

# 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

Thursday, April 20, 1939.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Cunningham, of Augusta.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

From the Senate: "An Act relating to Exemptions from Taxation" (H. P. 1729) (L. D. 837) which was recalled from the files by Joint Order, and on which the House accepted the report of the Committee on Taxation reporting "Ought not to pass" on April 5th.

Comes from the Senate with the bill substituted for the report and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Burbank of Chelsea, the rules were suspended and the House reconsidered its former action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee and concurred with the Senate in the substitution of the bill for the report.

Thereupon, the bill was given its two several readings.

Senate Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk. The House then adopted Senate Amendment "A" and under suspension of the rules the bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A" had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill "An Act relating to the publication of Legal Notices, Legal Advertising and Other Matter Required by Law to be Published in a Newspaper" (H. P. 1423) (L. D. 558) on which the House accepted the minority report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on April 12th.

Comes from the Senate, with the majority report, reporting a new draft (H. P. 2226) (L. D. 1168) and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment "A".

Mr. THORNE of Madison: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur with the Senate in this matter.

When the matter was originally

before us, I objected to the passage of the act as then drafted. I was a member of the committee who signed the minority report against the passage of the bill, even of the new draft. But Senate Amendment A has met all the requirements I asked for, and I think it meets the objection of those members of the committee who signed the minority report, "Ought not to pass."

Mr. LAMBERT of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: This bill was debated pro and con and the minority report on this bill was accepted. At that time it was put forth that this bill had discrimination. I have talked since then with several members of this House on other legislative matters, and it seemed to be the feeling of everyone here that no discrimination should be shown on any bill.

I want to call your attention to the fact that this amendment is nothing more or less than an attempt to pass this bill. In the ninth line of this amendment it says "must be printed in the English language," which would exclude the publication whereof I spoke last week.

I hope this House will not classify the publication of legal notices or legal advertising matter as having any nationality whatsoever. This bill gives it a nationality. If you want to go on record as doing so, I wish you would concur with the Senate, but, if you believe as I do, I hope you will vote that the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Thorne, will not prevail.

Mr. BIRD of Rockland: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: This bill was thoroughly debated in the Judiciary Committee and there was a difference of opinion in the Judiciary Committee about the bill. Now since that was debated, every member of the Judiciary Committee is now in favor of the bill. It seems to me that this bill should be enacted, as all of the objections have been removed. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Thorne, will prevail.

Mr. WEATHERBEE of Lincoln: Mr. Speaker, I spoke at some length on this bill last week, and I do not care to take the time of the House in going over this matter again, except to just answer the argument of my good friend from Lewiston by

saying that this bill is not a discriminatory bill, it does not discriminate against the French newspapers except to the extent necessarily of ruling that the French newspapers are not qualified to do this particular job of publishing legal notices.

I would like to point out to you that this amendment has certainly taken out all the doubtful phases of the bill and makes it a very clear matter, that is, that such legal notices must be published in the English language and they must be published in a newspaper which is entered as second class matter. However, the amendment provides also that the legal notices may be published in both French and English newspapers, and there is no reason why anyone doing the publishing cannot publish them in a French paper if he wishes to, but he must give notice to English-speaking citizens who may be involved in their property rights.

Furthermore, the bill leaves it to the discretion of the Court to order publication in only a French newspaper where it feels no harm can be done to the English-speaking people of the community. It seems to me that shows pretty plainly that this is not a discriminatory bill, but it is simply a matter of common-sense, simply a matter of ruling that the job of publishing legal notices should rest with a newspaper published in the English language. As I told you last week, the largest French newspaper in this State, *Le Messenger*, took in only \$33 for publishing legal notices. So this is no hardship for the newspapers, and it leaves it so a person will not have his property foreclosed or fail to get notice of some other proceeding because he did not happen to be a man who reads the French language and did not subscribe to a French newspaper.

I would like, in conclusion, to point out to you that there is a decision in Massachusetts—there are no decisions on the matter in Maine—but it seems quite apparent to somebody who has studied cases in other states that this situation has arisen. This case in 209 Mass, Page 111 refers to just such a proposition as we have. That case says:

"English is the language of this country. This conception is fundamental in the administration of all public affairs. It is an elemental truth, so axiomatic in its nature as

to need no supporting authority. \* \* \* It is plain that a general public notice required by law to be published in a newspaper must be printed in English in an English newspaper. The great weight of authority supports this view."

I think the matter must be very clear to this House. This is not a matter of wanting to discriminate against anyone, but it is a question of being forced to say frankly that we realize it is not proper legal notice to publish it in a language that the majority of people cannot and do not read.

Mr. LAMBERT: Mr. Speaker, I think this will be the last time that I will get up during this session. I want to thank each and every one for the consideration which you have shown me. The arguments brought out by the gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Weatherbee) this morning are the same ones brought to your attention last week. I attended that hearing. I do not know what the motives, outside of discriminatory motives, are behind this measure. At the hearing there was only one proponent and about ten opponents to this bill. I am sure that you all remember the arguments I brought out. I do not believe it is necessary to bring out any more arguments concerning this bill. I hope that you will stay with me, and I ask the Chair for a division of the House.

Mr. WHITNEY of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I do not know as there is much that I can add to what has already been said. As a previous speaker has pointed out, I believe the Senate Amendment has eliminated the objection, the primary objections that some of the members had to this bill. I would like to point out, however, that we are an English speaking nation, and therefore it is only natural and normal that legal notices should be printed in those papers printed in the English language.

Furthermore, as I understand it, there is no legal definition of what legally constitutes newspapers for the publication of legal notices. This bill defines that such notices must be published in newspapers entered as second class postal matter. I think that is the meat of this amendment and bill. For that reason, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Thorne, will prevail.

Mr. VARNEY of Berwick: Mr.

Speaker, I did not intend to say anything on this bill, but I feel that the gentleman from Rockland (Mr. Bird) apparently misunderstood what I said. As a member of the Judiciary Committee who signed the minority report "Ought not to pass", the other day I raised the legal objection which I had to the bill. I intended to say that all of those legal objections have now been removed. I can see no legal objection to the passage of the bill, but I do intend to vote against it however because I think there is no necessity for the legislation.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Thorne, that the House recede from its former action whereby it accepted the minority report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass", and concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the majority report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass in new draft," the bill being Bill "An Act relating to the Publication of Legal Notices, Legal Advertising and Other Matter Required by Law to be Published in a Newspaper." Is the House ready for the question? The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Lambert, asks for a division. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Thorne, that the House recede and concur with the Senate, 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. Ninety having voted in the affirmative, and 17 in the negative, the motion prevailed.

Thereupon the bill was given its two several readings and assigned for third reading immediately after the first recess this morning.

#### Reports of Committees Conference Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relative to the Use of Buckshot in Hunting Deer" (H. P. 676) (L. D. 251) reporting that the Committee is unable to agree.

(Signed)

Messrs. Howes of Charleston  
Noyes of Franklin  
Cowman of Portland

—Committee on part of House.

Worthen of Penobscot  
Elliot of Knox  
Boothby of York

—Committee on part of Senate.  
Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Ought To Pass In New Draft

Mr. JEWETT from the Committee on Pensions on Resolve in favor of Burleigh E. Bean of Waite (H. P. 816) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 2249) (L. D. 1208) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted and the new draft having already been printed was read twice under suspension of the rules, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

#### Passed To Be Engrossed

Resolve Creating a Recess Committee on Wage and Hour Legislation (S. P. 684)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

Mr. Varney of Berwick, offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to S. P. 684, Resolve Creating a Recess Committee on Wage and Hour Legislation.

Amend said Bill by striking out the word "approval" in the eighth line thereof, and inserting in place thereof the words 'advice and consent.'

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted and the resolve was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to Erection and Equipment of a State Police Barrack in Thomaston (S. P. 681) (L. D. 1192)

An Act Assenting to the Provisions of the Act of Congress entitled "An Act to Provide that the United States Shall Aid the States in Wildlife-restoration Projects, and for Other Purposes" (H. P. 1590) (L. D. 909)

An Act relating to Clerk Hire in Certain Counties (H. P. 2072) (L. D. 1099)

An Act to Provide for Tax Equalization (H. P. 2237) (L. D. 1188)

#### Finally Passed

Resolve Authorizing the Appointment of a Committee to Study the Advisability of a Contributory Re-

tirement System for Maine (S. P. 672) (L. D. 1201)

Resolve for the Purchase of One Hundred Copies of "A History of Education in Maine" (H. P. 511) (L. D. 1200)

Resolve in favor of Robert E. Wright, of Rock City, Delmar, New York (H. P. 2236) (L. D. 1187)

Resolve in favor of H. L. Bruen of Readfield (H. P. 2240) (L. D. 1197)

Resolve in favor of Joseph Michaud of Berwick (H. P. 2241) (L. D. 1195)

Resolve in favor of Edith Given of Windsor (H. P. 2242) (L. D. 1196)

Resolve in favor of Elvin Silsby of Aurora (H. P. 2243) (L. D. 1198)

Resolve Granting a Bonus to Certain Maine Veterans of the World War (H. P. 2244) (L. D. 1199)

### Orders of the Day

The Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, Report "A" "Ought to pass" Report "B" "Ought not to pass" and Report "C" "Ought to pass in new draft" of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Relating to Labor Relations" (S. P. 447) (L. D. 993) New Draft (H. P. 689) (L. D. 1207), all three reports tabled on April 19th by Mr. Marshall of Auburn, pending motion of Mr. Arzonico of Yarmouth, that Report "B" "Ought not to pass" be accepted. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney.

Mr. VARNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some of the members of the Labor Committee have been overnight working on a new draft of a Labor Relations Board Act, which new draft I understand is prepared now but which they would like to have an opportunity to take up with the Labor Committee to be sure it is in proper form before presenting it to the House and especially because I believe that the House would not be in a position to discuss that bill at this time, and also because of the fact that we have got to wait here anyway for printing until after dinner, I now move that this lie on the table until this afternoon session.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, moves that the three reports of the Committee on Labor lie on the table, pending the motion of the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Arzonico, that the House accept the

"Ought not to pass" report, and be specially assigned for this afternoon. Is this the pleasure of the House.

(Cries of "No, No.")

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, that the three reports lie on the table will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the three reports, together with the bill, were so tabled, and specially assigned for this afternoon.

The Chair lays before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter, Bill "An Act Providing for the Publication of an Annual Statement of the Financial Condition of the State by the State Controller" (S. P. 618) (L. D. 1116), which was indefinitely postponed in the House on April 12th, and which came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence, tabled on April 19th by Mr. Howes of Charleston, pending motion of Mr. Varney of Berwick, that the House recede and concur. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney.

Mr. VARNEY: Mr. Speaker, I think there is some merit to this measure about which nothing has been said yet on the floor of this House. I understand that bill, with the new amendment, calls for less than five thousand dollars. Most of you would be surprised if you knew how little expenditures will creep into these different departments unnoticed. I believe that there is five thousand dollars worth of merit in publishing a financial statement once a year, because it will have a deterrent effect on some of these departments to keep them down to where we intend that they shall stay, knowing that there is going to be published a financial statement at the end of the year which will show what is being spent in the different departments and what for. I certainly hope that this bill passes.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, that the House recede from its former action whereby the bill was indefinitely postponed, and concur with the Senate in the passage of the bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A".

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, might I ask through the Chair of the gentleman from Berwick (Mr. Varney) if the amendment provides for the publication of this report in the weekly newspapers?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Buzzell, asks a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney. The gentleman may answer if he chooses.

Mr. VARNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will say that it does as I read the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, that the House recede from its former action whereby the bill was indefinitely postponed, and concur with the Senate in the passage of the bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A". Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No, No.")

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the motion that the House recede and concur will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The House then adopted Senate Amendment "A" and the bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The Chair lays before the House the first tabled and unassigned matter, "Memorial to Congress Relating to Tariff Preferentials and Canadian Subsidies Adversely Affecting the Port of Portland and Other Atlantic Seaports" (S. P. 690), tabled on April 19th for reproduction. The Chair will inform the members that this Memorial has now been reproduced and distributed on the members' desks.

Mr. McGLAULFIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, before taking up the discussion of this matter, I want to tell you a story.

The Speaker came into the lobby out here where I was playing cards with my friend, the gentleman from Holden, Mr. DeBeck, and the Speaker asked me what my attitude was on one of these bills. After he had left and the crowd gathered about, DeBeck told the story this way: He said, "The Speaker came into that room and he walked right up to

Judge McGlauffin — he didn't pay any attention to anybody else at all. He said, 'Judge, you can do me a great favor if you will.' He said that the Judge looked up with much interest and he said, "Why, yes, Don, I would be glad to do anything for you." And the Speaker said, "Judge, some of these men in the House want to get home by Saturday night, and there is a possibility that they may if you will only keep still." (Laughter)

You noticed that I kept still all day yesterday. But these Memorials are much like waving a red flag at a bull when you come to throw them before me.

You recall that I told the story the other day of those three fellows, Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego. We had one Memorial that I will call Peter that went through the House, and that was a Memorial calling for a new postage stamp, and it was addressed to Jim Farley. We let that go through because some of us knew what a postage stamp was and some of us knew that Jim Farley was very fond of issuing postage stamps, and I had no objection to that. Then came Shadrach, the Townsend proposition, then Meshach, Gail Laughlin's proposition, and here is Abednego.

I am opposed to this Memorial, and the reason that I am opposed it is because we do not know anything about it.

Now listen to this: "Be it therefore Resolved, that this Legislature especially protests the British tariff preferentials \* \* \*." What does any man in this House know about British tariff preferentials? And, if you know anything about it, how do you know that it is affecting the Port of Portland? And how many of us know anything whatever about Canadian subsidies? This may be all true, but what do we know about it? We have not had any hearings on the matter, we have not had any evidence on the thing, and yet we are trying to tell the British and the Canadian government what they are going to do.

Some of us thought we had quite a little job to take care of the affairs of the State of Maine. There have been several attempts to tell the President and Congress what they should do, but now, if you analyze this measure, we are getting a little beyond that and we are in-

dicating indirectly what the British and the Canadian government shall do.

I would not object to sending a proposal of some kind to Hitler, protesting the taking of Czechoslovakia or to Mussolini protesting the taking of Albania, because we do not care a hoot what they think about what we say, and they care much less about what we think, too.

I remember reading from the life of William Pitt Fessenden that at the time of the impeachment of President Johnson, Neal Dow, of Portland, wrote Fessenden a letter, strongly urging him to vote to impeach the President of the United States, and Mr. Fessenden wrote back to Mr. Dow and said, "I am amazed that a man of your intelligence, being away from the scene of action and necessarily knowing little about it, should be telling me, who am on the ground and know all the facts, what to do."

Now if I were in Washington and I got such a Memorial as this, I should certainly feel that somebody was trying to tell me what to do when they did not know what they were talking about. I am told—I do not know this for a fact—but I heard it remarked that the American Legion wants this measure. Now I have great respect for the American Legion and I think it is wonderful institution, but I want to tell you that I am not going to be one to let even the American Legion make a fool of me by my voting for something that I do not know anything about, trying to tell Congress and the President and the British and Canadian government what they are going to do.

I move the indefinite postponement of this measure.

Mr. LaFLEUR of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to disabuse the mind of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) as to the American Legion being back of this Memorial. The American Legion is not back of this Memorial, and, as a member of the American Legion, I resent the implication that the American Legion is sponsoring this Memorial. As a member of the American Legion, I hope that the motion for indefinite postponement will prevail.

