

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

Ninety-Fifth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1951

**DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

SENATE

Tuesday, March 27, 1951.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Benjamin C. Bubar of Blaine.

Journal of Friday, March 23, 1951, read and approved.

From the House

Joint Order re Legislative Research Committee to make study of feasibility of County Manager Form of Government. (H. P. 1647)

(In Senate, on March 16, read and passed in concurrence.)

Comes from the House, having been recalled by Joint Order from the Legislative Files, and indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Allen of Cumberland, the Order was recalled from the Legislative Files and indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

Joint Order, re Legislative Research Committee to make study and investigate the government and management of the several counties in state, including feasibility of county manager form of government; to report to 96th Legislature. (H. P. 1666)

Which was read and passed in concurrence.

The Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Relating to Loan and Building Associations," (H. P. 1514) (L. D. 1120) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Conversion Rights," (H. P. 1626) (L. D. 1170) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Closed Season on Deer in Town of Vinalhaven, Knox County," (H. P. 1407) (L. D. 1015) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, Prohibiting Fishing in Certain Parts of Swan Lake, Waldo County," (H. P. 1225) (L. D. 779) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Forest Lake Improvement Association," (H. P. 1226) (L.

D. 780) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act Regulating Registration of Vehicles Leased from Federal Government," (H. P. 1490) (L. D. 1097) reported that the same ought to pass.

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

The Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act Enlarging the Purposes of Market Square Building Association," (H. P. 678) (L. D. 412) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1662) (L. D. 1231) under a new title, Bill "An Act to Incorporate the 'Paris Company,'" and that the New Draft be referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

Comes from the House, report read and accepted and the New Draft referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs. In the Senate, the report was read and accepted and the new draft referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence.

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Temporary Judges for Municipal Courts," (H. P. 1011) (L. D. 574) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence and the bill read once; Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Majority of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Fishing and Hunting Licenses for Residents," (H. P. 523) (L. D. 285) reported that the same ought to pass:

(signed) Senator:

WIGHT of Penobscot
Representatives:

PLUMMER of Lisbon
CHASE of Belgrade
BERNARD of Caribou
DENNISON of East Machias
FRECHETTE of Sanford
WATSON of Jackson

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

(signed) Senators:

ELA of Somerset
SMART of Hancock

Representative:

CARVILLE of Eustis

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

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Ela of Somerset, tabled pending acceptance of either report.

“Resolve in Favor of the Town of Sebec.” (H. P. 1663)

Which was referred to the Committee on Highways and the same ordered printed.

“Resolve Providing for State Pension for Euphemie O. Michaud, of Houlton.” (H. P. 1664)

Which was referred to the Committee on Welfare in concurrence.

Orders

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Aroostook, it was

ORDERED, the House concurring that S. P. 309, L. D. 660, bill, An Act Relating to Superintending School Committee of the Town of Houlton be recalled from the engrossing department to the Senate. Sent forthwith to the House.

On motion by Mr. Crosby of Franklin, it was

ORDERED, the House concurring that notwithstanding joint orders now in effect that no act or resolve shall be received by this legislature from the Director of Legislative Research after Wednesday, March 28, 1951 at one o'clock P.M.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Marshall of York, it was

ORDERED, the House concurring that H. P. 1208, L. D. 766, An Act to Create the Veazie Sewer District be recalled from the engrossing department to the Senate.

Sent forthwith to the House.

First Reading of a Printed Bill

Bill “An Act Relating to the

Trustees of the University of Maine.” (S. P. 515) (L. D. 1234)

On motion by Mr. Leavitt of Cumberland, tabled pending first reading.

Senate Committee Reports

Mr. Fuller from the Committee on Education on Bill “An Act Creating the Maine Military Institute,” (S. P. 200) (L. D. 461) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I suppose I could do what everybody else is doing around here and put this on the table and leave it there until about the end of the session but I think that the best time to talk about it is right now.

I disagree heartily, of course, with the recommendations of the committee. I put this bill in in good faith. It was my own idea but I believe that in this State of Maine at this time when we are sending thousands and thousands of boys into military service where they go to get training and most of whom turn out to be privates, corporals and sergeants, we ought to have a school in this state where a boy can get training to be an officer in the United States Army. A great many states have these schools. I know more about the school in Vermont than any other because I attended it as a boy; that is, Norwich University. I believe that the State of Maine needs such a school.

I am not warlike and do not want people to be trained to go out and we will say create enemies, but I do think that when we do have enemies and do have to fight, then the State of Maine should have a training place where the boys can be trained to be officers.

