Bill "An Act relative to Damage by Deer to Growing Crops and Orchards" (S. P. 179) (L. D. 230)

Sent up for concurrence.

### Bill Tabled

Bill "An Act relative to Hunting and Fishing Licenses; Revocation of" (S. P. 574) (L. D. 1106)

(On motion by Mr. Peakes of Milo, tabled pending third reading and specially assigned for Thursday morning, April 6th.

### Passed To Be Engrossed (Continued)

Bill "An Act Amending the Old Age Assistance Law relating to Disqualification for Transferring Property" (H. P. 1447) (L. D. 624)

Bill "An Act Amending the Old Age Assistance Law relating to Payment to Guardians" (H. P. 1448) (L. D. 625)

Bill "An Act Amending the Old

Age Assistance Law relating to Funeral Expenses" (H. P. 1449) (L. D. 626)

Bill "An Act relative to Exemption from Registration Fees of Certain Vehicles by Non-residents" (H. P. 2131) (L. D. 1118)

Bill "An Act Enlarging the Duties of the Forest Commissioner" (H. P. 2134) (L. D. 1119)

Bill "An Act relating to Guaranty of Titles of Motor Vehicles and to the Facilitation of the Recovery of Stolen Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 2135) (L. D. 1123)

Bill "An Act relating to Speed and Operation of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 2136) (L. D. 1120)

Resolve Concerning the Practice of Podiatry (H. P. 2132) (L. D. 1121)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Land in Aroostook County to Lucie Ouellette (H. P. 2133) (L. D. 1122)

Sent up for concurrence.

#### Amended Bill

Bill "An Act relating to Registration of Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 1686) (L. D. 742)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent up for concurrence.

At this point Mr. Fellows was conducted by the Sergeant at Arms to his seat on the floor, amid the applause of the House, the members rising, and Speaker Philbrick resumed the Chair.

#### Passed To Be Enacted (Emergency Measure)

An Act to Provide for the Repeal of the Charter of the Fort Kent Village Corporation (S. P. 393) (L. D. 763)

The SPEAKER: This being an emergency measure, it requires for its passage the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire elected membership of the House. All those in favor of the passage of this bill to be enacted will rise and stand in their places until counted and the Monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred and twenty-eight having voted in the affirmative, and none in the negative, 128 being more than two-thirds of the entire elected membership of the House, the bill was passed to be enacted.

An Act Creating the Board of Sanitation, Licensing and Inspection and Defining its Powers and Duties (S. P. 597) (L. D. 1107)

The SPEAKER: This being an emergency measure, it requires for its passage the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire elected membership of the House. All those in favor of the passage of this bill to be enacted will rise and stand in their places until counted and the Monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

One hundred and twenty-three having voted in the affirmative and 1 in the negative, 123 being more than two-thirds of the entire elected membership of the House, the bill was passed to be enacted.

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Amending the Law relating to Outdoor Advertising (S. P. 69) (L. D. 39)

An Act Providing for the Election of a Chairman of the Board of Selectmen (S. P. 196) (L. D. 240)

An Act relating to the Collection and Disposition of Money Received through Violations of the Inland Fish and Game Laws (S. P. 218) (L. D. 289)

An Act relating to Incorporation of Cemeteries and the Operation of Burying Grounds, Burial Structures, and Disposal of Dead Human Bodies (S. P. 325) (L. D. 578)

An Act relating to Public Exhibitions (S. P. 390) (L. D. 823)

An Act Creating the Passamaquoddy District Authority (S. P. 573) (L. D. 1101)

An Act relating to Local Option Provisions (S. P. 497) (L. D. 1035)

An Act relating to the Keeping of Dogs (S. P. 509) (L. D. 1048)

An Act relating to Requirements for Old Age Assistance (S. P. 555) (L. D. 1080)

Mr. DOWNS of Rome: Mr. Speaker, I move that An Act relating to Requirements for Old Age Assistance (S. P. 555) (L. D. 1080) lie on the table and be specially assigned for next Friday.

Cries of "No, No."

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, moves that An Act relating to Requirements for Old Age Assistance lie on the table and be specially assigned for next Friday. Is this the pleasure of the House? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail and the bill was passed to be enacted.