Mr. McGLAUFFIN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear that I did not charge the American Legion with any such thing. I stated that I

had heard that reported. I think that should make the matter clear to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. LaFleur, and there should be no resentment on what I had to say on that point.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

(Cries of "No, No")

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the motion that the Memorial be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair is expecting additional papers from the Senate and from the engrossing department. The House may be at ease for probably fifteen or twenty minutes.

#### House at Ease After Recess—11:40 A. M.

##### Passed to be Enacted

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

An Act Concerning Certain Trunk Line Highways (S. P. 673) (L. D. 1185)

An Act relating to Lighting Mount Desert Bridge (S. P. 674) (L. D. 1186)

An Act to Appropriate Moneys for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1940 and June 30, 1941 (S. P. 679) (L. D. 1190)

An Act to Repeal the Organization of the Plantation of Dallas (H. P. 946) (L. D. 372)

An Act relating to Elections in the City of Biddeford (H. P. 1162) (L. D. 481)

An Act to Create a State Boxing Commission (H. P. 2168) (L. D. 1145)

An Act relating to a Bounty on Seals (H. P. 2219) (L. D. 1162)

An Act to Protect the Industry of Packing of Fish and Fish Products and to Establish a Minimum Wage for Women and Minors Employed Therein (H. P. 2231) (L. D. 1181)

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order under suspension of the rules:

**Conference Report**

From the Senate:

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act relating to the Registration and Operation of Motor Vehicles by Non-residents" (S. P. 669) (L. D. 1175) reporting that the Committee is unable to agree.  
(Signed)

Messrs. Osgood of Oxford  
Beckett of Washington  
Elliot of Knox  
—Committee on part of Senate.  
Farwell of Unity  
Otto of Dexter  
Farrington of Augusta  
—Committee on part of House.

Comes from the Senate, read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate:

Report A of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Exceptions of Persons Entitled to Parole" (S. P. 30) (L. D. 10) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 677) (L. D. 1206) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Miss Laughlin of Cumberland  
Messrs. Hill of Cumberland  
—of the Senate.  
Hinckley of So. Portland  
Fellows of Augusta  
Thorne of Madison  
—of the House.

Report B of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Burns of Aroostook  
—of the Senate.  
McGlauffin of Portland  
Weatherbee of Lincoln  
Varney of Berwick  
Bird of Rockland  
—of the House.

Comes from the Senate with report "A" read and accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

Mr. COWAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to permit this to be laid on the table until the first thing this afternoon in order to prepare an amendment, because it

might make a difference in our attitude toward the bill. I move it be laid on the table until the first of the afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, moves that the two reports of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Exceptions of Persons Entitled to Parole" new draft (S. P. 677) (L. D. 1206) be laid on the table pending acceptance of either report and be specially assigned as the second item this afternoon. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the reports, together with the bill, were so tabled.

Paper from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

**Final Report**

From the Senate:

Final report of the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation.

Comes from the Senate, read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Varney of Berwick,

Recessed until 3 P. M.

**After Recess—3:10 P. M.**

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

**Passed To Be Engrossed**

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

Bill "An Act relating to the Publication of Legal Notices, Legal Advertising and Other Matter Required by Law to be Published in a Newspaper" (H. P. 2226) (L. D. 1168)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that Senate Amendment "A" be adopted in concurrence.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted and the bill, as amended by Senate Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

**Paper From The Senate**

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

From the Senate: Bill "An Act to Provide a Police Commission for the city of Biddeford" (H. P. 1163)

(L. D. 482) on which the House accepted the report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on April 5th.

Comes from the Senate, with the bill substituted for the report and passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. FORD of Saco: Mr. Speaker, I move that we now recede from our former action of April 5th and concur with the Senate in the substitution of the bill for the report, and that this bill be given its first reading at this time.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Saco, Mr. Ford, moves that the House recede from its former action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Legal Affairs and concur with the Senate in the substitution of the bill for the report.

Mr. DONAHUE of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker and members of the Eighty-ninth Legislature: This bill, which was reported out unanimously "Ought not to pass" by the Legal Affairs Committee, would provide for the appointment of a Board of Police Commissioners by the Governor and take away from the citizens of the City of Biddeford part of their right of home rule.

Under the present system in Biddeford, we have twelve patrolmen. The Department at the present time costs \$22,000 a year to run. Under this proposed legislation, this Commission could appoint 18 patrolmen and it would increase the expenditures in that department by approximately 33 1-3 per cent, and would result in an increase in the tax rate of one mill. I therefore rise in opposition to the motion of my friend, the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Ford.

A short time after the hearing an editorial was published in the Portland Evening Express, and, with your indulgence, I would like to read it to you:

#### **"Biddeford Police"**

We know very little about the honesty or efficiency of the Biddeford police force. Until there developed the movement to take the appointment of the officers from the hands of the local government and turn the power over to a State selected commission, we had heard nothing against it up this way. That isn't conclusive that the force is all right but it is an indication

that it is. At any rate it would have to be shown that it is pretty bad before in our opinion the Legislature would be warranted in depriving the people of the city of this much of their local self-government.

"The people of Biddeford are intelligent, and even though they have acquired the habit of voting the Democratic ticket, which is against them, they have had pretty good government out there. At any rate no scandals have developed and governmental matters have gone along very smoothly.

"In the course of the hearing on the police commission bill it was brought out that big gambling games have been going on there, participated in by Portland players without interference by the police. That might be, for gambling games are going on in Portland and we suppose in Bangor, which the police are unable to stop, although we must say for them here that they try hard. But if the police of Biddeford can't handle the situation, there is a good sheriff's department which should be able to check proceedings if matters get too raw.

"The only precedent for a State-run police force in Maine exists in Lewiston, but there matters got so raw that something had to be done. And even at that some very high class citizens of the place are by no means sure that the idea is right."

Within twelve hours from the time the hearing terminated, the gentleman who charged that gambling games were going on in the city of Biddeford, and who occupies the office of Recorder in the Municipal Court in the city of Biddeford, and whose duty it is to see that warrants are issued in any case he knows of where there is any violation of the law, was served with written demand by the Police Commissioner of Biddeford to produce before them such information as he had or to issue such warrants as he desired, and that the department would immediately execute them. And from that day to this the Police Commission of the city of Biddeford has received no reply from that gentleman.

I believe that this Legislature is fair, I believe that this Legislature is not going to impose upon the taxpayers of the City of Biddeford a police force which will add to their tax burden when the present force has cooperated so efficiently with

the State police, and cooperated with the Secretary of State's Department and performed their duty in a creditable manner and are doing so at the present time, under an appropriation of \$23,000. This bill would mean an increase of 33-1/3 per cent. I therefore hope the motion of the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Ford, does not prevail. (Applause)

Mr. BELANGER of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, I represent the city of Biddeford and we are perfectly satisfied with the way things are now. We elect our police commission by the people and for the people. I think the people of Biddeford should have a voice in this matter. I do not want to tell you how to vote on this matter, but I would ask you to vote the same as you would if this imposition was to be put on your own town or city. I thank you.

Mr. FORD of Saco: Mr. Speaker, before moving the indefinite postponement of this referendum, perhaps it would be wise for me to make a few remarks, and they are this: I do not want you folks to think that we are in any way sugar-coating this measure. This measure is pure and simple a party measure. If I were to tell you that it means one thousand votes to the County of York, Republican votes, it might mean the election of the Governor, it undoubtedly would mean not electing our county ticket, and undoubtedly would mean that for perhaps years to come we will not send Republican Senators to this body, and that is what it does mean to me. I am across the river and in no way implicated in the political fight they may have in Biddeford. We do not want them to come over to us and we do not want to go over to them. But I, as a good Republican, am interested in electing a Republican ticket in York County. Therefore I move the indefinite postponement of this referendum.

Mr. MacNICHOL of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, I bow to the steamroller. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Ford, that the House recede from its former action whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Provide a Police Commission for the city of Biddeford" and concur with the Senate in the

substitution of the bill for the report. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Saco, Mr. Ford, that the House recede and concur in substituting the bill for the "Ought not to pass report" will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-four having voted in the affirmative and 28 in the negative, the motion prevailed, the bill was substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report, and under suspension of the rules was given its two several readings.

Mr. Donahue of Biddeford, then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to H. P. 1163 L. D. 482, Bill "An Act to Provide a Police Commission for the City of Biddeford."

Amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof the following:

**'Referendum.** This act shall be submitted for approval or rejection to the qualified voters of the city of Biddeford at a special election held for the purpose, or at any regular election, held before January 1, 1940, and warrants shall be issued for such election in manner now provided by law for holding municipal elections, notifying and warning the qualified voters of said city to meet in the several ward rooms of said city, there to cast their ballots concerning the acceptance of this act. The vote shall be taken by ballot at said election in answer to the question: "Shall an act passed by the legislature in the year 1939, entitled 'An Act to Provide a Police Commission for the City of Biddeford' be accepted?" which question shall be printed on the official ballots and at said election the voters of said city in favor of accepting the act shall vote "Yes" and those opposed shall vote "No". Otherwise said ballots shall be in the form provided by law when a constitutional amendment is submitted to the vote of the people. The provisions of the law relating to the preparation of voting lists for municipal elections shall apply to such election and said election shall in all other respects be conducted according to law, and the results thereof shall be determined in the manner now provided by law for the determination of the election of mayor. If a majority of the valid votes cast as aforesaid shall be in

favor of accepting the same, then this act shall forthwith take effect as herein provided. So much of this act as authorizes the submission of this act to the voters of Biddeford shall take effect as provided in the constitution, but it shall not take further effect unless adopted by said voters as hereinbefore provided.'

Mr. FORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the indefinite postponement of this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Saco, Mr. Ford, moves that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. FORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Saco, Mr. Ford, asks for a division. All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" 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. Seventy-two having voted in the affirmative, and 28 in the negative, the motion prevailed, and House Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

#### **Passed to Be Enacted (Emergency Measure)**

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

An Act relating to Registration of Veterans' Graves (S. P. 686) (L. D. 1203)

The SPEAKER: This is an emergency measure and requires for its passage the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire elected membership of the House. As many as are 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 three having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, 103 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 the Installation of Pick Clocks in Textile Factories (S. P. 151) (L. D. 124)

An Act in Regard to New Trials on the Ground of Newly Discovered Evidence (S. P. 650) (L. D. 1158)

An Act relating to Interest on Small Loans (S. P. 685) (L. D. 1194)

An Act relating to the Salary of the Recorder of the Northern Cumberland Municipal Court (H. P. 687) (L. D. 260)

An Act relating to Jury Commissioners (H. P. 2201) (L. D. 1146)

An Act relating to Prenatal Examination (H. P. 2230) (L. D. 1170)

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Provide for the Issuance of State of Maine Improvement Bonds and the Allocation of the Proceeds from Sale" (S. P. 380) (L. D. 804)

Comes from the Senate with the bill substituted for the report and leave to withdraw granted.

In the House, that body voted to concur with the Senate in the substitution of the bill for the report and to also concur with the Senate in granting leave to withdraw.

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Judiciary on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for a Bond Issue, the Proceeds of Which to be Disbursed for the Construction, Improvement and Equipment of State Buildings (S. P. 397) (L. D. 805)

Comes from the Senate with the bill substituted for the report and leave to withdraw granted.

In the House, it was voted to concur with the Senate in the substitution of the bill for the report and to also concur with the Senate in granting leave to withdraw.

#### **House Report of a Committee**

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules).

Mr. Hinman from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act for the Assessment of a State Tax for the Year 1939 and the Year 1940" (H. P. 465) (L. D. 136)

Report was read and accepted, and the bill, having already been printed, was given its three several readings under suspension of the rules and passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House at this time the first tabled and specially assigned matter, three reports of the Committee on Labor, Report A, Report B and Report C on Bill "An Act Relating to Labor Relations" (S. P. 447) (L. D. 993) tabled by the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, earlier in today's session, pending the motion of the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Arzonico, that the House accept Report B "Ought not to pass."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Charleston, Mr. Howes.

Mr. HOWES: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when I went home to dinner I had quite a lot of information, but when I came back all I could find was pictures.

In regard to these three labor bills that we had here, I will say that we have spent considerable time this winter and failed to agree on anything. Finally, we appointed a committee, Mr. Hill, Mr. Chase, and Mr. Marshall, and they drafted a bill. They came in one night and stayed until about midnight. Then they took this down and they re-drafted another bill, this bill we have here, Senate Paper 689. I will say that since that there has been another bill drafted. The report of the committee was 7 to 2 in favor of this bill. It seems to me that we should pass this bill if we are going to pass any bill.

Personally, I did feel, at the time of the last Legislature, and at the time of the strike in Lewiston, that if we had a Maine Commission to look after that strike that Maine would have saved thousands and thousands of dollars. I think it was somewhere around sixteen weeks before the Federal Relations Board acted on that strike. In the meantime the employees in the shops in Lewiston were out of work and the city of Lewiston was paying a vast amount of money to keep those people alive. At the same time around a million dollars was lost in wages.

This bill sets up a Commission, the Commissioner of Labor of the State being one member, and there would be two other members appointed. They only receive pay during such time as there is a strike and at such times as they are called.

I know that the last Legislature and this Legislature has been against any new commissions, and I voted against several myself. But

the Commissioner of Labor is already paid, and you are to pay these other two just while they are working.

Some people have argued that Maine has very little labor troubles. That is probably so to a great extent. But if we had some labor trouble, the same thing would happen that happened before: We would have to wait for Washington, and they are already loaded down with bills. As I said yesterday, if we have a Commission I believe they will say to the Maine Commission, "Go ahead and fix things up."

I believe it is only fair to labor, I believe it is only fair to the people of the State of Maine and the cities that have these large mills. Supposing we should have a big strike in Biddeford, it would cost the city an untold amount of money and cost the Legislature three or four months' work.

I am not going to take too much time on this bill because there are other men who are going to speak, but I do hope that it has a passage.

I have some figures here: Total number of employees in the State gainfully employed, 175,225; number employed in interstate industries 68,000; number employed in intrastate industries not covered by the Federal Act, 107,000.

I consider it only fair to these people to have a Commission to settle their disputes.

Mr. MARSHALL of Auburn: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I want to take just a minute and a half of your time. A motion has already been made by the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Arzonico, that we concur with the Senate in accepting the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee. If this is done, we will not have an opportunity to consider the redraft which is printed and which appears on your desks and which sets up a Labor Relations Board in the State of Maine.

Now this draft was made up by the Chairman of the Labor Committee, Senator Hill, assisted by other members of the Labor Committee, after a great deal of consideration, careful thought and conscientious effort.

I won't take too much of your time, but I would remind you that down until 1819 if you and your neighbor had a disagreement over

the boundary line between your properties that you would fight it out in a physical way. That is the way that labor and its employers consider their troubles today. It cost the State of Maine \$60,000 for the use of the National Guard in Androscoggin County some two years ago, when, I believe, if we had had a board in our own State of Maine, administered by Maine people such as you and I are, this thing could have been approached in a calm, intelligent and civilized manner. I believe that this bill provides the machinery so that these disputes can be decided by the ballot box on the part of employees, and I believe it will fairly administered by the employers, because we do not want to harm them. We are interested in the public relations between employers and employees. May I again remind you that if the motion of the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Arzonico, prevails we will not have an opportunity to consider this redraft, and I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that we should.