The Maine Maritime Academy is such a school, but it trains men to become officers in the United States Navy and the merchant marines. I believe we need a school where they can train men to be officers in the United States Army.

It can be argued that we have such a school in the University of Maine because they have there an ROTC division. ROTC takes up a very short period of the boys' who are in the university. They are in uniform only during the time of

training, and otherwise live a completely normal college life.

This school, as I hoped the trustees would set it up would be a place where in the morning you'd wake up to "reveille," at night go to bed with "tattoo" and would be asleep by the time of "taps." The life is a life that a great many boys enjoy and get a great deal of profit from. I know because, as I said, I went to such a school and I have talked with a great many of my comrades at the school and know how much it was appreciated. I know how much it has done for its boys.

Norwich University during the last year had less than three thousand alumni, and of that alumni, that were living, 85% were in the armed forces and there were 45 brigadier generals, 6 or 7 major generals and 2 or 3 lieutenant generals who were graduates of that school. That certainly shows the good training that such a school gives and the high rank which those graduates attain in the armed services.

Maine has no such school and I think we need one. I move that the Senate substitute the bill for the report.

Mr. FULLER of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I think that there are probably many who might find considerable merit in such an institute. Personally I believe that there would be some fine objectives accomplished, but it does seem that where the state is finding so much difficulty in financing so many of the schools, our normal schools, our state universities, our maritime academy and it is so difficult to find the funds to channel back to the poorer communities for our regular schools, our public schools that this is not the time, the proper time, to embark on the establishment by statute of such an institution. I hope the motion to substitute the bill for the report will not prevail.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Leavitt, to substitute the bill for the "Ought Not to Pass" report.

A viva voce vote being had,

The motion to substitute the bill for the report did not prevail.

Thereupon, the "Ought Not to Pass" report of the committee was accepted.

Mr. McKusick from the Committee on Education Bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of Somerset Academy," (S. P. 178) (L. D. 390) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Broggi from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Apportionments from School Funds," (S. P. 251) (L. D. 550) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Published Records of Vital Statistics," (S. P. 373) (L. D. 899) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Ela from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Taking Animals and Birds for Scientific Purpose," (S. P. 454) (L. D. 1068) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Smart from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Hunting of Foxes," (S. P. 487) (L. D. 1168) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Weeks from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Repealing Advisory Committee on State Budget," (S. P. 363) (L. D. 877) reported that the same ought to pass.

Mr. Brown from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act Relating to the Taking of Alewives in the Town of Franklin," (S. P. 278) (L. D. 617) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the Use of Drags in Bluehill Bay, Hancock County," (S. P. 468) (L. D. 1101) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted, the bills read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. Weeks from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Town of Kittery School District," (S. P. 105) (L. D. 159) reported that the same ought

to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which report was read and accepted and the bill read once; Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted without reading and the bill as amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act to Ratify and Confirm the Incorporation of East Edington Public Hall Company." (H. P. 1051) (L. D. 631)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Bill "An Act to Create a Town Council-Manager Form of Government for the Town of Limestone." (H. P. 1116) (L. D. 703)

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Her Own Business Program." (H. P. 1233) (L. D. 786)

Which was read a second time and passed to be engrossed, in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Creating the Rockland Port District." (S. P. 347) (L. D. 813)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Rockland School District." (S. P. 379) (L. D. 905)

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

Sent down for concurrence.

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Marshall of York, the Senate voted to take from the table, House Report "Ought to Pass" on Bill, An Act Prohibiting the Printing of Pauper Assistance in Town Reports (H. P. 206) (L. D. 128) tabled by that Senator on March 16th pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. MARSHALL: Mr. President, I now move acceptance of the report.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, in the three days of last week during our debate on the recommendations of our Appropriations

and Financial Affairs Committee we were reminded several times very vividly that we still do have a federal government and that we have as a member of our Senate an outstanding representative of that government. We also learned much about the financial problems of our state and we held on to, by a narrow thread, an old tradition of our state, town government.

Now, it seems to me that the bill which is before us is a bill that should not be before the legislature. It seems to me it is a bill that concerns our several towns in the state and those towns alone. It seems to me to be a bill of principle which concerns those towns and those towns alone, and if it is a bill of principle, right or wrong, it involves a social matter which also concerns the several towns in our state. Therefore, I believe it should be taken up separately by our several towns as to its adoption. I move, Mr. President, the indefinite postponement of this bill.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would, if possible, like to say a few words briefly on this subject. I think this subject is of great concern not only to the various towns within the State and to the State in itself. I believe, as you all know, that relief is roughly divided into six parts: First, there is veterans' relief; second, there is old age assistance; third, there is aid to dependent children; fourth, there is aid to the blind; fifth aid to State paupers; sixth and last is town paupers, those having a settlement within the towns in which they reside. In the first four forms of relief we cannot publish the names. It is definitely forbidden by law. The fifth, aid to state paupers is sometimes published and many times it is not. The sixth and last, town paupers are invariably and always published in the town reports.