**Passed to be Enacted  
(Continued)**

An Act relating to the Support of Parents (S. P. 556) (L. D. 1081)

An Act relating to Reports to Towns of Excise Tax Payments (S. P. 557) (L. D. 1082)

An Act relating to the Examination of Railroads by the Public Utilities Commission (S. P. 562) (L. D. 1087)

An Act relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees (S. P. 596) (L. D. 1108)

Mr. MELANSON of Cherryfield: Mr. Speaker, I move that that this bill lie on the table.

Cries of "No, No."

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cherryfield, Mr. Melanson moves that An Act relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees (S. P. 596) (L. D. 1108) lie on the table. All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to table did not prevail, and the bill was passed to be enacted.

**Passed to be Enacted  
(Continued)**

An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law Exempting Certain Employees (H. P. 902) (L. D. 294)

An Act relating to Permits for Non-resident Charter Parties (H. P. 1333) (L. D. 540)

An Act relative to Jail Auditors (H. P. 1428) (L. D. 609)

An Act relating to the Licensing of Aircraft (H. P. 1439) (L. D. 619)

An Act relative to Trapping Season (H. P. 1557) (L. D. 655)

An Act relating to Vacancies in Town Offices (H. P. 1649) (L. D. 709)

An Act relating to Fees for Licenses (H. P. 1769) (L. D. 938)

An Act Designating a Certain Road as "Moosehead Trail" (H. P. 1802) (L. D. 965)

An Act Permitting Teachers to be Elected under Contract (H. P. 1980) (L. D. 1050)

An Act Providing for the Disposition of Moneys from the Tax on Gasoline Purchased for Use in Internal Combustion Engines (H. P. 1983) (L. D. 1058)

An Act Repealing the Bounty on Porcupines (H. P. 1986) (L. D. 1055)

An Act to Incorporate the Brooks Water District (H. P. 2035) (L. D. 1067)

An Act to Amend the Charter of the Lubec Water Company (H. P. 2036) (L. D. 1068)

An Act Naming the Deer Island-Sedgwick Bridge (H. P. 2037) (L. D. 1069)

An Act Providing for Licenses for Cinematograph, Moving Pictures and Operators (H. P. 2039) (L. D. 1070)

An Act to Provide a Town Council and Manager Form of Government for the town of Norway, in the county of Oxford (H. P. 2040) (L. D. 1071)

An Act relating to the Assessment of Inheritance Taxes (H. P. 2056) (L. D. 1092)

**Tabled**

An Act Regulating the Operation of Motor Vehicles (H. P. 2058) (L. D. 1094)

(On motion by Mr. Farrington of Augusta, tabled pending passage to be enacted)

**Passed to Be Enacted  
(Continued)**

An Act relating to Inspection of Motor Vehicles (H. P. 2060) (L. D. 1096)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Interest of the State in Land in Washington County to Robert Bernard, Jr. of New York (S. P. 229) (L. D. 276)

Resolve Authorizing the town of East Machias to Close the West Outlet of Gardiners Lake (H. P. 421) (L. D. 145)

Resolve Authorizing the Sale of a Certain Interest Held by the State in an Undivided Part of Township 4, Range 3, N. B. K. P. in Somerset County (H. P. 948) (L. D. 374)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Land to Mrs. Grace Shannon Moore of Macwahoc (H. P. 1460) (L. D. 569)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Sell Land on Muscongus Island (H. P. 1461) (L. D. 568)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Land in Aroostook County to Hector Martin (H. P. 1726) (L. D. 898)

Resolve to Reimburse the town of Bethel for the Fighting of Fire in Unorganized Township of Albany (H. P. 1867) (L. D. 1010)



### Orders of The Day

Under Orders of the Day, the Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Providing for Clerical Employees for Legislative Joint Committees" (H. P. 1985) (L. D. 1054), tabled on March 29th by Mr. Farwell of Unity, pending second reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. FARWELL: Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, I tabled this bill and had it specially assigned for today. I yield to the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs.

Mr. DOWNS of Rome: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Cumberland. Mr. Gyger.

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

Mr. GYGER: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Gyger, offers House Amendment "A" and moves its adoption.

The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1985, L. D. 1054, Bill "An Act Providing for Clerical Employees for Legislative Joint Committees."

Amend said Bill by striking out Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Sec. 4. **Employment of clerks.** The chief clerk and various committee clerks, stenographers and messengers shall be selected by a committee composed of the president of the senate, the speaker of the house and the director of personnel. So far as practicable, preference shall be given to those who have had previous satisfactory experience, and secondly to those on the eligible list maintained by the bureau of personnel.'