Mr. MILLER of Bath: Mr. Speaker, neither at the hearing nor in the debate here in the House have the proponents of this bill pointed out that any labor conditions exist in this State that would necessitate the passage of this bill. Their only argument is the fact that the party platform contained a promise to do something for labor.

It may be good politics to keep all the promises made in a party platform, but in view of the fact that a platform is drawn up a year or two previous to the time a Legislature convenes, I consider that all matters contained in that platform should be considered on their individual merit and necessity. Conditions can change in a year or two to the extent that a promise made at a party convention may be very poor legislation, or there may be no necessity for such a measure.

I personally would much prefer good legislation to good politics regardless of the party platform. You all know the hornets nest that the passage of the National Labor Relations Act stirred up. It gave the radical element that exists in labor all the ammunition they needed to start sit-down strikes and other troubles that, after all, in most cases, cause labor itself to suffer.

Labor conditions in general in Maine are peaceful, which is in it-

self a large factor in the encouragement of the industrial development of our State.

Why pass a law that would ultimately cause the unrest and troubles in this state that the National act did all over the country? In my opinion, the passage of any labor relations legislation at this time would defeat the very object for which it was intended.

Mr. ARZONICO: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to remind the members of the House at this time that this bill which is now No. 1297 was very thoroughly considered in committee and, as you all recall, it was reported out of committee by five members "Ought not to pass." I say that in explaining the division of the vote in the committee. As you will recall, three members voted "Ought to pass" on Bill No. 993, the original bill. Two members reported "Ought not to pass" on that. Four members reported "Ought to pass" on L. D. 1207, which is this new draft. Therefore that vote was five in opposition—five members of the committee were in opposition to this draft.

I am wondering, after it is all done and said, this redraft, as we called it in committee, did not satisfy organized labor. They absolutely rejected it. It has been presented to the employers, or their representatives, and they rejected it. I am wondering what we as members of this Legislature are going to do, pass something that labor and industry has said they do not want? Are we passing this bill for them or just for ourselves here? I thought that a Labor Relations Act would be something to benefit both the employer and the employee. As long as they turned it down, I think the Legislature should do likewise. I therefore hope that the "Ought not to pass" report will be accepted.

Mr. MILLS of Farmington: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the amendment which has been placed on your desks, House Amendment "A" to this bill. I have gone over this with a representative of labor this morning and this amendment would clear up the objections that they have to the bill. I think that they are minor objections and that they would be cleared up by the amendment. The party platform has been spoken of, the Republican party platform. I believe that it would be a grievous breach of trust

for both the Republicans and Democrats to turn down the Labor Relations Bill.

We Republicans said in our party platform: "We favor the enactment of State labor relations legislation adapted to the needs of Maine labor and for the protection of the wage earner. We believe that the State Labor Department should be expanded to the extent that safety and sanitary conditions for the worker may be fully assured."

Further, the Democrats in their platform said: "We advocate the immediate enactment of a State Labor Relations Act establishing a State Labor Relations Board."

It has also been said that there are no conditions in the State of Maine which warrant the enactment of such a bill. Brother Marshall a few moments ago pointed out very ably the conditions which resulted from the Lewiston strike and that very likely it could have been averted if we had had such legislation on the books.

A week or two ago I picked up the Portland Press Herald and on one of the back pages were some figures which to me indicated that there were conditions in Maine which warrant such a measure because of the extremely low wages which are paid in Maine. I would like to read a little of this which I took from the Press Herald. "Maine wages below national average in 1937, Board reports." They were the latest figures available. "Mean of \$662 compares with U. S. figure of \$890. Washington, April 9 ((P)) Wages credited to the old age insurance accounts of 217,410 Maine workers in 1937 fell \$228 below the national average, the Social Security Board reported today."

Later on in the clipping it was stated: "Average wages were higher in such industrialized sections as New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and the Great Lakes Region. Michigan workers had the highest average, \$1,102, followed by New York, \$1,042, and Illinois, \$1,029.

Maine is in the geographical situation of New England which is given here as having one of the highest averages, but Maine workers receive \$228 less than the national mean. When you consider the southern states and the wages that they pay down there, I think that it is a situation which very likely would bring about labor difficulties in the future

such as we had in Lewiston a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every member will remember his party pledge when he votes on this bill. It was a solemn pledge and I think many workers in the State voted for us because they felt we would enact such a measure.

I hope the motion of the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Arzonico, does not prevail.

Mr. SLOSBERG of Gardiner: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: The problem that we have before us now has been a most difficult one for the Labor Committee. We have been in conferences many, many times, and we finally reported out Legislative Document 993 in three different ways. Since that time, however, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Arzonico, we have met, and the members who signed Report A, which was "Ought to pass" on Legislative Document 933, have now agreed that they are in favor of L. D. 1207. In other words, the Committee at the present time is seven for the bill and two against.

I think the problem that confronted the Labor Committee is the problem that now confronts this House. The problem is so difficult that it is impossible to draft a bill which will be satisfactory to all people, that is to labor, on the one hand, and to employers, on the other. However, the Labor Committee felt that a Labor Commission as embodied in L. D. 1207 was a step in the right direction. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Yarmouth (Mr. Arzonico) will not prevail.

Mr. LAMBERT of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: As I have heard various arguments concerning conditions in the city of Lewiston, I feel as though I should get up and tell you of the conditions which did exist in the city of Lewiston at the time of the strike.

The city of Lewiston was faced with a most depressing condition, and the workers were under a handicap by not having a State Labor Relations Board to call upon to help them in their difficulties.

I hope the members of this House will give fair consideration to the demand of the majority of the workers in the city of Lewiston and that the motion of the gentleman from Yarmouth, (Mr. Arzonico) will not prevail.

Mr. ARZONICO: Mr. Speaker, much has been said with reference to the Lewiston strike. I do not believe that that particular strike or any other shoe strike that we may have in the future would have anything to do with what we are trying to decide.

We are trying to decide on a State Labor Relations Board, whether or not the State of Maine wants it now or whether it needs it now. That is the question. If we had had a State Board at the time of the Lewiston strike, it is my opinion that the State Board would not have been able to settle that dispute, because, unless the State Board settles it satisfactorily to both sides, they are going to insist on referring it to the Federal Board when that particular industry comes under interstate commerce. It is a Federal matter and the Federal Board must decide. I think we ought to forget the Lewiston strike and decide on this issue.

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, supposing we do forget the Lewiston strike altogether and suppose we consider many other places where labor is employed, should not we, as Republicans and as Democrats try to carry out the solemn pledge that we made in our State Convention.

You know that I have a fearful memory for some of the activities which we have taken on some things, notwithstanding our party platform. I want to read to you in particular a plank from the Republican Platform and a plank from the Democratic Platform. I know that you have all read L. D. 1207, and you have just heard the amendment read.

Paragraph 17 of the Republican Platform reads as follows:

"We favor the enactment of state labor relations legislation adapted to the needs of Maine labor and for the protection of the wage earner. We believe that the State Labor Department should be expanded to the extent that safety and sanitary conditions for the worker may be fully assured."

Someone, — I do not know just who it is — has drawn this bill that provides for a commission to carry out that pledge to the people of this State.

Now our friends, the Democrats, said, on the side of labor:

"We reaffirm our strong belief in the right of labor to organize and

bargain collectively, free of coercion and intimidation on the part of employers, and we reaffirm our belief in the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and peaceable assembly for all our people."

Now there is what the two parties have said. Here is the bill, and here is the amendment, which is agreeable, as I understand it, to labor. Incidentally, permit me to say that it is the wish of our Chief Executive that we carry out something that will keep faith with the people of this State, both Republicans and Democrats. Therefore I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Yarmouth, (Mr. Arzonico) will not prevail.

Mr. RAMSDALL of Dayton: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Dayton, Mr. Ramsdell, 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. As many as are in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for 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 motion will be entertained.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is, shall the main question be put now? Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Yarmouth, Mr. Arzonico, that the House accept Report B, "Ought not to pass." The gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Mills, asks for a division. All those in favor of the motion for the acceptance of the "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.

Twenty-nine having voted in the affirmative and 73 in the negative, the motion to accept Report "B,"

"Ought not to pass" did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Howes, the House voted to accept Report C, "Ought to pass in new draft."

The new draft having already been printed, under suspension of the rules, had its two several readings.

Mr. Mills then offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" to S. P. 689, L. D. 1207 Bill "An Act Relating to Labor Relations."

Amend said Bill by striking out the word "organization" in the fourth line of Section 4 thereof, and inserting in place thereof the word 'employer'.

Further amend said Bill by adding at the end of Section 3 thereof a new sub-section to read as follows: '(e) It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer to interfere with, restrain or coerce his employees in the exercise of their rights to organize.'

Further amend said Bill by inserting at the end of Section 4 thereof the following: 'No employer or his representatives shall have the right to call an election.'

Further amend said Bill by striking out in Section 9 thereof the words "or seasonal industries".

Thereupon, House Amendment "A" was adopted and under suspension of the rules the bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the second tabled and specially assigned matter, two reports of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Exceptions of Persons Entitled to Parole" (S. P. 30) (L. D. 10) new draft (S. P. 677) (L. D. 1206) Report A, "Ought to pass in a new draft" and Report B, "Ought not to pass."

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan.

Mr. COWAN: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: If I had the eloquence of the gentleman from Belfast (Mr. Buzzell) or the agility of mind of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Payson), I might be able to give you some words of wisdom or entertainment.

I tabled this bill because I was uncertain as to what the thing might lead to. When our Judiciary Committee reports a bill out with an even division, five for, and five against, what are our poor minds to think in regard to the matter?

While I am here on my feet, I want to call your attention to the fact that there are several members of the House who have not so far in this session exercised their constitutional right to make themselves heard. One is the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, and another is the gentleman over in the corner, commonly known as "Buckshot Johnnie". The gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Hinman, the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Weatherbee, and, your humble servant—none of us have expressed ourselves once on the floor of the House, and we all have speeches inside us and we want to get them out on this last day. (Laughter)

Now if you will bear with me a minute, I want to pay my respects to one of the greatest of all the committees we have, our joint Committee on Judiciary.

Now the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, has called your attention to the fact that this is the greatest of our committees, and not only the greatest of our committees but the greatest committee on Judiciary that we ever had. We have there ten legal persons, all lawyers of the first caliber, and we have here their report before us, five for and five against. Now this Committee on Judiciary are all men—and women too, because they have a lady member—that I have the pleasure of regarding as personal friends. They have been very kind to me in this session of the Legislature. The first bill they turned down was one I brought in, and, through the kindness of their hearts, they killed it.

I want to call attention specifically to the caliber of the gentlemen on this committee in the House. Of course I shall not mention the caliber of those in the unmentionable body further down the corridor. There is the great pugilist, the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Weatherbee; there is the tax expert, Mr. Varney of Berwick; the noted botanist, Mr. Bird; that custodian of public morals, Mr. McGlauffin; our next Attorney General, James Dewey Thorne; Mr. Hinckley, none of whose remarks

have been expunged from the record at this session, and the cagey Mr. Fellows (Laughter)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, these people have brought in a divided report, five for and five against. Now I do not know whether we should call that a good bill or a bad bill. To my very simple mind it does not look to me as if it was very well drawn. I think it was drawn by one of the stenographers by the office boy. And if we can find the Judiciary Committee divided in that way, five for and five against—if they brought in a unanimous report, I would say kill it, but with five for and five against, it must be good, and I move the acceptance of Report A, "Ought to pass in new draft." (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, moves that the House accept Report A, "Ought to pass in new draft" on Bill "An Act Relating to Exceptions of Persons Entitled to Parole." Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the House accepted Report A, "Ought to pass in new draft" in concurrence. The new draft, having already been printed, was given its two several readings under suspension of the rules.

Mr. VARNEY of Berwick: Mr. Speaker, I cannot fail to make these short remarks and call to your attention this fact: I still believe that this bill should not pass, although I do not think it is particularly important one way or the other. I would like to call your attention to the fact that of the seven able lawyers referred to here four signed the "Ought not to pass" report and three the "Ought to pass."

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the new draft had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

### Conference Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature, on Bill "An Act relating to the County Commissioners of Androscoggin County" (H. P. 2061) (L. D. 1097) reporting that a majority of the Committee recommends that Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed; that House Amendment "B" accompanying this Report be adopted, and that the

Bill as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" be enacted.

(Signed)

Messrs. Goss of Poland  
Pratt of Turner  
Winslow of Auburn  
—Committee on part of House.  
Findlen of Aroostook  
Worthen of Penobscot  
—Committee on part of Senate.

Mr. LEVEQUE of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I move that House Paper 2061, Legislative Document 1097, be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman that the only question before the House is on the acceptance or rejection of the committee report. After that question has been decided, the Chair will recognize the gentleman, if he desires.

Is it the pleasure of the House to accept the report of the Conference Committee?

The motion prevailed and the report was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Leveque, now moves that Bill "An Act relating to the County Commissioners of Androscoggin County" (H. P. 2061) (L. D. 1097) be indefinitely postponed?

Mr. GOSS of Poland: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I was not prepared to make any address on this particular measure, but I just want to say that the Conference Committee considered this matter very carefully and finally came out with a five to one report, which is on your desks today, and it is, I believe, their sentiment that this bill should go through. That is all I wish to say unless there is further argument, in which case I might wish to make some rebuttal.

Mr. LAMBERT of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, as I understand this bill regarding the County Commissioners of Androscoggin County, it provides for the Chairman to receive a salary of \$1,500 a year and the other members to receive a salary of \$1,000 a year. In all the other counties except Androscoggin the Chairman of the County Commissioners is elected by the County Commissioners themselves. This bill says that the oldest member or the outgoing member of the County Commissioners is to be the Chairman. I wish that the members of this House would adopt the system

for Androscoggin County like every other county. I therefore hope that the motion for indefinite postponement does not prevail.

MR. GOSS: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I am very sorry to have to go into detail on this particular thing. However, with reference to the salaries of the County Commissioners of Androscoggin County, I will say that, as the situation has been, the salary of the Chairman has been \$2,000, of which \$500. is for his duties as Superintendent of Buildings. The salaries of the associate members has been \$750 each per year. The Chairman is expected to normally put in his full time. That is why the salary of the Chairman has been so far beyond the associate members. It has been felt by many that the salaries should be nearer alike, and so the proposed plan was to set the salary of the Chairman at \$1,500 and the associate members at \$1,000 each.

Now this is not an increase in salaries; it is merely a rearrangement.

Now in regard to the rotation of the Chairmanship, I am going to come right out here in plain English and tell you just exactly what the situation is. We have a board of County Commissioners of which two are Democrats and one a Republican. The only purpose of the amendment, which would require the rotation of the Chairmanship, is so that the Republican member who is in the minority will have an opportunity to be Chairman of our County Commissioners. We are not depriving the minority party of the Chairmanship; we are merely trying to protect our own Republican member. He, having received the vote of the people, which elected him to the Board of our County Commissioners, should have the opportunity of serving at least one term as Chairman of the Commission.

THE SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Leveque, that Bill "An Act relating to the County Commissioners of Androscoggin County" be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Leveque, that the bill be indefinitely postponed will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the

motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the House voted to reconsider the passage of the bill to be engrossed and further voted to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment "A".