We can take this last category and we can divide that, too, possibly into two parts. There are those who are the deserving cases and those that are undeserving. I admit and we all know there are many cases of pauper relief, both state and town, which are not deserving cases, but this last—this

last one half—we will concede are deserving cases. We publish their names. We hold them up, not only they but their children, to ridicule. They are town paupers,—a disgrace.

I will agree it is a tradition also to publish their names and this tradition is a heritage, heritage from our English ancestors who came over here from the old country many years ago and brought with them the workshop, the almshouse, and also the disgrace of paupers whose only crime was destitution.

Some few years ago the legislature saw fit to discontinue the publishing of vital statistics in the town reports. It was a prerogative of the town before then to publish those reports, giving the births, deaths and marriages within the towns. It seemed there was nothing about the publishing of those reports that would seem wrong in any way, but yet it was brought out that it was. It was really no concern of anyone. Now, if the town does publish the name of those destitute who have been driven to ask relief of the town, there is nothing accomplished. It will not stop people from going to the town selectmen and overseers of the poor and asking for aid.

Another thing that might be brought out, and I think many have found from experience that once we publish the names of men or women as town paupers we have certainly tainted them with shame. They are disgraced and feel they have lost their self respect. After that they don't hesitate to go to the town and ask for everything. They have lost something they feel they will not regain, and therefore, they will persist and will become professional welfare seekers that we are attempting to drive from the relief rolls.

I feel the passing of this bill will be a mark of progress and much will be accomplished. I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

Mr. COLLINS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill was heard before the Committee on Towns and Counties and I think that it was the feeling of the committee that the bill had considerable merit, but I think that what influenced most of the think-

ing of the committee in putting out a unanimous report was the fact that we were discriminating on a certain type of recipient of public relief.

There was no opposition expressed at the hearing. All of the testimony was in favor of the bill. I did receive a letter from a town manager of one of the towns, stating that he thought the list of the names of people receiving relief should be continued. I did not hear from any other towns.

I note in the town report of the town of Caribou, the last annual report, the classification of persons receiving relief is given, A. D. C. with so many cases, old age assistance, and aid to the blind, and then in the cases of direct relief in the town of Caribou this year they did not print the names. Evidently the town council and the town manager have decided that in that instance it was not good policy to put in the names of those receiving relief.

Because the Committee felt that it was discrimination against one group of people who were receiving relief, they came out with a unanimous report on the bill, that it ought to pass. For this reason I hope that we do not indefinitely postpone the bill as recommended by the Senator from Oxford, Senator Boyker.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, in the event that this report is accepted I have an amendment which I intend to present. In view of the discussion now taking place, I might as well express my feelings on the bill, and then I will present the amendment at the proper time.

I agree with all that has been said by the three preceding speakers but I feel it is entirely a matter for the towns, themselves, to decide. If they want to print the names in the town reports they are free to do so. If they do not wish to print the names in the town reports they are free to omit them.

I cannot agree with the thinking of some members of the legislature that all towns in the state of Maine are alike. There are different situations in each of our several municipalities and for that reason I would hope to leave with those mu-

nicipalities as much power as possible in order that they might govern themselves as they see fit.

If this bill is passed, prohibiting the publishing of names in the town report of those receiving town aid, I fail to see why it would not be just as logical for a future legislature to say to the people of the town of Franklin "You shall not publish the names of delinquent taxpayers in the town report". I know there are many people who do pay taxes because they don't want their names to appear. I do know there are people who would perhaps call on for assistance but they don't want their names to appear in a pauper account. I know from experience with the present laws on the books prohibiting the publishing of the names of veterans in the town report, it is costing the towns any amount of money, and if this bill is passed as it is now, I am afraid it will cost additional money to those towns.

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, I just want to go on record as saying it seems to me that the unanimous report of the committee, "ought to pass" is very sound and logical. There are two excellent reasons for going along with this bill. If we do not do so we are discriminating against one type of person receiving public assistance. The second is that this bill will help the children of the paupers. I don't think our sympathy will be so much with the paupers but it seems to me any child whose parents' names are being published as town paupers would be discriminated against and hurt. I will have to vote for the bill.