'Sec. 5. **Salaries.** The salary of the chief clerk shall be fixed by the committee mentioned in section 4 hereof, and the salaries of the clerks, stenographers and messengers shall be fixed by the said committee after consultation with the chief clerk.'

'Sec. 6. **Intent of act.** It is the intention of this act to create a central bureau of clerks who shall be full time employees during the ses-

sions of the legislature and who shall work for such committees at such times as seems best in the judgment of the chief clerk. Provided, however, that a full time clerk and/or stenographer may be assigned to any committee provided it seems best in the judgment of the committee named in section 4 hereof.'

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "A" be adopted? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs.

Mr. DOWNS: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of the bill and the amendment, and, in support of that motion, I shall speak very briefly. My opposition to this is that it seems to me that it simply builds up another bureau or commission which, ever since the inception of our State Legislature, it has been possible to get along without. It seems to me that I can see how impossible it would be for a young man from outside, with no legislative experience but perhaps with a fair amount of brains and ability, to come in here and serve as a Clerk or a Messenger upon any committee of the Legislature. It is possible that some may say that this is an economy measure, but we have no assurance of that. Without any further remarks of my own, I am leaving it entirely in your hands.

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, perhaps in opposition to the remarks of the member who has just spoken, it might be in order to give you the reasons why this bill was presented. It is a bill that has been talked about in the executive sessions of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, and it is presented to you for two big reasons. First of all, there are those of us in the Legislature who think it is out of place for individual members session after session to bring with them people who must have a committee appointment. I will give you an example of what I mean. You have in this House a Committee on County Estimates. They meet once or twice during the session and, believe it or not, it was proposed that the committee employ a Clerk and that he be paid a salary as Clerk of that committee. Now we submit to you that some of these committees do not need a Clerk; that one Clerk may do the work of two or three

committees, and properly do it, and that a Chief Clerk to guide in an executive manner the work of all committees would cut the present cost of \$10,000 for a biennial session of the Legislature about \$6,000. In other words, we should save about \$6,000, and have a cost of about \$4,000 instead of \$10,000. We believe that \$10,000 for clerk hire during the four months of Legislature is a lot of money. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, will not prevail.

Mr. PAYSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, this is an old timer in a new form. Perhaps I might take this opportunity to remove a misapprehension which seems to have grown up about the residents of South Hope. The impression seems to have gotten about, because I have spoken about Peleg and myself, that all the rest of the citizens are the same. I wish to assure you that that is not true.

Down in South Hope, when I was a youngster, there was a very smart young fellow down there by the name of Ray Gushey. He went away to a theological school and graduated and finally got a call to come back and preach down there. Well, he had to preach quite a bit. He had to preach Sunday morning in South Hope; he had to preach Sunday afternoon up at the head of the lake, which was four miles away, and he had to preach in the evening at the Hope Corner church, five miles from the head of the lake, which was quite a bit of travel. The people in town liked him very much and the ladies got together and had a bazaar or something to raise money. After it was over they counted the proceeds and paid the bills and they had \$3.89 left. Then the question was what to buy the minister for a present. There was in the church a deacon who had been known to do a little horse stealing. He said he had a horse he would sell them for \$3.89. So the ladies bought the horse. There was not any harness or any wagon to go with the horse, but the deacon threw in a rope to tie around the horse's neck. The minister very gratefully thanked the people for the horse and went down the road with the horse toward his home. On his way home he had to pass his father's place. The old man saw him coming from a long ways off and he came down the road to see what he was leading.

He looked the horse over skeptically and fairly carefully. Finally the son, coming out of his umbrage, anticipated his father by saying: "That is a better beast than our Lord rode in on to Jerusalem." The old man looked at the horse's feet and says: "My gracious son, it is the same animal." (Laughter)

At every session of the Legislature we have the same old ideas revived. Somebody always proposes that all bills be put into the Legislature before we ever get here. Somebody always has the idea that we will cut everybody's salary in the State and save a lot of money, no matter what becomes of efficiency. Someone always has the notion we will get through by March 15th, and somebody always proposes some penny-pinching economy.