House Amendment "B" was read by the Clerk, as follows:

House Amendment "B" to H. P. 2061. L. D. 1097 Bill "An Act Relating to the County Commissioners of Androscoggin County."

Amend said Bill by adding at the end thereof the following:

'Provided, however, that if said elected member in Androscoggin County shall in writing decline the election as chairman, the Board may, by ballot, elect either of the other members to be chairman. The chairman of said Board in Androscoggin County shall receive a salary of \$1500 per year, and each of the other members shall receive a salary of \$1000 per year.'

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" was adopted and the bill as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

#### Paper From the Senate

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

#### Senate Resolve in First Reading

Resolve relating to the Appointment of a Committee to Investigate Maine Coast Fisheries, Incorporated, and Fishermen's Relief Corporation (S. P. 375) (L. D. 795); in new draft (S. P. 680) (L. D. 1191) under title of "Resolve relating to the Use of Public Funds Advanced to Fishermen's Relief Corporation, and Maine Coast Fisheries, Incorporated, for Relief of Needy Fishermen in Maine."

(This being a printed resolve, the rules were suspended and the resolve was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence)

MR. BUBAR of Weston: Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to address the House for just a moment.

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

MR. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and

members of the House: I just want to take this opportunity, because we are coming so near the close of the session that I may not get a chance to get on my feet again, to thank the members for bearing with me during the session. I will admit that once or twice I may have hit a note that sounded as a discord to the souls of some of the older members, but I want to thank you for taking me in as green as I am.

I have here at this time a little paper which I wish to be read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the document, if there is no objection.

### THE LEGISLATURE HAS ADJOURNED

By Benj. C. Bubar

The Legislature has adjourned,  
It's near the first of May.  
My grip is packed, my ticket's  
bought,  
I'm going home today.

If I'm nutty or cuckoo,  
Or caught out in the rain,  
Of if I have no place to go,  
Well—I'll come back again.

I'm all fed up on rules and bills,  
And arguing all day.  
I've made my speeches and I'm  
through.  
I'm going home to stay.

I like the fellows, one and all.  
I've had a heap of fun.  
But 'taint no place for kids like me.  
I'm home-sick, and I'm done.

I've voted right on every bill.  
My conscience tells me so.  
I've done my best for those back  
home,  
And now I want to go.

Of course when 'lection day comes  
'round,  
And I hear duty's call,  
I may decide to come again,  
But,—'twon't be 'til next fall.

Anyway, I'm going home.  
The folks I love the best  
Will meet me at the train  
And—you can guess the rest.

There won't be any arguing,  
No speaking loud and long.  
I'll just sit 'round and rest a bit,  
And listen to their song.

Yes-sir-ee, I'm all packed up.  
From basement to the dome—  
I've said good-bye to all the boys,  
And now—I'm going home.

If I've said an unkind word,  
Forgive me, friend, I pray.  
The Legislature has adjourned.  
I'm going home today.  
(Laughter and applause)

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the members that there are more important reports about to be acted upon. The House may be at ease for a few minutes.

### House At Ease

4.55 P. M

The Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Varney of Berwick, was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. VARNEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief remarks for the information of all of the members of the House.

As I understand it, practically all of the printing that is necessary for the adjournment of the Legislature has been done in advance, so that it appears now that we could probably adjourn sometime in the early evening.

Certain special activities have been planned for the early evening, and, by early evening, I mean seven-thirty. For that reason, I hope that at the proper time, as soon as we have finished the calendar which is now before us, that this House will bear with me in a recess until seven-thirty. At that time, after we have finished the special activities to which I refer, if it appears to the majority of the members that they had rather stay and complete the work, you will have an opportunity to decide on whether or not you want to do so. If the majority feel that they had rather adjourn at that time and come back tomorrow morning, then you may do that; but I will ask the House to bear with me in a recess, when the time comes, until seven-thirty this evening, in order that we may go through with our special activities as planned. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The House is proceeding under Supplement No. 5.

**House Committee Report**  
**(Out of Order and Under Suspension**  
**of the Rules)**

Mr. Churchill from the Committee on Claims on the following Resolves:

H. P. 818 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Hodgdon for Support of Paupers.

S. P. 237 Resolve in Favor of the Town of Houlton.

H. P. 1483 Resolve to Reimburse Jackman Plantation for Expenses of Arthur W. Couture, Otherwise Known as Peter Couture, and William Couture 3rd, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1249 Resolve in Favor of Michael Kane, of Bangor, for Burial Expenses of Harry Cousins and Honore Devou.

H. P. 1483 Resolve in Favor of Addie E. Keegan, of Van Buren.

H. P. 964 Resolve in Favor of J. T. Kelleher & Son, of Bangor, for Burial Expenses of Transients.

H. P. 1022 Resolve to reimburse the Town of Kingfield for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1383 Resolve in Favor of the Town of Kingfield.

S. P. 207 Resolve to Reimburse Dr. C. C. Knowlton for Medical Attendance to Seth A. Moore, a State Pauper.

S. P. 206 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Lamoiné for Hospital Aid for Elsie E. Lyons, State Pauper.

H. P. 822 Resolve in Favor of Lawry Brothers Company, of Fairfield.

H. P. 959 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Limestone for Support of Lewis Cowett.

H. P. 1489 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Lincoln for Support of John S. McNamara and Family, Paupers.

H. P. 1488 Resolve in Favor of the Town of Lincoln for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1259 Resolve in Favor of M. C. Maddan of Old Town, for Medical Attendance for Paupers.

H. P. 1370 Resolve in Favor of the Madigan Memorial Hospital, of Houlton, for Treatment of Dependent Persons Living in Reed Plantation.

H. P. 1018 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Madison for Support of Charles M. Perkins, Jr., a State Pauper.

S. P. 315, L. D. 596 Resolve Reimbursing the Town of Mexico for Support of Joseph and Rosario Rossi.

H. P. 986 Resolve to Reimburse

the Town of Milford for Support of Calvin C. Johnston.

H. P. 1040 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Millinocket for Hospital Treatment of Avis Edith Corron, Daughter of George J. Corron, State Pauper.

H. P. 1039 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Milo for Support of State Paupers.

H. P. 1379 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Moscow for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1269 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Moscow for Support of Charles H. Brown.

H. P. 987 Resolve in Favor of Manning C. Moulton M. D. of Bangor for Treatment of Alvin H. Day, a State Pauper.

H. P. 963 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Mount Vernon for Support and Burial Expenses of Mrs. Carrie Snowman, Having no Known Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1017 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Danforth for Support of Ralph W. Crone and Family.

H. P. 528 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Dedham for Support of Harry R. Bates, State Pauper.

H. P. 994 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Dennysville for Support of Albert Gardner and Family, of Plantation No. 14.

H. P. 973 Resolve for Payment of Expenses of John H. Watterson, Transient Person, in the Town of Blaine.

H. P. 989 Resolve in Favor of J. A. Donovan, M. D., of Houlton for Treatment of Edwin Steeves, a State Pauper.

H. P. 1016 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Dover-Foxcroft for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1248 Resolve in Favor of the Eastern Maine General Hospital for Treatment of Roland Potter, of Hudson.

H. P. 1033 Resolve in Favor of the Eastern Maine General Hospital, of Bangor, for Treatment of Dependent Persons.

H. P. 1262 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Eastport for Support of Carrie Harris, Having no Known Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1265 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Eastport for Support of Hollis D. Grant, Having no Known Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1264 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Eastport for Support of Sadie Grant, Having no Known Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1261 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Eastport for Support of Jean Goulet, Having no Known Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1263 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Eastport for Support of Paul Leighon, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 988 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Ellsworth for Support and Burial Expenses of Victor Linja and August Miller, Paupers.

H. P. 65 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Fairfield for Aid to Emma Parker, State Pauper.

H. P. 1035 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Fort Fairfield for Support of George Parks and His Children, Henrietta and Geraldine Parks, State Paupers.

H. P. 1034 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Fort Fairfield for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1026 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Frankfort for Support of Cleve A. Harvey and Family, Having no Known Settlement.

H. P. 1025 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Frankfort for Support of Kenneth E. Harvey and Family, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 993 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Farland for Support of Luther C. Colbath, a State Pauper, Now Deceased.

H. P. 1117 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Gouldboro for Support of State Paupers.

H. P. 1471 Resolve in Favor of Beatrice Guimond, of Township 17, Range 4, Aroostook County.

H. P. 847 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Hodgdon for Support of State Paupers.

H. P. 1268 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Aurora for Support of Velma A. and Marjorie L. Richardson.

H. P. 1301 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Anson for Support of the children of Frank Lewis, State Pauper.

H. P. 1305 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Anson for Support of Frank Lewis, State Pauper.

H. P. 1307 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Anson for Support of Harold L. Smith, State Pauper.

H. P. 836 Resolve in Favor of the Aroostook Hospital for Treatment of Harriet Daggett, a State Pauper.

H. P. 1266 Resolve in Favor of the Aroostook Hospital for Treatment of Herbert R. Russell, Son of Zodac B. Russell, State Pauper.

H. P. 821 Resolve in Favor of City of Bangor.

H. P. 965 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Bangor for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1366 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Bar Harbor for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 980 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Benton for Support and Burial Expenses of Hiram G. Hall, having no known settlement in the State.

H. P. 1378 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Bingham for Support of State Dependents.

H. P. 370 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Bradford for the Support of Charles E. Sawyer and Mary A. Sawyer, State Paupers.

H. P. 843 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Brewer for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1247 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Brewer for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1365 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Bridgewater for Support of LeRoy O. Wilcox and Family.

H. P. 1041 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Bristol for aid to John William Shorey.

H. P. 985 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Brunswick for Expenses of Pierre Romeo Letoile, a Transient.

H. P. 972 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Burnham for Support of James P. O'Brien, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 971 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Burnham for Support of Raymond W. Edwards and Family, State Paupers.

H. P. 1361 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Camden for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1009 Resolve for Payment of Medical Expenses and Hospital Treatment for Carl N. Pool and Family.

H. P. 833 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Caribou for Support of the children of Ralph Libby.

H. P. 834 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Caribou for Support of Mabel Moode, the Daughter of Lyons Moode.

H. P. 457 Resolve Reimbursing Town of Carmel for Medical and Burial Expenses of Henry M. Damon.

H. P. 1142 Resolve to Reimburse Cary Hospital for Hospital Services Furnished to Mrs. Doris Carr.

H. P. 1141 Resolve to Reimburse Cary Hospital for Services Furnished to the Town of Connor for Paupers.

H. P. 957 Resolve to Reimburse Caswell Plantation for the Support of Yvonne Casista, of Caswell.

H. P. 958 Resolve to Reimburse Caswell Plantation for Support of Aurgle Despres.

H. P. 977 Resolve in Favor of the Central Maine General Hospital of Lewiston for Treatment of Dependent Persons.

H. P. 975 Resolve in Favor of the Central Maine General Hospital, at Lewiston for Treatment of Wayne E. Kimball of Mechanic Falls.

H. P. 978 Resolve in Favor of the Central Maine General Hospital, at Lewiston for Treatment of Lawrence Ronco, of Eustis.

H. P. 5 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Charleston for the Support of the Children of Harvard J. Smith, State Pauper.

H. P. 876 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Chapman for Support of Jacob D. Morse, a State Pauper.

H. P. 1490 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Auburn for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 4 Resolve in Favor of the City of Augusta for the Support of Martin L. Savage.

H. P. 1373 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Calais for Support of Clifford R. Craig, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1368 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Old Town for Support of Mrs. Celia Holmes and Child, Having no Known Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1003 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Miss Elise DuMaine.

H. P. 997 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Mrs. Shirley B. Johnson and one child, Mary Jean Johnson.

H. P. 999 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Joseph Yeaton, illegitimate child of Mildred Austin.

H. P. 1008 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Alvah Coron and family.

H. P. 1007 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Mrs. Katherine Somerset and her two minor children, Irene R. Somerset and Dorothy E. Somerset.

H. P. 1006 Resolve to Reimburse

the City of Portland for the Support of Mr. Henry Jewers.

H. P. 1004 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Milledge Preston, his wife, Lorena Chaney Preston, and six minor children; Arnold, Calvin, Milledge, Jr., Mildred, Raymond, and Jaunita.

H. P. 1002 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Mrs. Shirley Perkins and her two minor children, Ina J. Perkins and Marion R. Perkins.

H. P. 998 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Mrs. Myrtle M. Jenkins Campbell and her minor children, Emily M. Campbell and Beatrice C. Campbell.

H. P. 996 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of Mrs. Olive Penney and her minor child, Maurice B. Penney.

H. P. 1000 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Portland for the Support of George W. Burgess and his wife, Mary Manchester Burgess.

H. P. 829 Resolve to Reimburse the City of Westbrook for Support of Family of John Klusnick, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 970 Resolve to Reimburse Concord Plantation for Support of Florence L. Rollins, a State Pauper.

H. P. 235 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of New Vineyard for Aid to Earle Welch, a State Pauper.

H. P. 1381 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of New Limerick for Assistance to Andrew G. Martin and Wife, State Paupers.

H. P. 1242 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Newport for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 969 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Norridgewock for Burial Expenses of Perley A. Martin or Addison P. Martin.

H. P. 968 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Norridgewock for Support of Lesime Paradis and Family.

H. P. 524 Resolve in Favor of Northern Maine General Hospital, Eagle Lake.

H. P. 527 Resolve in Favor of the Town of Orland for Support of Harry R. Bates, State Pauper.

H. P. 1010 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Orneville for Support of Carl N. Pool and Family.

H. P. 953 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Patten for Support of Abbie Dechane, a Pauper.

H. P. 1241 Resolve to Reimburse

the Town of Perham for Support of Guy Huston, a Pauper.

H. P. 875 Resolve in Favor of Presque Isle General Hospital for Treatment of Mrs. Mitchell Clavette.

H. P. 1354 Resolve in Favor of the Presque Isle General Hospital in Presque Isle.

H. P. 846 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Readfield for Burial Expenses of Mrs. Rosamond Noyes.

H. P. 961 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Richmond for Support of Lester W. Little and Family, State Paupers.

H. P. 702 Resolve in Favor of the Town of Rangeley.

H. P. 1380 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Sangerville for Support of Paupers.

H. P. 1027 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Searsport for Support of Vaughn Stairs and Family, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 1015 Resolve in Favor of Sisters Hospital, of Waterville.

H. P. 1472 Resolve in Favor of Stephen Sinclair, of Township 17, Range 4, Aroostook County.

H. P. 1271 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Smyrna for Medical Attendance of State Paupers.

H. P. 1485 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of South Berwick for Support of State Dependents.

H. P. 1364 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Swanville for Support of Libbeus and Lillian Ames' Children, of Swanville.

H. P. 707 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Wade for Support of State Paupers.

H. P. 1038 Resolve to Reimburse the County of Washington for Burial Expenses of James Libby, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 956 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Washburn for Support of Walter R. Dyer and Family, Having no Settlement in the State.

H. P. 706 Resolve appropriating money to pay a pauper claim of the Town of Washburn.

H. P. 962 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Waterford for Support of Frank E. Mayo, State Pauper.

H. P. 1352 Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Weston for Support of Ruby T. Crone and Family, State Paupers.

S. P. 250, L. D. 448 Resolve in Favor of the Town of Willimantic, to Reimburse for the Support of Marshall Lovejoy and Family, State Paupers.

H. P. 820 Resolve to Reimburse the

Town of Woodstock for moneys collected by the State of Maine through mistake.