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President, I would like to call to your minds that there is on the statute books a law that requires municipal officers to issue an annual town report, and in that town report to tell to whom and for what purposes money is spent, and there is also a penalty for failure to do so. There is also a provision that says a town, by vote in annual town meeting, may waive that duty. I think if we indefinitely postpone this measure there is in the law a provision by which the towns can handle this at the present time.

They would have a perfect right to vote on it.

I would also call to your minds that at the present time in our towns, if a family or member of a family needs an emergency operation or has to go to a hospital for medical attention the hospital, in case the person is not able to make a cash deposit, immediately contacts the municipal officers and asks them if they will guarantee the bill. Of necessity the municipal officers do guarantee the bill. Now, if this measure is put on the statute books you will find many of those people will be much more dilatory in paying those bills than they would be if they knew there would be no publicity in the matter.

I think if this measure were put on the statute books it would mean a direct loss to the towns and more serious loss to the smaller towns, just on that one matter.

Mr. WIGHT of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, last week we heard in the Senate a great deal of criticism of the federal government and the way it dictates the policy we must use in our Health and Welfare Department. A good deal of our financial troubles at the present time come from that department and if we could do as possibly a great many would like to do, and that is to publish the names of those recipients of aid from that department, it would be conceded that the rolls would be reduced and the expenditures of that department reduced.

Are we not today, if we pass this bill, saying the same thing to the towns that the federal government is saying to the state? Are we not telling them they cannot publish these names and hold down those pauper relief rolls? It just seems reasonable that the publishing of those names does hold down those categories of relief.

I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone will prevail.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President, I really hate to rise twice to speak on the same subject, but I cannot go along with the thinking that the publishing of these names does and will cut down on pauper relief. I think a fair example is to witness how our

pauper relief rolls have been growing in the past years, especially in view of the fact that we publish the names. It seems to do nothing to accomplish that purpose.

I would again remind the Senate that we have disposed of many archaic laws that concern distressed persons, almshouses and workshops, and all those things that tended to reduce these people who were destitute and needed aid, to a position of shame. I truly think if we go along with this bill it will be a step in the right direction and will not increase pauper relief in this state.

I do not see and I cannot conceive why the selectmen, the duly elected administrative officers in the towns, cannot properly administer the law relative to pauper relief without a club to hold over the heads of destitute people.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President, when the vote is taken I request a division.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state the question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Marshall, to accept the "ought to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, having again been referred to as the representative of the minority party in this Senate I feel that I should have a few words to say on this question.

I have had quite some experience with relief to paupers in past years, having served as alderman in the City of Lewiston for four years and being at the same time Overseer of the Poor, having been Mayor of that city for two years and having had to pass on pauper cases many times, also having been in the Welfare Department of this state for years, and I feel that with all those years of pauper service I have some background and some reasoning on the matter of pauper relief administration.

I am glad that a least for once we cannot blame this one on the federal government. This is entirely up to the State of Maine. I am in quite a delicate position, having been one of the proponents of home rule in years past and having fought many a battle on the question of home rule, having to say to those gentleman who

request home rule on these pauper cases, "No." But I feel that in this case the question is beyond home rule and is a matter for the whole state to vote on. And I feel that it is an unchristian thing to do to mark people with the mark of shame because through no fault of their own they are forced to ask help from their town.

My experience tells me that if you can, in a city such as Lewiston, tell who are the chiselers and who are not, certainly in the small towns they should know who are deserving of aid and who are not. And I will go along with Senator Dennett in saying that it is the fault of the overseers of the poor or the selectmen if they do not. They are in a position to know whether certain people who ask for relief are entitled to that relief or not. If they do grant that relief then that is their responsibility and they should not be able to dodge that responsibility by the fact that they can publish the names of the persons to whom they give relief.

I believe that the Scriptures tell us that what we give with one hand should not be known to the other hand. I believe in the principle of Christian charity. I believe that those who deserve help should receive it and should not be punished or marked for the rest of their lives, with their children, because they have received help from a city or town. Therefore I believe that this is a principle more important than the principle of home rule and when the vote is taken I shall vote in favor of the motion to pass the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Washington: Mr. President, in regard to this bill I am very much in favor of the passage of the bill for several reasons. I was a member of the city council for about eight years, and we are a poor town. We always have been a poor town and I know that there are cases of some people who receive relief whose names are not published and others whose names are published. I believe that there are proportionately just as many chiselers in the small towns as there are in the larger towns and cities. There are people who have paid taxes in their towns for per-

haps forty years and who now cannot do it because the prices of everything have gone up so much, in the last few years.