Now I maintain to this House that the members of this Legislature do a vast amount of work in the short time we are here, in the fifteen or sixteen weeks. A vast number of bills and matters have to be passed upon. I believe that to pass this bill to pare down the committee system and the clerk system set-up will hamper and restrict the efficiency of the Legislature, and, for the small amount saved, I cannot believe it is worth while. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Gyger, presents House Amendment "A" and moves its adoption. The gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, moves that the bill be indefinitely postponed. The motion to amend takes precedence over the motion to indefinitely postpone. The motion before the House is on the adoption of House Amendment "A". Is it the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "A" be adopted?

The motion prevailed and House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, that the bill, as amended, be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, that Bill "An Act Providing for Clerical Employees for Legislative Joint Committees," as amended, be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken the motion prevailed and the bill as amended was indefinitely postponed, and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act to Provide Moral Instruction for Children in Connection with the Public Schools" (H. P. 1312) (L. D. 535), tabled on March 29th by Mr. Dwinall of Camden, pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

The SPEAKER: The Chair notes the absence of the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Dwinall.

On motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin, the bill was retabled, pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

The Chair lays before the House the third tabled and today assigned matter, Senate Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Provide for the Appointment of a Board of Commissioners of Police for the city of Bath" (S. P. 183) (L. D. 234) reporting came in a new draft (S. P. 510) (L. D. 1049) under title of "An Act to Provide for Civil Service Rules for the Police and Fire Departments in the city of Bath" and that it "Ought to pass," tabled on March 29th by Mr. Miller of Bath, pending acceptance in concurrence; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Miller, the "Ought to pass" report was accepted in concurrence and the bill was given its two several readings.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment "A" and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Miller, offers House Amendment "A" and moves its adoption. The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment "A" to S. P. 510, L. D. 1049 Bill "An Act to Provide for Civil Service Rules for the Police and Fire Departments in the City of Bath."

Amend said Bill by striking out the words "and fire" wherever they appear in the title and in the Bill.

Further amend said Bill by striking off from the word "departments" wherever it appears in the Bill the final "s".

Further amend said Bill by striking out from Section 1 thereof, the words "of the fire department and".

Further amend said Bill by striking out from Section 2 thereof, the words "or fire" wherever they appear therein.

Further amend said Bill by strik-

ing out the words "either of" in Section 2 thereof before the words "said departments."

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted, and the bill was tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The Chair lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned matter, House Report "Ought to pass" of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relative to Non-resident Fishing Licenses" (H. P. 1569) (L. D. 632), tabled on March 31st by Mr. Pike of Bridgton, pending acceptance; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Pike, the "Ought to pass" report was accepted.

The Chair lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to School Busses" (H. P. 2049) (L. D. 1095), tabled on April 1st by Mr. Ellis of Fairfield, pending motion of Mr. Farwell of Unity that the bill be indefinitely postponed; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. ELLIS: Mr. Speaker, there can of course be no argument but what scholars in our towns are entitled to safe and comfortable conveyance. As far as the restrictions in this bill are concerned, I do not think they would affect my own town because I think our conveyances do, or would at least before this bill went into effect, comply with them, but I am wondering how it will affect some of our smaller towns. I do not know. I am going to leave that up to the Representatives from those towns. It looks to me as though perhaps it might be a hardship upon them and that safe conveyances could be provided without conforming to these restrictions. I hope, in the absence of any law or restrictions upon conveyances, that our State Department would look after the matter, but if we are going to pass a law and say just what the rules and restrictions upon conveyances are going to be, and the towns must conform to them, I cannot see the sense of adding to that a clause or amendment leaving it up to the State Department of Education whether that law shall be enforced or not.

Mr. GRUA of Livermore Falls: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word against this bill. I feel certain it is going to cost my town money.

There are very few busses that comply with the requirements in this bill. It seems to me that the School Committee and the Superintendent of Schools can look over the various conveyances used for conveying scholars in each locality and I believe that they are perfectly competent to decide whether or not it is a satisfactory conveyance. After all, the local town is the one that has to foot the bill and not the State of Maine. It seems to me that we are putting altogether too much in the hands of the State Board of Education. I believe education should be regulated right at home by the people at home who know how much they can afford to put into education and all the things that go along with it. I think the consensus of opinion is that the burden put upon towns for roads and schools in the State of Maine is the thing that is breaking the backs of the farmers. I think that many of these conveyances that do not quite comply with the requirements are perfectly adequate and perfectly suitable for our children, especially if they have the approval of our local School Committee. I therefore hope very much that the motion to indefinitely postpone may prevail.