H. P. 1020 Resolve in Favor of the Town of Van Buren.

Reported a Consolidated Resolve under title of "Resolve providing for the Payment of Certain Pauper Claims" (H. P. 2252) and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was read and accepted and under suspension of the rules the resolve was given its two several readings, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

### House Committee Reports

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

#### Referred to the 90th Legislature

Mr. Cushing from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of Clyde H. Smith (H. P. 696) (L. D. 292) reported that same be referred to the 90th Legislature.

#### Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Bragdon from the Committee on Claims reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve to reimburse the town of Norridgewock for Support of Mrs. Eva Sterry (H. P. 967)

Mr. VARNEY of Berwick: Mr. Speaker, I move that the "Ought not to pass" reports of the Committee on Claims on Items 3 to 100 inclusive be accepted without further reading

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, moves that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" reports of the Committee on Claims on Resolves which bear Item Nos. 3 to 100 on Supplement No. 5 of the House Advance Journal, without further reading.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, it is evident that history repeats itself, and everything is left until the last minute and crowded through here.

Now I introduced three claims from the town of Lisbon in this House that called for any money, and I find that everything I have introduced has been turned down. It seems that a lot of other things here have been passed. I would like to know how the committee arrived at the various things that ought to pass.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman objects to the acceptance of the reports without reading? If the gentleman desires, the reports will be read individually.

Mr. PLUMMER: No, Mr. Speaker,

I do not care to have them read individually. I would like to have some explanation as to why all of mine were turned down and some of the others were passed. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman desire any particular item to be excepted from the motion of the gentleman from Berwick?

Mr. PLUMMER: One item, Mr. Speaker—Item 56, Resolve Reimbursing the town of Lisbon for Support of Paupers, H. P. 538.

The SPEAKER: If the gentleman will defer his remarks, the Chair will state that the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, moves that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" reports on Items 3 to 100, excepting Item Number 56, as follows:

Mr. Cushing from the Committee on Claims reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve to reimburse the town of Anson for the Support of Parker Lewis, a State Pauper (H. P. 1393)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to reimburse the town of Anson for Support of Edith Lewis, State Pauper (H. P. 1302)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to reimburse the town of Norridge-wood for Support of Lester Brown, Jr., and Family (H. P. 1363)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Children's Hospital at Portland, for Treatment of Maurice Cyr of Caribou (H. P. 1350)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Caribou for Support of Paupers (H. P. 832)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Roxbury for support and Burial Expenses of Isabell May Strout Cereno (H. P. 1014)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Milo for Support of Paupers (H. P. 1101)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Belfast for support of Paupers (H. P. 1360)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Aroostook Hospital of Houlton for Treatment of Dependent Persons Living in the town of Orient (H. P. 1267)

Same gentleman from same Com-

mittee reported same on Resolve for Expense of Treatment of Amelia Dubay, belonging in St. Francis Plantation (H. P. 1476)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Cary Memorial Hospital of Caribou for Treatment of Zephrein Corbin of Hamlin Plantation (H. P. 1244)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Dillingham and Son of Auburn (H. P. 1784)

Resolve in favor of J. A. Donavan M. D. of Houlton for Treatment of Dependent Persons Living in Reed Plantation (H. P. 1372)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Dr. Blossom of Caribou (H. P. 1359)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse Mount Chase Pl. for Support of Sterling R. Davis, Having no Known Settlement in the State (H. P. 951)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of LaGrange for Support of Quentin A. Mitchell and Family (H. P. 1255)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Hartland for Support of Raymond Thompson and Family (H. P. 534)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Charleston (H. P. 1877) (L. D. 1021)

Mr. Cleaves from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Washington for the Support of Elmer K. Clark, State Pauper (H. P. 71)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Holden for Support of Charles L. Daley (H. P. 960)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Vinalhaven for Aid to William H. Brown and Family (H. P. 1514)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Pittston for Support of Orrin Baker's Family (H. P. 1384)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Eustis (H. P. 1818)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to

Reimburse the city of Portland for the Support of John L. Carr and his Wife, Phyllis Profenno Carr (H. P. 1005)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse Carroll Plantation for Support of Nolan Downs and Family (H. P. 825)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Central Maine General Hospital at Lewiston, for Treatment of Willard Fish (H. P. 1275)

Mr. Churchill from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse Grace Patten of Connor for the Board of Antoine Gagnon, a Pauper (H. P. 368)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Richard L. Savage, M. D., of Fort Kent, for Treatment of Dependent Persons in St. Francis Plantation (H. P. 1258)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Marcotte Home of Lewiston, for Board and Care of Zedore Martin, a Pauper (H. P. 1021)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Oakland for Hospital Aid for Rosie May Robinson (H. P. 817)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Children's Hospital at Portland, for Treatment of Ned Cyr of Van Buren (H. P. 1486)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Ashland for the Support of Bertha West Greeley (H. P. 703)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse Carroll Plantation for Mother's Aid Paid to Mrs. Virginia Moores (H. P. 1251)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of S. H. Bond and Son of Jefferson (H. P. 1478)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Central Maine General Hospital, Lewiston, for Treatment of Mrs. Albert St. Pierre and Child, Belonging in Hamlin Plantation (H. P. 976)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to reimburse the city of Portland for the Support of Frank A. Martin, his

wife, Gertrude Wallace Martin, and Children Donald Wallace, Mary Louise Martin and Barbara Joan Martin (H. P. 1001)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Cary Memorial Hospital of Caribou (H. P. 1353)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Prentiss for Assistance to George C. Briggs Jr. and his Family, State Paupers (H. P. 979)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Kingfield for the Support of Frank Smith (S. P. 1123)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Eastport for Support of Winfred Fisher, having no Known Settlement in the State (H. P. 1260)

Mr. Fogg from same Committee reported same on Resolve in Favor of the Home Private Hospital Inc. at Old Town for Treatment of Calvin C. Johnston (H. P. 983)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to provide Payment of Expenses of Tonsil Operations for Children Living in Mount Chase Pl. (H. P. 1349)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Eastern Maine General Hospital of Bangor, for Treatment of Mrs. George C. Briggs, Jr. (H. P. 966)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Reimbursing the town of Monticello for Supplies Furnished a State Pauper (H. P. 1520)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of T. S. Dickison M. D. of Houlton for Treatment of Wellman Reed of Reed Plantation (H. P. 1371)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Clinton for Support of Alvin T. Brown and Family (H. P. 981)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the city of Augusta for the Support of Joe Guimond (H. P. 1037)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Rice and Tapley of Madawaska (H. P. 1473)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse St. Agatha for Support of Paupers (H. P. 1474)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Fort Fairfield Clinic, Inc. (H. P. 1356)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Waterville for Support of Louis and Richard Cormier (H. P. 1013)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of M. J. Pelletier of Fort Kent (H. P. 698)

Mr. Melanson from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Moscow for Support of Bert L. Clark (H. P. 1270)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Hodgdon for Hospital Treatment for Mrs. LeRoy C. Wilcox (H. P. 1351)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Lewiston for Support of Leo Harvey and family, belonging in St. Francis Plantation (H. P. 1477)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Dr. Gregory of Caribou (H. P. 1358)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Patten for Support of Sterling R. Davis, Having no Known Settlement in the State (H. P. 952)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Dresden for Support of Wilmer and Arthur Bixby, Sons of Fred E. Bixby (H. P. 1044)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Craigs Funeral Home of Old Town (H. P. 1481)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Dr. Lindley Dobson of Presque Isle (H. P. 1357)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Portland for the Support of Mrs. Thelma Kierstead and her Two Minor Children, George Merrill Kierstead and Gloria Kierstead (H. P. 1120)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Mars Hill Hospital,

Mars Hill, for Treatment of Mrs. John L. McDonald of Bridgewater (H. P. 1480)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Rockland for Support of the Three Minor Children of Edward Drinkwater (H. P. 1030)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Fort Fairfield Drug Co. (H. P. 1355)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Winterport for Support of Charles E. Reynolds and Family, Paupers (H. P. 1024)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Winterport for Support of Maurice Stillman and Family (H. P. 1028)

Mr. Race from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Easton for Support of Alexander Jenkins a Pauper (H. P. 874)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Prospect for Assistance to William H. Brown and Family, Having no Known Settlement in the State (H. P. 1023)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Mary McDonald of Milford, for Board and Care of Charles H. Avery, Having no Known Settlement in the State (H. P. 1517)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Cary Memorial Hospital at Caribou, for Treatment of Vital B. Cyr (H. P. 1245)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the city of Augusta, for the Support of Allen Mullins (H. P. 1036)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Portland for the Support of Kenneth W. Merrill, his Wife, Iva Hutchins Merrill and Four Minor Children, Kenneth Wayne, Thomas Charles, Richard and Elaine J. (H. P. 1121)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve for Payment of Expenses of Mrs. Byrd McDonald of Bridgewater (H. P. 1479)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Sherman for Support of Fred and Arthur Humph-

rey, Children of Mrs. Ransom R. Bradeen of Silver Ridge Pl. (H. P. 955)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Parsonfield for Support of Frederick W. LaBree and Family, Having no Known Settlement in the State (H. P. 950)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of R. W. Wight and Son of Presque Isle (H. P. 1272)

Mr. Bragdon from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Gorham for Hospital Treatment for Dawn Randall (H. P. 526)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Leeds for Hospital Aid for Mary Millett (H. P. 1254)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Old Town for Support of Paupers (H. P. 984)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Farmington for Support of Richard Crocker or Richard C. Welch (H. P. 992)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Dillingham and Son, Auburn (H. P. 1491)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Winthrop for Support of Richard and Florence Hallock (H. P. 536)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Portland for the Support of Mrs. Helen Valley, Deserted Wife of Alphonso R. Valley and Three Minor Children, Alphonso, Florence, and Dolores Christine (H. P. 1122)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of D. F. Bennet, M. D. of Lubec for Treatment of Mrs. Harold C. Lund (H. P. 1012)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Orono for the Support of Mrs. Joseph S. Dall, State Pauper (H. P. 233)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of St. Albans for Hospital Treatment of Clyde Everett Fields (H. P. 1257)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in

favor of the City of Rockland for Support of Paupers (H. P. 954)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Washington for Support of James Rall, State Pauper (H. P. 70)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Washington for the Support of Gardner Jones, State Pauper (H. P. 69)

Mr. Churchill from same Committee reported same on Resolve Reimbursing Norway Village Corporation (H. P. 1515)

Mr. Cushing from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Aroostook Central Institute of Mars Hill (H. P. 375)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Caribou for Support of Frank Judkins and Family (H. P. 877)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Caribou for Medical Attendance and Hospital Treatment of Mrs. Ellen Jackson, of Allagash Plantation (H. P. 1243)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Brewer for Support of Frank Damon and Family (H. P. 844)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Bridgewater for Support of Paupers (H. P. 532)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the city of Portland for the Support of Leland P. Johnson, his wife Marie Woodward Johnson and One Minor Child, Francis J. Johnson (H. P. 1119)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Benton for Support of Norman I. Burke, son of Lester P. Burke (H. P. 1367)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Anson for Support of Gordon Lewis, State Pauper (H. P. 1308)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve to Reimburse the town of Anson for Support of Alfred Alvah Caron, a State Pauper (H. P. 1300)

On motion by Mr. Dwinall of Camden, the House voted to accept the "Ought not to pass" reports on Items 3 to 100, inclusive, with the exception of Item 56.

Sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Item No. 56.

The gentleman from Cherryfield, Mr. Melanson, from the Committee on Claims, reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve Reimbursing the town of Lisbon for Support of Paupers (H. P. 538).

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, the town of Lisbon, for quite a number of years, has been supporting some paupers that belong to the town of Eastport. (Laughter)

We have tried for a number of years to get our pay, and we cannot do it. As a last resort, we have asked the State to pay it.

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I just want to say this, in defense of the Committee on Claims:

The Claims which have been passed by this Legislature amount to \$93,000, which is by far the smallest amount that has been accepted by any Legislature within the memory of those who are connected with the finances of the State, and I think that the Committee is entitled to much thanks and appreciation for the service that it has rendered in this particular session. I hope that we may not now upset or interfere with their work by attempting to except one, in which case we would be just as much obligated to reconsider the others.

I move Mr. Speaker, that the "Ought not to pass" report be accepted. (Applause)

Mr. MacNICHOL of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, I wish to have the name of the fair city of Eastport expunged from the record.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. MacNichol, moves that the name of the city of Eastport be expunged from the remarks of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Cries of "No, No".

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Hinman, moves that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Claims on Resolve Reimbursing the town of Lisbon for Support of Paupers. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, the "Ought not to pass" report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The House has

now acted upon all matters which have come to it.

The Chair understands that the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, now moves that the House recess until 7:30 o'clock this evening. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House so recessed.

#### After Recess 7:40 P. M.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

Papers from the Senate, out of order and under suspension of the rules, disposed of in concurrence.

#### Final Report

From the Senate:

Final Report of the Committee on Education.

Comes from the Senate, read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: (Out of order and under suspension of the rules).

#### Senate Resolve in First Reading

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

Resolve in favor of Otis Jacob Bowen of Newport (S. P. 225); in new draft (S. P. 691) (L. D. 1213) under same title.

(The rules were suspended and the resolve was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.)

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules.)

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for an Additional Issue of Highway Bonds (S. P. 197) (L. D. 241) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 693) (L. D. 1210) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Comes from the Senate, report read and accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

Mr. COWAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: We have here a provision for greatly enlarging the State's bonded indebtedness, and although possible arguments can be advanced in favor of doing that, such as the fact that money can be borrowed cheaply,

nevertheless it is an increase in our indebtedness, and all increases in bonded indebtedness must always be repaid with interest.

We are today confronted with an enormous burden of interest. We have our old age pension which we have discussed pro and con here. If we had, a few years ago, as advised by our Governor of those days, gone on a pay-as-you-go policy, we doubtless would have every mile of highway we have today, every new bridge, and we would be saving on interest alone sufficient to take care of that entire desired expansion of old age assistance. Any such increase in interest, any such increase in our bonded indebtedness, cannot help but lead this State farther toward bankruptcy.

We are one of the few States in the Union that today can boast of solvency and a good market for our bonds. The very fact that we can borrow money today at a reasonable rate is because we have constrained ourselves in the past and because we have not wasted our resources and because we have not borrowed foolishly.

Now this suggestion for further bonded indebtedness is one we should look at very, very carefully. I do not see how we can favor any such program.

I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, moves that the report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on "Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for an Additional issue of Highway Bonds," reporting "Ought to pass in new draft," with the accompanying resolve in new draft, be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. Speaker, I think before we vote on any such a proposition we should at least know something about the present bonded indebtedness of the State of Maine as it is set up.

I recall that two years ago when we convened in this Legislature our bonded indebtedness was \$30,000,000. This year, in January, our bonded indebtedness was less than \$29,000,000. If you will look at your treasury statement, you will find that this year the State of Maine is retiring nearly \$2,000,000 in bonds. In other words, if we issue \$1,600,000 worth of bonds this year and retire \$2,000,-

000 of bonds, we are not going into the hole.

Mr. VARNEY of Berwick: Mr. Speaker, I am frank to say I did not anticipate an attack upon this bond issue, and I do not know how qualified I am to speak upon it. I certainly hope that some member of the Ways and Bridges Committee can give us more light on this than I am able to do. If I do make any mis-statements, it will be entirely unintentional, and I hope someone will correct me.

If I understand this bill correctly, it merely provides for an additional bond issue, to take effect in 1943. As I understand it, we now have a previous bond issue. The receipts from the present bond issue are used entirely for the matching of Federal highway projects, and that previous bond issue which is now in existence takes care of our Federal Aid highway system for the next two years.

Now this bond issue will not produce any money to be spent on any highways for the next two years, and it is not any increase in amount. I mean by that it is simply a continuation of the present policy of the State to issue bonds to provide for highway construction. The purpose of introducing it in this Legislature is merely because it has to be voted on by the people. Were we to wait until the next Legislature is in session two years from now, then the next Legislature could, of course, pass this same act, if they saw fit, as an emergency measure, but it would have to be referred to the people for their vote, and that could not be done and get the vote of the people in time so that it could be used for State Highway construction in 1943. It is therefore very important, not for the sake of maintaining our highway program now or for the next two years, because that is already provided for, and our program will go on for the next two years regardless of whether or not we pass this act, which merely submits to the people of Maine the question of whether or not they want to continue two years from now with a similar highway program to that which we now have.

Now I have heard a few rumors which are circulating around the House that this bond issue is put in here to make up for the \$800,000 which we took out of highway funds for old age assistance. I want to correct that statement because, in the first place, there is nothing in

this bill that would make any bond issue available in the next two years for any purpose, and therefore the program which we pass will be in effect anyway for the next two years, and, before this becomes effective, almost before any bonds can be issued or any money received under this act, there will be another Legislature in session, which, of course may or at least could change the entire program around.

Now I hope that I have made it plain to the members of this House that this is a tremendously important issue. If I remember correctly, in the Governor's inaugural address—and I happened to look this up here on my desk—he referred at that time—and that was before we had any old age assistance program to work out at all—he referred at that time in these terms to this bond issue:

"However, if State and Federal Aid Highway Construction is to be carried on after June 30, 1941, it is apparent that additional provisions for financing will be required and should be provided during this session."

Now I want to make sure that you all understand that this bill is merely making possible, if the people see fit to adopt it, a bond issue which will provide State and Federal Aid Highway Construction after June 30, 1941, and has nothing to do with the present fiscal two-year period. I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Cowan) that this bill be indefinitely postponed will not prevail.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman who just spoke a question, for information.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin, asks a question through the Chair of the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney. The gentleman may answer if he wishes.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that our present highway construction on the main lines, the funds are provided for by bond issue—is that correct?

Mr. VARNEY: I would say that it is, sir, yes.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I further understand that we are retiring bonds that these

bonds are to take the place of. I so understood the gentleman to say, if I got that right.

Mr. VARNEY: I think you are right, sir.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: Now this question I do not know: Are we asking for more money than is necessary to replace the bonds that are being retired and to be retired in the near future?

Mr. VARNEY: I would say in answer to that question that we are not asking for any additional money. That is, this bond issue would simply permit us to continue construction at the same rate at which we are now constructing these Federal Aid Highways under the present bond issue.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: In other words, we are not trying to get some money by bonds to take care of something else beside the highway construction. Is that right?

Mr. VARNEY: That is right.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House—

Mr. MURCHIE of Calais: Mr. Speaker, my comment on this is going to be very short, as I have always tried to make it. I just want to say to the members of the House that if you want to upset the whole darned highway program of the State of Maine, vote against this bond issue at the present time and that is what you will do.

This is nothing more than following out the regular program of construction that has been going on for years and take care of bonds that will be retired. It is nothing more than the carrying out of that program. We are not asking for any more money, but are simply asking to be in a position to match Federal highway funds. It is pure ignorance to think that it is anything else.

Mr. HUSSEY of Windsor: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Bridges Committee, I will say one thing and that is that I will confirm every statement that the member from Berwick (Mr. Varney) has said. Voting against this bill means a curtailment of the State Highway program. Our program during the past years has depended upon bonds and those bonds are being retired, and if we do not vote for the bond issue, why our highway program will be curtailed. Di-

rectly it does not affect the rural towns because a bond issue is only for State and Federal highways, but indirectly it does affect every town in the State of Maine. In voting against this bill, it would mean the curtailing of the road program of the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine. In order to continue on, as we have in the past, it is necessary to vote for this bond issue because it is simply a continuation, as I said before, of a program that we have followed in past years. Before the next Legislature meets, our present bonds will be taken care of, and it is necessary, in order to continue our present highway program, to vote for this bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Butler, moves the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion, it requires the consent of one-third of the members present. 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 present having arisen, the motion is entertained. The question now is, shall the main question be put now? Is this the pleasure of the House?

Mr. VARNEY: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to see whether or not you want to put the main question now. I hope it is clear to every member what they are voting on. If there is anyone here that can explain it and feels that they want an opportunity to do so, I wish they would arise and say so. I would be in favor of giving them an opportunity.

Mr. GOSS of Poland: Mr. Speaker, relative to putting the main question now, I would like to say that I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER: As many as are in favor of putting the main question now will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was not ordered.

The SPEAKER: The matter is now open for general debate.

Mr. GOSS: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I appreciate

your courtesy in giving me an opportunity to speak on this most important measure. Relative to this bond issue, which is one of the most serious questions that we have to discuss, I would like to say this, not so much in regard to the amount of the bond issue, as in regard to the necessity of the bond issue: It is the bond money that matches the Federal funds for the trunk line construction, and if this bond issue or any bond issue fails of passage, the funds from the general highway funds have got to be taken to match Federal funds. Therefore eventually it is going to mean a depletion of the general highway funds and the result is going to be that the rural communities will suffer because they depend upon the general highway fund for State aid, third class and maintenance. Therefore it means that the rural towns in Maine are going to get hit if this bond issue or any bond issue does not go through.

Mr. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, am I in order to speak again?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is in order.

Mr. COWAN: Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen: I really have listened with certain astonishment to the arguments, not that the arguments themselves were unsound, but I could not understand how men so sound themselves could have gone so far astray.

This matter of borrowing money to pay current expenses is something that I cannot understand. It is not as though we needed this money.

There is talk here about the highway building construction program being curtailed. Well now, perhaps it will be curtailed, but what of it? Are you going to borrow and borrow up to the \$45,000,000 that this bill calls for, in order to spread yourselves on luxuries? Is that what we are going to do?

I had thought from the attitude of the members of this Legislature that we were here to try and carry this State through with as little unnecessary expense as possible. Now we all like to have our roads; we all like to have good bridges. I enjoy riding over good roads as much as any of you. We probably all do a great deal of travelling over both main highways and country highways. I myself get around a great deal over the State, and I wish they could all be made solid concrete

from Kittery to Fort Kent and clear across. But we cannot afford to do it, and that is about what is proposed here. Of course they would not go to any such absurd length as that, but it is putting us further and unnecessarily into debt.

I could not quite follow the last speaker in his argument. Now this is New Deal legislation and it is a New Deal program: Borrow more money and spend more money to try to build yourself up and pull yourself up by your bootstraps. It cannot be done, members, and you know it cannot. And in your daily argument one to the other, you say that this New Deal program is wrong, and you say that this continued borrowing, continued issuing of State bonds and national bonds, is putting us in a bad situation. How can you then come in here and say, "Let us borrow some more?"

Now they say these are replacement bonds. Part of them are replacement bonds. But are we not ever going to pay off our debts? We borrowed some thirty millions of dollars, we built these highways, and we set up a gas tax, among other things, to take care of principal and interest. All right, let us do it. It is not any disgrace, members, it is not any disgrace at all for the State of Maine to reduce its indebtedness. It would not be any disgrace for the national government to reduce its indebtedness, even though that idea is not popular in Washington.

I cannot follow the argument. Are you going to keep on piling up debts for your children to pay? Are you going to pile up interest on interest? What about the education of your children? How are you going to send them to school and to college if you are piling up on yourselves increased interest costs? How are those children going to educate their children if you pile up these things?

If we have something offered to us that we cannot afford to buy, let us not buy it.

Now the gentleman who spoke before me has suggested that these are entirely replacement bonds, but he said he was not well posted on the matter and he did not have all of the facts. Of course when you look at this bill you see immediately that a large part of this suggested bonded indebtedness is new indebtedness, new debt, and every cent of that must be raised from taxation

and paid back, and every cent of principle that is raised from taxation out of your pockets and your children's pockets will have that maelstrom of interest.

Some of you know that I have been pretty closely connected for a great many years with this matter of financing farmers of the State of Maine, and I tell you right now that I never assisted in financing a farmer in this State that I did not feel some measure of regret that he should find himself in a situation where that was necessary. (Applause)

Mr. McGLAUFILIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Varney, I do not claim to be greatly posted on this subject, but I can explain the matter as I understand it. Our main highways have been constructed by money raised from bond issues, and this money has been matched by the Federal Government. Outside of this money that we are talking about, the State of Maine spends about \$9,300,000 a year for highways that are not first class highways. We get from the Federal Government something like fourteen hundred thousand dollars a year. From time to time these bonds become due and must be retired. My understanding of this bond issue is to take the place of those bonds that are retired so that we can continue our first class road construction and take advantage of the aid from the Federal Government. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, says: "When are we going to retire these bonds?" My understanding is that it will be undertaken if and when we get our first class roads completed, which we hope will be sometime.

Mr. MILLS of Farmington: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to argue either one way or the other on this bill, but I rise to ask two questions from someone or anyone who is informed well enough to answer them. I think this is one of the most important measures that has come before this Legislature, and I think it should have come before this Legislature at a time when we could have properly considered it. I think the last days of the session it is very difficult for us to go into the merits of a measure like this. I would like to know why it is necessary to hold it until the last. I wish someone would tell me why we did not

have this a month ago, so we could have properly gone into it on its merits.

The second question I would like to ask is this: In 1935 a similar measure was before us and we authorized an issue of five million dollars in bonds. This year we have before us a measure to authorize the issuance of nine million. I would like to inquire why it is necessary to have four million more.

Mr. HUSSEY: Mr. Speaker, we had a fifteen million dollar bond issue two years ago and the last bond issue was five million. We had a fifteen million dollar bond issue and then a five million dollar bond issue. This one calls for nine million. That is simply, as I said before, a replacement bond issue. The bond issue takes care of the Federal and State highways, and it is absolutely necessary for this bond issue to go through. It is not increasing our indebtedness.

There is no business in the State that does not operate on borrowed money. At the present time, with the present price of money, there is no better opportunity to hire money than there is today. As I understand it, money can be borrowed at approximately 2%. This bond issue does not call for twenty or twenty-five million; it is for nine million. Nine million does not increase our indebtedness more than we have at the present time.

Now in the rural towns, this does not directly help the State aid highways but it does indirectly. If we do not pass this bond issue it means that more money would be taken from the general highway funds. I firmly believe that it is a business proposition for the State of Maine. Furthermore, it includes bridges. I tell you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, it means something to the highways of the State of Maine if we do not pass this bond issue so that we can get funds from the Federal Government. If we do not do this, the money will have to be taken from the general highway funds, and in that case it will affect the rural districts. This is a proposition that will come before the people and I believe that we should give the people a chance to vote on this issue.

As I said before, we never had an opportunity to hire money at such a low rate as we can at the present time. It is not something

that will force anything upon the people. If we do not pass it in this Legislature, before another Legislature convenes the bonds will be retired and there will be a hold-up in our highway program in the State of Maine. This is an opportunity to continue our program and I cannot agree with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan. If we do not vote for this bill it will mean a tie-up in our whole highway program. I certainly hope that this bill will pass and be passed on to the people to vote on this bond issue to keep up our highway program.

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, I came in late and may I ask if the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Cowan) has already spoken twice?

The SPEAKER: If the gentleman asks that as a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will answer yes.

Mr. HINMAN: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make sure that I was protecting myself.

I want to say first that I arise in a dual capacity. I arise first as a Representative in this Legislature and to give you a true picture of the condition as it actually exists and without any question about the truthfulness of what I may say. In the second place, I arise, without being boastful, as representing the biggest individual road-building organization in the State of Maine. In that capacity, the citizens have some obligation to carry on this industry as well as they have others. There are millions of dollars invested in road equipment in this State and I do not like the implication that you can let down that industry.

Now the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, says that he cannot follow the argument. Frankly, I did not hear all of the argument. But when anybody says that we are following New Deal policies, I say without any hesitancy that they do not know what they are talking about. This bond issue is entirely being liquidated on the basis of the income from our gasoline and registration money, and on the basis of what we are now receiving, without any increase, it will take care of itself as well as the retirement of those bonds that we have, and I say that it is perfectly sound. I have been approached on bond issues of fifteen or twenty-five million dollars and I have been opposed to it. Now

this program has been laid out by the Ways and Bridges Committee and I say that it is sound and will pay its way as it goes.

What is our road condition in the State of Maine? I submit to you that you may ride in any direction that you may suggest from this building, you may go from Kittery to Fort Kent, and you have never seen the roads in any worse condition in recent years than they are right now. I submit to you that if you will go to the Highway Department they will give you figures to prove that we have gone backward in our progress in the last fifteen years. In other words, it can be proven that our roads are wearing out faster than we are building them. On that basis, I plead with you that we may carry along this program, and that it will be cheaper for us to carry it along than to let it lapse. I also submit to you that this bond issue, like all others, must be offered to the citizenry of the State of Maine. I submit that every bond issue that has ever been offered to them has been accepted by more than four to one. This bond issue, if the people of Maine do not want it, they do not have to accept it. I do think that it is only fair for all parties concerned that this bond issue should be submitted to the people.

Mr. HOLMAN of Dixfield: Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen: I am one of those who probably do not know much about this, but I had the privilege of listening to a gentleman whom I consider does know something about it, Mr. Chester Gray of Washington, D. C., a Director of the Highway Users Conference, speaking at Orono during the Farm and Home Week program, and he told us what the gentleman from Skowhegan (Mr. Hinman) has just told us, that the roads are wearing out. He said that the best road we know how to build today will not last over twenty-five or thirty years at the most. Two or three other points which he brought out are these: One is that we should not build roads until we need them. The argument for that is that they will wear out if we do not use them at all. The idea has been suggested in the papers that we should have a super-highway across this country. Now there is no more need for that than there is to build a high-

way from here to the moon. For the same reason, we should not build roads until we are ready for them. It has also been said that we should pay as we go. I think the arguments which have been made bears that out. If we are going backward and if the roads are wearing out faster than we can build them. I think it is a good argument to pay as you go. If not, I do not know where we are going to land. If this bond issue is simply to take the place of bonds which are being retired, I do not know why we raise the limit to forty-five million dollars as stated in this bill.

Here is another angle that I think we should look into. We had an Economy Committee appointed and they looked into some of the departments of state and recommended certain reductions. I understand that they did not have time to go into the Highway. I do not know whether or not they could have made any reduction there, but it seems reasonable that in all probabilities it might be possible for them to curtail to some extent so that we would not go backward in our road building so much as some claim if we do not provide the bond issue. I do not know whether it is possible or not, but I think it might be a good idea to pay something on the bonds and pay for the roads at the same time.