Mr. FARRINGTON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Motor Vehicles.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Unity, Mr. Farwell, moves that Bill "An Act Relating to School Busses" as amended, be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Motor Vehicles. The motion to recommit takes precedence over the motion to indefinitely postpone.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Motor Vehicles. All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Unity, Mr. Farwell, that the bill be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion of the gentle-

man from Unity, Mr. Farwell, will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed, and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair lays before the House the sixth tabled and today assigned matter, motion by Mr. Snow of Dover-Foxcroft, that the House reconsider its action of March 31st whereby it accepted the minority report "Ought not to pass" in non-concurrence on Bill "An Act Imposing a tax on Blueberries for Advertising and Stabilizing the Blueberry Industry of the State" (S. P. 343) (L. D. 827) which came from the Senate with the majority report "Ought to pass" accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed, tabled on April 1st by Mr. Hinman of Skowhegan; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. HINMAN: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: My only reason for tabling this measure was because I felt, if we were to have a reconsideration, it should come at this time when more of the members are present than were present at the Saturday session.

Mr. DENNISON of East Machias: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that most of the people who came up here to the two hearings on blueberries seemed to be opposed to a tax on blueberries.

Now it seems to me we listened to quite a number of people who were very much in favor of trying to do something to improve the industry, either in research work or advertising, so, for those people, this bill was brought out in a new draft. The bill had careful consideration by the joint committee, and it was reported out seventeen to two in favor. I move that we accept the majority report of the committee "Ought to pass."

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Snow, that the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the minority report "Ought not to pass." Is the House ready for the question? All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Snow, that the House reconsider its action whereby it accepted the minority "Ought not

to pass" report will say aye; those opposed no.

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

Fifty-five having voted in the affirmative and 37 in the negative, the motion to reconsider prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brown, that the minority report "Ought not to pass" be accepted. Is the House ready for the question? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know as I can add a great deal to what has been said. As a matter of fact, I do not think the majority of people in Washington County engaged in gathering blueberries want this bill. They expressed very plainly at the hearing that they preferred to maintain their own affairs, and until there is a hearing had on this new bill, I do not believe the Legislature should pass it.

As I called to your attention the other day, the fourth section of this bill says that the Department of Agriculture shall establish grades and methods of identification of different grades of blueberries and cooperate with those who wish to advertise.

This is simply an entering wedge, and I might say that it is favored by those who want to put the State of Maine into the advertising business for the sake of, or at least partially for, the profit which they derive out of the advertising.

They told us there were a great many poor people who could not afford to advertise. This is an entering wedge which will drive those very people into advertising, because as soon as someone has made a contribution to the Department of Agriculture and they have established grades and identification which would take the customary form of State of Maine advertising, your red, white and blue package, these very people would be driven into paying the tax or else see other blueberries advertised in preference to theirs.

There is another bill coming before this Legislature where the Economy Committee recommended that the blueberry fly control be done away with. These same men who are advancing this bill, or,

rather, one man who is behind the whole thing, came before that committee and testified it was impossible for the people down there at this time to raise six thousand dollars for this inspection the State would have to carry on. Now if they are so poor that they cannot contribute to a necessary service, which, by good rights, should be theirs anyway, and which the State of Maine ought not to be carrying, how can they justify the position of passing this bill which would compel them to tax themselves? I hope that the "Ought not to pass" report will be accepted and two years from now they can come in with a united program, a constructive, reasonable program, what the majority of the people want, and it will be up to this Legislature to give it to them. Until we do that, I say it is simply an entering wedge for money to be spent by the Publicity Bureau of the State of Maine, and I believe it should be turned down.

Mr. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, the member from Caribou, Mr. Brown, is referring entirely to the original bill where a tax is mandatory. The bill before us has nothing to do with the original bill; it is a new draft, and there is nothing mandatory about it in any way. It calls for no money from the State and anyone who enters into it can do it voluntarily. It would seem as though those people who are interested in trying to do something, after having this come out of the committee with the report seventeen to two in favor, that those people should have this opportunity and that we should accept the majority report of the committee "Ought to pass."