Another thing is the amount of interest that we are paying. If we could save the amount of interest, the interest would provide enough to take care of our roads. I just want to call those points to your attention.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, it was said by the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Hinman, that for the past fifteen years our road program has gone backward rather than forward. I think it is generally known that for the past fifteen years we have gone either backward or forward on the policy of bond issues. It might be of interest to note that on April 1, 1920, there was due from the State on its bonds \$1,600,000, and during this period of fifteen years, when we either have been going backward or forward we have increased our indebtedness, so that as of December 1, 1938, our money difference on our bonds was \$23,737,500. So it is indicative that we have been going backwards for fifteen years with the policy of carrying

heavy bond issues. This year we have to pay two million and a half in interest charges and retiring bonds. It might be a good plan, under that policy, to begin refinancing our bonded indebtedness, so that we will get to a point where we can actually pay as we go and be spending the two and a half million in matching Federal funds.

Mr. BURGESS of Limestone: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate very much to rise and try to explain some of the things which I think are misunderstood, because, being a new man in the Legislature and certainly a new man on the Ways and Bridges Committee, I admit to you now that I certainly do not know all about it. But, in the hope that I may clear up some of the misunderstandings which I think prevail, I will do my best.

The State has always carried on the road construction activity, and, by reason of that construction activity, the revenue to the State by reason of gas tax is greatly increased. For the past two or three years the State has been paying off its indebtedness faster than it has been issuing the present authorized bonds.

I want to compare, for the benefit of my good friend, the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, an investment of this type with that of any man who goes into business. He goes into business and makes an investment because he hopes, at least, that by reason of the additional investment there will be an additional return.

This bond issue, if I understand it correctly, will authorize the issuing by the State of approximately \$1,600,000 a year. Every cent of that money will be put into permanent construction of highways and bridges. I ask you, members, if those highways and those bridges are not something that can be used for years to come? Like any other business activity, when you buy a piece of equipment you do not take the entire cost of it out of one year's program, you amortize it. That is what the State has been doing on a sound road construction program, and that is what your Committee on Ways and Bridges, by proposing this program, proposes that it shall continue.

It has been said that your interest charges are greatly increasing and becoming prohibitive. I think if you care to go into it you will find there

is an offsetting decrease in cost of maintenance and perhaps more. By reason of carrying on what has proven in the past to be a sound and sane road program, this Legislature is now being asked to authorize bonds — and it will necessarily go to the people on a referendum vote — to replace those which are being retired. And, after the next two or three years, if I am correct, your bonded indebtedness will gradually decrease, and the people of the State will have had the roads to use, and the State's revenue will have increased too. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the Committee on Ways and Bridges, you will have helped to have solved the road program of today, which we know needs plenty of attention. I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail. (Applause)

Mr. STILPHEN of Dresden: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, will not prevail.

To begin with, all bond issues have to be put before the people, and I do not know why this Legislature should fear that. I do not understand that it will make a \$45,000,000 indebtedness. I think they are trying to make this Legislature understand that with this \$9,000,000 bond issue we shall immediately hire \$9,000,000. That is not so. We issue these bonds as fast as we need them over a period of five years, and, during that time, they are being taken care of from the general highway fund. I sincerely hope the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, that the report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide an Additional Issue of Highway Bonds, together with the resolve, be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman has already spoken twice. Does the gentleman desire leave to speak the third time?

Mr. COWAN: No, Mr. Speaker. I wish to ask a question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will have to rule that asking questions is debate. The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, asks leave to speak a third time. Is this the

pleasure of the House? All those in favor of the gentleman being permitted to speak a third time will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the gentleman was granted permission to speak the third time.

Mr. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the question I would like to ask is this: If the \$45,000,000 that appears in this resolve means nothing, why do we have the figure of \$45,000,000 in the resolve?

Mr. BATES of Patten: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. BATES: Of whom does the gentleman ask the question?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will overrule the point.

The gentleman may continue.

Mr. COWAN: If it is the intention to ask authority is issue no more than \$9,000,000 of bonds, why ask for authority to issue a total of \$45,000.00? I would like to have that question answered, if I may.

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, we have heard it said that this Legislature was one of the best that has convened for a long time, and I, for one, am willing to admit it without proof. It does not seem to me as if we, in the dying hours of this Legislature, should commence to toy with such an important problem as this. It does seem to me that the words of our colleague, Mr. Murchie, ought to sink into us to such an extent that they should be considered.

Now to answer the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Cowan) permit me to read: "The state under proper enactment of the Legislature may issue its bonds not exceeding the aggregate of forty-five million dollars in amount at any one time, and all bonds issued after the year 1938 shall be payable serially within fifteen years from the date of issue, at a rate of interest not exceeding 4% per year, payable semi-annually." In the sum of forty-five million dollars, at a rate of interest not exceeding 4%. It is all in the bill and tells how much may be issued per year.

Now our colleague, Mr. Murchie, says that if we do not do this, it will upset our entire apple-cart. We do not want that done. I take stock and believe in the Ways and Bridges Committee. I have all the

faith in the world in their sound judgment.

There is another thing we want to think of. Do we want to go home and not raise money enough to take care of twelve of fifteen thousand workers on the roads in the State of Maine? We certainly do not. What are we going to do if we do not do this?

And then there was another question asked: When are these bonds going to be paid? The answer is very clear, distinct, concise. They will be paid when due.

I hope the motion of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Cowan) does not prevail.

Mr. FARRINGTON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I think possibly I can answer the question that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, has asked. He said if we are not going to need so much, why does the bill read forty-five million dollars. If I am correct in my understanding, under the Constitution of Maine even at the present time we have a commitment of thirty-six million dollars at the present time. Under the Constitution, if every cent of our bonded indebtedness of this State were paid off, we could not issue any more bonds without raising the bonded indebtedness under the Constitution. That being so, with the debt limit of thirty-six million dollars at the present time, this forty-five million dollars debt limit makes it possible to issue only nine million dollars.

Mr. MURCHIE: Mr. Speaker, one more word, Mr. Speaker, and that is simply this: We are not asking for anything immediate; we are simply asking in this bond issue to plan for the future. I want to say, in a spirit of fair play, and without any prejudice, that it seems to me that most of the opposition to this idea seems to have come from that section of the State that already has its highways pretty well in order. There are other sections in the State of Maine, such as the section to which I belong, where we, like they, have a strong weakness for the great outdoors. Now give us a chance. I insist that if you do go on with the desire of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Cowan) you are simply going to wreck the highway program.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The ques-

tion before the House is on the motion—

Mr. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, that the report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges, reporting "Ought to pass in new draft" together with the resolve, be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Limestone, Mr. Burgess, asks for a division. All those in favor of the motion that the report and resolve be indefinitely postponed 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.

Seven having voted in the affirmative and 101 in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Thereupon, the House voted to accept the report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges "Ought to pass in new draft," the resolve was given its two several readings under suspension of the rules and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair notes with pleasure the presence in the House of the distinguished President of the Senate, Honorable Sumner Sewall. The Sergeant at Arms will escort him to the Speaker's desk.

Thereupon, the Honorable Sumner Sewall was escorted by the Sergeant at Arms to a chair at the right of the Speaker, the members rising and applauding.

#### Senate Bills in First Reading

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

Bill "An Act Reapportioning the Expenditures of the General Highway Fund" (S. P. 235) (L. D. 268); in new draft (S. P. 695) (L. D. 1212) under same title.

Bill "An Act to Provide for Further Issuance of State Highway Bonds" S. P. 308) (L. D. 514); in new draft (S. P. 692) (L. D. 1211) under same title.

(The rules were suspended and the bills were given their three several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence)

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules:

From the Senate: Bill "An Act relating to Requisites for Old Age Assistance" (H. P. 286) (L. D. 91) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 10th.

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

In the House: Senate Amendment "C" read by the Clerk.

On motion by Mr. Miller of Bath, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby it passed this bill to be engrossed.

Senate Amendment "C" was adopted and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Resolve in favor of Several Academies, Institutes and Seminaries (H. P. 2247) (L. D. 1204) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 19th.

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

In the House: Senate Amendment "A" read by the Clerk.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Lee, the House voted to recede from its former action whereby it passed the bill to be engrossed.

The House then adopted Senate Amendment "A," and the bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill "An Act to Authorize the Liquor Commission to Grant Part-time Liquor Licenses to Summer Hotels" (H. P. 2233) (L. D. 1180) which was indefinitely postponed in the House on April 13th.

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

In the House: Senate Amendment "A" read by the Clerk.

Mr. HINCKLEY of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adhere to our former action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. SLEEPER of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I think that this matter has been hashed over several times in the House. We from the coastal sections of the State are not asking anything from this Legislature in a monetary sense. All that we ask is a little justice.

Our shipyards are gone, our quarries are closed, and the only basic industry that we have left in Knox, Hancock, Waldo, York and Cumberland Counties is the summer tourist business. We have explained at great length here that the success of that business in some degree hangs upon the granting of these licenses to summer hotels.

This is not a wet measure in any sense. Since the House turned down that measure the other day, a very prominent member of the House told me that he thought that it was a good idea. He said that one of the towns in his section had a summer hotel, and, in order to protect the license which that summer hotel had, the residents of the town, contrary to their private belief, had consistently voted wet, so that the hotel could have a liquor license. He said that this bill perhaps would be a God-send to the dry voters of this town, and that if this bill passed the town could then go dry and stay dry during the winter and spring and fall months and the summer hotel could still have their liquor license.

All that we ask is fair play. This is really an important measure to the summer hotels of the State, and it does not open the gates wide open to the issuance of liquor licenses. We are not asking for money. I think all the coastal counties are in pretty good shape financially. I do not think many of the towns in these counties or any of them are receiving aid from the State. But we would like to have the Legislature help us in this one bill. I hope the motion of the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Hinckley) my seatmate, will not prevail.

Mr. BIRD of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede from our former action and concur with the Senate.

Mr. HINCKLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed. In furtherance of that motion, I would like to say that this bill has been killed once in this House. Now we have in this House as members two funeral directors and embalmers, and I think it would be a fine idea, the next time we kill a measure, to call in these funeral directors and embalmers, so that the bill may be given a proper burial and so that we may not have to act upon it again. I notice, however, that one of these

funeral directors and embalmers is absent tonight. I do not know whether he is embalmed or not. (Laughter)

Now let me say first, if I understand correctly, this bill emanated from the Maine Central Railroad, which owns the Sam-O-set Hotel in Rockland and Rockport. Now of course the part that is in Rockland is not worried, because that is where they have their bar, and they can sell all the liquor they want to. But the part that is in Rockport contains the dining room, and they cannot sell liquor in the dining room unless they get such a measure as this. They want us to pass this measure so that they can sell liquor both in the dining room and in the bar.

As I say, it emanated from the Maine Central Railroad, but, since that time, some other hotels have fallen in with the idea and now they want it in some of the other towns which voted dry. You understand Rockport is dry and Rockland is wet. The people in these various towns have been given an opportunity by the Legislature of Maine to say whether or not they want liquor sold in the various cities and towns in this State. In other words, they have local option. This Legislature has gone on record time and time again in endorsing the idea of local option. We have held up the plum to the people in these various cities and towns and said to them: "You can vote on the question of whether you want liquor or not." Now we are taking this plum away from them and saying that notwithstanding your people have voted dry, the Liquor Commission may take it in their own hands and say your town is wet, and we are going to let these various hotels sell liquor.

Now of course I will agree with the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Dow, who said the other day that this is a temperance measure, and I will agree with my Brother Sleeper that this is not a wet measure, but the purpose of it is to allow the tourist hotels in the State in dry towns to sell liquor. Now this bill says that it may be sold only to non-resident registered guests. Is there anything to prevent a registered guest from inviting half the town in as his guests in that hotel and serving them all the liquor he wants to? There is nothing in this bill that prevents that.

They also say the hotel must be

in existence two years. That practically gives a monopoly to hotels that are existing at the present time, because who is going to build a hotel and put in thousands of dollars of his own money and then take a chance on whether he will be allowed to sell liquor or not.

I think the people of the State of Maine have a right to vote on this question, and I do not believe we ought to put it in the hands of the Liquor Commission to take it away from them.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinckley, moves that the House adhere to its former action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate. The motion to recede and concur takes precedence over the motion to adhere. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Young.

Mr. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen: I think you know me well enough to know one thing. At least I feel that way and I want to leave at the close of this session feeling that way. I like to be fair in both arguments and statements and in anything else that I do here.

Now when this bill was indefinitely postponed the other day, some of the gentlemen who voted for the indefinite postponement were against the bill as it stood in that form. After the bill had been indefinitely postponed, without consultation upon my part whatsoever, I was approached by those men, some of them selectmen, some of them with very firm personal convictions about intoxicating liquor. Now I want to be fair and all I ask is that every man be fair in return. They brought some suggestions to me, and knowing that I happened to be an attorney by profession, they suggested to me that if I would redraw this bill or add a proper amendment to it that their opposition to the bill would stop. I believe that some of those gentlemen will verify the fact that what I am saying is the truth.

So in accordance with their suggestion, I put everything in the amendment that they requested. This was not an attempt to put anything over. The bill was indefinitely postponed. Those gentlemen

who approached me are respectable, honorable men, and personally they do not touch intoxicating liquor. They are fair men. They are fair men in this way: They realize that we people of the coastal towns have large investments in our hotels. They realize that we have no other means of getting income except by catering to those persons who come into our State. We cater to them in other states on such matters as fishing and hunting, and so forth, and in fairness to us who wanted the bill—they were fair-minded men—and they said they would withdraw their objections if we could draw the bill in such a way as to agree with their suggestions.

Now I will ask you as fair and honest men if I have not done it. They said restrict it for summer use only. We have done that. Next they said eliminate the selectmen for the simple reason that the political aspect might be involved in the granting of licenses locally. They asked me to put in that nobody but the Liquor Commission would have control of this particular type of license. I have done so. They also said that they must have in it a provision that no one but non-resident registered guests should be served with liquor. I have done so. And then of my own volition, so there would be no ring-around-the-rosie around this act I attached at the end a penalty clause, which penalty provides the same effects as other violations of the liquor laws, and it is taken by reference verbatim from the 1937 law.

Now I quite appreciate my good friend Brother Hinckley's personal feelings on the liquor question. Personally aqua pura entirely suits me, but it is my duty when I come here, rather than to reflect my personal feelings, to consider the wishes of my constituents whose livelihood is at stake. While I myself do not indulge in the cup that cheers, I cannot make myself so narrow minded that I should sacrifice the investment, the wishes and desires of the people of my community or any other community who have invested large sums of money.

Now may I logically answer my friend by saying this: That the objective of placing that provision in the law which requires established hotels of two years standing, was to answer his very own argument the other day when he said that

the fly-by-nights would come in and license clubs and then everybody would have clubs, and so forth. So I eliminated clubs at the request of the gentlemen who came to me, and nothing but hotels can be licensed. I have done fairly everything requested of me. I have done it honestly and sincerely. I feel that our people in these towns should have this license. God above knows it is hard enough to make a living in the few short weeks they have.

Now having been fair with these gentlemen, and having been fair and honest in what I have done, I ask you as fair men and women to support the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Strong: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I desire to be fair, but it seems to me that one issue involved in this particular measure, even as amended, is the fact that notwithstanding the majority of votes cast in any city or town, they will be able to have a liquor license.

I think the liquor traffic in Maine has been handled with two main objects, namely that there should be a State Liquor Commission in charge of and administering the entire traffic. And I think it is equally safe and true to say that of equal importance has been the fact that the towns and cities of this State have had a right at their town meetings to decide whether or not those communities were to be dry or wet, and, under that system of dual control, this thing has been handled and handled well.

The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, tells us that they are not asking anything from the State of Maine when they ask for this piece of legislation. I agree that they are not asking anything in the way of money, but, in order to satisfy these few communities that he mentions, we are asking the people of the State of Maine to surrender the right of local option, the first step, I say, to the entire breakdown of the splendid control that is now being maintained of this traffic in the State of Maine. And I insist that under this particular measure, before this amendment was offered, the door was wide open. I say that with this amendment the door is still on the hinges, but it is becoming wider open all the time. For that reason, I support the motion of the gentleman from Portland,

Mr. Hinckley, that this matter be indefinitely postponed. (Applause)

Mr. DOW of Kennebunkport: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the members of the House, as I did the other day, that Kennebunkport voted dry. I would also like to point out that the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinckley, works in a city where there is a bar on every other corner. That, to me, is the difference. We are not asking for a license to grant our townspeople the privilege of going to a bar; we are simply asking for the privilege of allowing the people who pay twenty-five per cent of our taxes and one hundred per cent of our income to be allowed to enjoy the privileges which they enjoy in their own home states, the people who simply come in the summer time, the people who patronize the nicest clubs and the nicest hotels along the Maine coast.

Mr. HOLDEN of Webster: Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to face the House?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman has permission.

Mr. HOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, (Mr. Young) spoke about some of the people talking with him. I was one of the people that did tell him that if the law was fixed the way it is in New Hampshire and Vermont so that the summer hotels could sell to registered out-of-town guests only, I would not oppose the bill. Therefore, I do not see how I can oppose it, because in New Hampshire and Vermont that works out very nicely. I myself could not see why the summer hotels here should not have the same privileges for the tourists. But I did tell him I would not stand for clubs having it, because they did not have a license in New Hampshire and Vermont except in the wet towns. So I shall not oppose the measure, but of course I would never vote for it.

Mr. HINCKLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the status of my motion to indefinitely postpone?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman that the action of the House was to indefinitely postpone the bill. The bill returns to the House after the non-concurrent action on the part of the Senate. The gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Hinckley) has moved to adhere, which would have the effect of repeating the motion to in-

definitely postpone. The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, moves that the House recede and concur. The motion to recede and concur takes precedence over the motion to adhere.

Mr. WALLACE of Sanford: Mr. Speaker, I am one hundred per cent against this measure for the reason that it is going to take the vote away from the voters in the small towns. I am going to vote against this measure one hundred per cent.

Mr. SLEEPER: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I would just like to answer the thought put out by the gentleman from Strong, Mr. Richardson. I wish every member of the House was as sincere in his attitude toward the public life of the State as Mr. Richardson is. I really think he is sincere in that—and I am not trying to flatter him.

However, he brings up the issue of local option. He is absolutely right in that, but I think that is perfectly covered by the fact that this is for consumption by non-resident registered guests in summer hotels which are principally dependent on non-resident guests for business. In local option, as I understand it, you vote to see whether the citizens of that town or community are entitled to buy or sell liquor. This has nothing to do with the citizens or residents of that town. As the gentleman from Webster, Mr. Holden, said, our neighboring State of New Hampshire has a law similar to the law which we are trying to pass. Our principal rival for summer resort business is the State of New Hampshire. Again I say our summer hotels are not prospering to any great extent. I wish that we could help them, because by doing so we are certainly not going astray and we are certainly not violating local option because this does not affect citizens of Maine.

The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinckley, brought up the fact about the situation in the Sam-O-set Hotel. He said there was nothing to stop the guests of the Rockland section of the hotel from inviting the guests in the Rockport section of the hotel from coming in there and imbibing in these liquors. Well, as I understand it, there is no law on the books which says anything about imbibing liquors in dry towns. The question is merely buying and selling. So I

hope the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, will prevail, and that we will recede and concur with the Senate.

Mr. HOWES of Charleston: Mr. Speaker, I rise in the interests of the small towns of the State of Maine. I come from a town that is dry. I do not know of any reason why the Liquor Commission should come into my town and sell rum. I do not know why this Legislature should ram it down our throats. I support the motion of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinckley. We have got some selectmen who stand up for the rights of the people, and now you are going to take that away.

Mr. HINCKLEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. DONAHUE of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker and members of this Legislature: It seems clear that on the same day the Democrats of Biddeford and the dries of the State of Maine are being put in the same class. I call upon every member of the Democratic Party in this House to stand for the true principles of Democracy when they are invaded by the ballot, and the rights of Democracy are invaded by the Republican Party who are disregarding those rights. I say to every Democrat, "Stand for the right of the ballot and you preserve America." (Applause)

Mr. CROCKETT of North Haven: Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House: I dislike to rise and speak against the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper.

I come from a coastal town, in fact it is an island, and we are probably for the size one of the largest summer resorts in the State of Maine. My town is dry, very dry, and I consider this act class legislation and nothing else. It cannot be anything else. I want to go on record as opposing the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird.

There is another thing I want to mention. It says: "issue a spiritous and vinous liquor license for consumption by non-resident registered guests on the premises to a summer hotel located in such city or town." It does not necessarily mean that the gentlemen in my town or anyone in any town cannot get anyone to go into that hotel and buy liquor for them.

My town is dry and they wish to stay dry. I feel if this was put up to them as local option for the hotel to sell it there, they would certainly vote it down three or four to one. I am very much against this bill.

Mr. WALLACE of Sanford: Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, that the House recede from its former action whereby Bill "An Act to Authorize the Liquor Commission to Grant Part-time Liquor Licenses to Summer Hotels" was indefinitely postponed and concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment "A". The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinckley, has asked that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, would it be out of the way to have this matter laid on the table until tomorrow forenoon?

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman desire to make that motion?

Mr. HOLDEN: I would make the motion to lay it on the table until tomorrow forenoon. There is one little difficulty which we would like to correct —

The SPEAKER: The motion to table is not debatable. The gentleman from Webster, Mr. Holden, moves that Bill "An Act to Authorize the Liquor Commission to Grant Part-time Liquor Licenses to Summer Hotels" lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, that the House recede and concur with the Senate, and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning. All those in favor of the motion to table will say aye; those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird —

Mr. COWAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, in order that there may be no doubt as to where I stand on this, because I raised the question first the other day, the gentleman from Old Orchard Beach, Mr. Young, and I worked together on this amendment. I do not like it much better than I did before, but I told him I would not oppose it, and I said that is all I would do.

I would ask that I be excused from voting when the vote is taken.

Mr. HOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like —

The SPEAKER: The Chair will remind the gentleman that he has already spoken twice upon this matter. The gentleman from Holden, Mr. Webster, asks permission to speak a third time. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Cries of "No, No."

The SPEAKER: Permission is denied. Is the House ready for the question? The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, that the House recede from its former action whereby the bill was indefinitely postponed and concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment "A". The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinckley, asks that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays. In accordance with the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered at the request of one-fifth of the members present. All those in favor of the vote being taken 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: Thirty-eight having requested the roll call, and 38 being more than one-fifth of the members present, the vote will be taken by the yeas and nays. The Chair will remind all members that they must remain in their seats until the vote is taken and the result declared. Any person not a member of the House who is sitting in the seat of a member will kindly withdraw.

The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, has asked to be excused from voting. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Cries of "No, No."

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the request of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cowan, to be excused from voting will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the House declined to excuse the gentleman from voting.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, that the House recede from its former action whereby it indefinitely postponed the bill and concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" will say yes when

their name is called; those opposed will answer no. The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Arzonico, Barter Batchelder, Bates, Bird, Bragdon; Brown, Corinna; Brown, Eagle Lake; Burgess, Rumford; Burgess, Limestone; Buzzell, Chandler, Clough, Cook, Cowan, Dean, Dorrance, Dorsey; Dow, Kennebunkport; Dwinal; Emery, Farwell, Gyger, Hanold, Hinman, Holden, Hussey, Jordan, LaFleur, Leveque, Mahon, McNamara, Melanson, Merrifield, Meserve, Miller, Mills, Murchie, Noyes, Otto, Palmeto, Paul, Payson, Peakes; Pike, Lubeck; Poulin, Rumford; Race, Ramsdell, Robbins; Robinson, Peru; Shesong, Sleeper, Slossberg; Smith, Thomaston; Snow, Dover-Foxcroft; Stacy, Sylvia, Tardif, Varney, Weed, Weatherbee, Winslow, Worth; Young, O. O. Beach.

NAY—Babin, Bacon, Belanger, Butler, Cleaves, Colby, Crockett, Cushing, DeBeck, Dennison, Donahue, Douglass; Dow, Norway; Downs, Eddy, Everett, Farrington, Fellows, Fernald, Fogg, Ford, Fowles, Good, Goss, Grua, Hall, Haskell, Hawes, Hinckley; Holman, Howes, Jewett, Keene, Labbee, Lambert, Larrabee, Marshall, McGillicuddy, McGlauffin, Norwood, Pelletier; Pike, Bridgton; Plummer, Pratt, Preble, Richardson, Robie; Robinson, S. Portland; Smith, Westbrook; Snow, Hermon; Starrett, Stilphen, Thorne, Townsend, Violette, Walker, Wallace, Whitney, Williams, Winter.

ABSENT—Ayotte, Bolduc, Bowers; Brown, Caribou; Burbank, Churchill, Davis; Dow, Elliot; Ellis, Erswell, Hamel, Hodgkins, Latno, Lord, Luro, MacNichol, Maxim, Porell; Poulin, Waterville; Robinson, Bingham; Stevens, Thompson, Welch; Young, Acton.

Yes—64.

No—61

Absent—24.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-four having voted in the affirmative and 61 in the negative, with 24 absentees, the motion prevails.

Thereupon the bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Construction of a Bridge Across the Kennebec River" (S. P. 234) (L. D. 272) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 694) (L. D. 1209) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

In the House, report read and

accepted and the bill had its two several readings.

Senate Amendment "A" read by the Clerk and adopted and the bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A" had its third reading under suspension of the rules and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Mr. Bird of Rockland, presented the following Order, out of order, and moved its passage:

ORDERED, that His Excellency, Governor Lewis O. Barrows, and Mrs. Barrows, be escorted to the hall of the House forthwith.

The order received passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will designate the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, to convey a message to His Excellency, Governor Lewis O. Barrows, and to Mrs. Barrows, and to conduct them to the hall of the House.

The Chair takes pleasure at this time in noting the presence in the hall of the House of several distinguished gentlemen who formerly presided over this body. The Chair will ask the Sergeant at Arms to conduct them to the Speaker's desk.

Thereupon, the Sergeant at Arms conducted the Honorable Frank H. Holley and the Honorable George E. Hill, to the Speaker's desk, amid the applause of the House, the members rising.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents to the House the Honorable Frank Holley, Speaker of the House of Representatives in 1923. (Applause, the members rising)

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents to the House the Honorable George E. Hill, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-eighth Legislature. (Applause, the members rising)

Mr. LAFLEUR of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I notice in the rear of the room the Speaker of the House in 1937, Honorable Franz U. Burkett.

The SPEAKER: The invitation of the Chair included all distinguished gentlemen who formerly served as Speaker. The Sergeant at Arms will conduct the Honorable Franz U. Burkett to the Speaker's desk.

Thereupon, the Honorable Franz U. Burkett was conducted to the Speaker's desk, amid the applause of the House, the members rising.

The SPEAKER: The Chair takes pleasure in presenting to the House the Honorable Franz U. Burkett, Speaker of the House of Representa-

tives of the Eighty-sixth Legislature. (Applause, the members rising)

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inquire if the Honorable Nathaniel Tompkins is now in the hall of the House, or the Honorable Burleigh Martin.

The Chair regrets their absence.

At this point, Governor Lewis O. Barrows, accompanied by Mrs. Barrows, entered the hall of the House, escorted by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Bird, and the Sergeant at Arms, and were conducted to the Speaker's platform, amid prolonged applause, the members rising.

The SPEAKER: For nearly two and a half years, the Blaine Mansion, the executive mansion of the State of Maine, has been graced by a most gracious lady, a devoted wife and mother—(Applause, the members rising)

The SPEAKER (Continuing) a charming hostess who has made the hospitality of the executive mansion exactly what it should mean to the State of Maine. All the ladies of the Legislature and the wives of the members and particularly those members whose fate has kept them in Augusta over the week-ends, can testify to the truth of my statement.

The State is indeed fortunate in having such a fine characterization of gracious hospitality in the position of the first lady of the State.

During that same period the State has been served as its chief executive by a distinguished gentleman whose honesty of purpose, his courage, his honor, his entire devotion to the welfare of the State, deserve well of the State.

It is a great pleasure for me to present at this time, in the name of the Eighty-ninth Legislature, to Mrs. Pauline Barrows, as well as to Governor Lewis O. Barrows, on behalf of all of the House, what I understand is to be a silver tray. At this time the presentation is made in the form of a check which I trust Mrs. Barrows will find useful in enabling her to make her own choice of the gift we desire her to have. (Prolonged applause, the members rising)

The Chair understands that unanimous consent is granted to Mrs. Barrows to address the House.

Mrs. BARROWS: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and members of the

Eighty-ninth Legislature: I truly appreciate this gift as a token of your friendliness, and I want you to know that Lew and I have enjoyed the spirit and friendliness of you all, and we shall miss you. (Applause, the members rising)

The SPEAKER: The same consent is granted His Excellency, the Governor.

Governor LEWIS O. BARROWS: Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, and members of the 89th Legislature: It sometimes happens that I am totally at a loss to adequately express my feelings, and this is truly one of the times. For more years than I like to admit, because I appreciate the fact that they are necessarily on the decline, it has been my pleasure to have been associated in one capacity or another with various members of the Legislature or with the State House family, and I know of no finer association that anyone could desire. I know that each and every one of you will substantiate this statement, coming here as you do, sometimes making what I suspect may be personal sacrifice, financially at least. Nevertheless, there is one thing that I know transcends all this, and that is the friendships that you have formulated here. I think that is best evidenced by the number of times you are privileged to come back for a reunion, and I know the membership of this Legislature is no exception. And I say, speaking from the observance of that period of time, that the membership of this Legislature is unquestionably on a par with any, to my knowledge, in the history of the State of Maine. I would even go farther than that, because I realize that the problems that have confronted you are probably of far greater significance than those which have confronted any of your predecessors.

I have taken occasion several times during this legislative session, in speaking to groups outside of the Legislature, to commend, in the most sincere terms, the earnestness of purpose, the determination and the deliberation with which you have faced the problems before you. I know that you have worked hard, and I hope you will believe me when I say that I have never worked any harder in my life than during the last two legislative sessions.

I also know that when the smoke has cleared away and you have adjourned without day and have returned to your homes, then you will

sit in retrospect and will observe that this Legislature has unquestionably established a record, because of the way you have kept the finances of Maine within proper bounds. It will redound to your credit, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. President, and members of your respective branches, and I believe it will be unparalleled in the history of Maine.

Mrs. Barrows and I thank you sincerely for this evidence of esteem. (Prolonged applause, the members rising)

(Thereupon Governor and Mrs. Barrows retired, amid the applause of the House, the members rising)

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, when I spoke before the evening recess I referred to the special exercises. However, I did not mean the debate which we had prior to the last presentation. At that time I thought that we perhaps stood in position where we could adjourn without day tonight. I now find that it is impossible, and, at the risk of being struck by the Speaker, I will say that it is because the Senate has adjourned.

I now move that we adjourn.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, moves that the House adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed and the House so adjourned.