Mr. SLEEPER of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, as I understand this bill and as it was explained to me at that hearing, everyone who canned blueberries I think was in favor of the bill while those who sold fresh blueberries were not in favor of it. I think if the canners of blueberries wish to identify their product on a wholly voluntary tax basis, they certainly ought to be allowed to do so. I think the identification would be entirely on the sale of canned blueberries, and certainly if the canners of this State—and, so far as I can see, the bulk of the blueberry canners favor this bill—if they wish to voluntarily tax themselves and identify their product

with a red, white and blue label, I think they ought to be allowed to do so. It is not going to cost us anything, so I, for one, move that the majority report "Ought to pass" be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Caribou, Mr. Brown, that the minority report "Ought not to pass" be accepted. All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

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

On motion by Mr. Walker of Littleton, the House voted to accept the majority report "Ought to pass in new draft." This being a printed bill, under suspension of the rules, the bill had its two several readings and was assigned for third reading tomorrow morning.

On motion by Mr. Farrington of Augusta, the House voted to take from the table the thirty-first unassigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Reserved Number Plates for Motor Vehicles" (H. P. 566) (L. D. 199) tabled on April 3rd by that gentleman pending passage to be engrossed.

Mr. Farrington offered House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" to H. P. 566 L. D. 199 Bill "An Act Relating to Reserved Number Plates for Motor Vehicles"

Amend said Amendment by striking out all of the first paragraph thereof, and inserting in place thereof the following:

Amend said Bill by inserting after the word "year" at the end of line eleven of Section 102 as quoted in the Bill the words, 'plus a fee of \$1.00'.

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it adopted Committee Amendment "A". House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was then adopted.

Thereupon, Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was adopted, and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Dow of Norway, the House voted to take from the table the twenty-seventh unassigned matter, Bill "An Act Relating to Collection of Poll Taxes" (H. P. 484) (L. D. 179) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on February 23rd and came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence; tabled on April 3rd by Mr. Dow pending the motion of Mr. Stilphen of Dresden that the House recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Dresden, Mr. Stilphen, that the House recede and concur with the Senate. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Burgess of Limestone, the House voted to take from the table the twenty-fifth unassigned matter, House Report "Ought to pass when amended by Committee Amendment "A" of the Committee on Motor Vehicles on Bill "An Act Relating to Operators' Licenses" (H. P. 1691) (L. D. 746) tabled on April 1st by that gentleman pending acceptance.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta (Mr. Farrington) can obtain the floor if he chooses. The question before the House is on the acceptance of the committee report "Ought to pass when amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee report be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, moves the acceptance of the committee report. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of those who have perhaps not looked into this bill to the fact that the amendment, I believe, that is offered will change the age limit in the bill from seventeen down to sixteen, and will strike out a very undesirable part of the bill.

I want to call your attention to another paragraph in the bill, and, with your permission, I would like to read it:

"Provided, however, that it shall

be unlawful for any person under the age of twenty-one years to operate within this State a school bus, bus, taxicab or other public or livery conveyance designed for the carriage of passengers for hire or otherwise."

I take no issue in regard to the age limit of sixteen. I do want to call the attention of the members to the fact that in a great many of our rural sections where schools have been centralized, it is necessary for one of the high school pupils—

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BUZZELL: Is there any motion before the House?

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, that the House accept the committee report.

Mr. BUZZELL: Has the report been accepted, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The report has not been accepted.

Mr. BURGESS: May I proceed, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BURGESS: (Continuing) It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, in these rural areas for one of the high school pupils who has reached the age of fifteen to drive the car or conveyance, conveying not only those of his own family but others in the neighborhood. I object very strenuously to that part of the bill. Mr. Speaker, is there a motion before the House?

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the acceptance of the committee report.

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I hope the report is not accepted.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, that the House accept the committee report "Ought to pass when amended by Committee Amendment 'A'."

Mr. GOOD of Monticello: Mr. Speaker, I might say a few words in explanation of some things which the gentleman from Limestone (Mr. Burgess) did not mention.

Now I am strongly in favor of safety and I believe that the majority of the people do not recognize the danger there is in operating

motor vehicles, but I have also learned that a person young in years can operate one a lot better than some of the older persons.

Now the objection I have to this bill is on these grounds: A lot of farmers in Aroostook County, when it comes digging time, have a lot of work to do in a short time, and we have a bunch of boys—I am the father of five children, and three of them are boys—and when it comes digging time, if I can put one of my boys who is fifteen years of age on a truck loading in the field and we have a man at the potato house to unload, it saves a man's wages of three or four dollars a day, and it means a lot to us in the fall of the year.

As has already been stated by the gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, these towns do not have any high school and many of the students have to go twelve miles. A lot of the boys and girls club together and one boy takes the car and drives down to the school at Houlton. Under this bill you will deprive them of that privilege, and we have either got to pay their way down or else keep them at home.

As I said in the beginning, I believe in safety, yet I believe this is going to deprive a lot of boys and girls of a privilege they need at this time, therefore I hope that the majority report will not be accepted.

Mr. STILPHEN of Dresden: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have been opposed to this bill from the start, and I went before the committee and told the committee that I thought whoever presented this bill was trying to trim on the wrong end of years. If they would take someone eighty or eighty-five whose wife has to go with them and hold them in the car—take them off the list, they would be doing something. I was much opposed in putting this to seventeen years and the committee said it would report sixteen. I am going to move for the indefinite postponement of the entire bill.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Dresden, Mr. Stilphen, moves that the report of the committee and the accompanying bill be indefinitely postponed. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. PAUL of Portland: Mr. Speaker, when this Legislature convened, the Parent-Teachers' Association and many other organizations in the western part of our State insisted that the age limit for

the operation of automobiles be raised.

We have in the city of Portland two large high schools, and many of our children drive from one school to the other in preference to going to school closer by. It is true that a great deal of reckless driving takes place by children to and from their way to school.

Now the proponents of this measure wanted to raise the age to eighteen. Your committee considered the merits. I think most of the members of the committee have children who drive automobiles, and we all want safety not only to the children themselves but to others who are drivers on our roads. I believe that we arrived at a happy solution on the sixteen years and that it was the proper age. There was no question about it whatsoever in the committee. The age of eighteen, we believe, might be older than the age required in order to give the safety which we want on our roads and city streets.

As you will note, this bill has been redrafted—the gentleman from Portland just called it to my attention to the fact that it cites seventeen but the age sixteen is on the redraft. I shall be very much disappointed if the bill does not pass and if the majority report is not accepted.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Dresden, Mr. Stilphen, that the report of the Committee on Motor Vehicles and accompanying bill, "An Act Relating to Operators' Licenses" be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. COWAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, have we the redraft before us?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will call attention to the fact that the report of the Committee is "Ought to pass" when amended by Committee Amendment "A." Does the gentleman desire Committee Amendment "A" read?

The Clerk will read Committee Amendment "A".

Committee Amendment "A" to H. P. 1691, L. D. 746, Bill, "An Act Relating to Operator's Licenses."

Amend said Bill by striking out the words "Exiept as herein provided" in the fifteenth line of Section 33.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the figure "17" in the first

line on Page 2 of Section 33 and substitute therefor the figure '16'.

Further amend said Bill by striking out the following sentence starting on the first line of Page 2 of Section 33: "The secretary of state, subject to the other provisions of this section may, however, issue a limited or restricted license to a minor not under the age of 16, which shall entitle said minor to operate a registered motor vehicle only when accompanied by a parent or guardian having the custody of said minor."

Further amend said Bill by adding the word 'color' after the word "numbers" in the eighth line on Page 2 of Section 33.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Dresden, Mr. Stilphen, that the report and bill be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion for the indefinite postponement of the report and bill will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed, the bill and report were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Orders of the Day.

Mr. VARNEY of Berwick: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, asks unanimous consent to address the House. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. VARNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say briefly that from time to time it probably will be necessary for me to make a suggestion as to the hour of recess or the hour of adjournment. I simply want to point out to the members that many times there are things I have to take into consideration in suggesting the hour to which we shall recess or adjourn which do not appear to the members on the face of it. In all cases I will try to use my best judgment in the manner which I think will lead to a speedy consideration by this House of all matters.

For example, at the present time I am confronted with deciding whether the House will recess until this afternoon or adjourn until tomorrow morning. I want to say, in making that decision, it occurs



to me that we have now gone over all of the matters which were specially assigned for today, so that should we now recess until two o'clock we might come back, and, unless some of you have matters on the table which you are willing to remove, we would have nothing which we could discuss this afternoon. Now as set off against that, there are several of the important committees of this Legislature which have been trying to find time when they could have executive sessions of their committees in order to discuss some important bills which are before them and which have not yet been reported out, and

if we have a session this afternoon, those committees cannot meet this afternoon, which means it will be at least another day before they can report out those matters.

I wish to speak of one other thing. Probably we have got to the point where it becomes necessary for us to stop laying matters on the table and postponing them to another day to a certain extent.

Having made that brief statement, Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House adjourn until tomorrow morning.

The motion prevailed, and House adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.