I think it is a terrible thing to publish their names when about eighty percent of them do not want them published and will go without necessities long before they will go to the town and ask for aid. And why should we publish them just to satisfy a few curious people? That is what it means. In my town I can name, I think, about ten percent of them who are chiselers. They go to church, they go to their lodge, they go to the movies, and if you put their names on the list they will go just the same. There is no shame in them. But there are many others who will not ask for relief when they really need it because they feel it is detrimental to their children. In my town it has been thrown up to the children where their fathers and mothers have asked for aid and I think it is a shame. I hope this bill will pass.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I also hope that this bill will pass. I don't know a great deal about it because in Portland we don't have too many of them but if it is a fact, as has been brought out here, that there are people in Maine who are not asking for aid because they are afraid their names will be published I think we ought to have a law that will allow them to apply for aid without their names being made public. I certainly should never rest easily if I voted for a bill which would force people to go hungry and cold and without food and clothing.

Mr. BOYKER of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I thought I had read this bill and understood it. It seems to be the opinion of many here that this bill ought to pass and that it does not require the names of paupers to be printed. I am not in favor of printing the names of paupers in any town report and if this bill does prohibit that I am certainly for it. That is my position. Perhaps someone can explain this bill. I would like to have it explained. Perhaps someone of those who are in favor of the bill can do so.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President and members of the Sen-

ate, in answer to Senator Boyker's question, this bill does prohibit the printing of the names of town paupers in the town books and I think it is the whole idea which has been expressed by many of the speakers, to prevent the names being bandied about. I believe, as the Senator from Washington stated, that there are a few curious people who dig in to see who the town paupers are so that they can pass the word along. Incidentally, this would not prohibit the publishing of the amount of money paid to the poor and I believe it could very easily be printed in the town book as "case number one," "case number two," and so on, in numerical order, but it does definitely prohibit the names of the town paupers being published in the books.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from York, Senator Marshall, that the Senate accept the Ought to Pass report of the committee. The Senator from York, Senator Marshall, has requested a division. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A division of the Senate was had.

Twenty-one having voted in the affirmative and nine opposed, the Ought to Pass report of the Committee was accepted.

The PRESIDENT: The question now before the Senate is on to motion of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Boyker, that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

A viva voce vote being had

The motion to indefinitely postpone did not prevail.

Thereupon the bill was given its first reading, and House Amendment B was read and adopted in concurrence.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I offer Senate Amendment A and move its adoption. I will try to explain what this amendment does. It adds at the end of the bill the words "unless any town at its annual town meeting shall vote to include such names in its next annual report. As I understand it, if this bill becomes a law and the town takes no action, the names of the paupers will not be printed in the annual report. However, if at its annual town meeting, the citizens of that town decide they want

to print those names in the town report, they may so act in their town meeting authorizing and directing their selectmen to print the names in the town report.

That, I believe is local government and I believe those towns are as well qualified to determine whether or not they want to print the names, as we are to dictate to them that they shall not print the names. That is the crux of the whole matter. I agree with much that has been said and I think that if I were voting in my town meeting I would vote not to print the names of paupers in the town report. However, conditions may arise that would make it desirable and necessary that those names be printed.

I think that in our last town meeting in Franklin if there had been a provision whereby the names of the veterans might have been printed in the town report that the town would have so ruled because 75% of our town pauper aid was to Veteran No. 2, Veteran No. 3, Veteran No. 4 and that condition is bad. I feel that if those names had been printed in the town report, part of the veterans would not have been calling for aid.

I hope that the amendment is adopted.

The Secretary read Senate Amendment A. Senate Amendment A

"Amend said bill by adding at the end thereof, before the period, the following underlined clause, 'unless any town at its annual town meeting shall vote to include such names in its next annual report.'"

Mr. BARNES of Aroostook: Mr. President, I am sorry that I could not be in the Senate to hear all of the debate on this measure which we are now proposing to amend, but I have inquired from my seat-mate and there is one proposition that has not been brought up. It is my belief, and I have checked with at least one other member of the Senate who is a lawyer, that we have in our statutes a prohibition against voting by paupers and I can conceive of a situation in a small town particularly if you had an unscrupulous board of town selectmen in office, that they might want to get the paupers in to vote.

There you have a very close tie up because the selectmen are also overseers of the poor and you might get a bad board perpetuating themselves in office by this means.

I agree with everything that has been said relative to the taking of these names out of the town report for charitable reasons, reasons that you don't want to hold your poor people who, through no fault of their own, you don't want to hold up to the prying eyes of the curious. But I think this other matter is very fundamental and I would like to have a chance to look into it a little further. If it is true that paupers are not permitted to vote, which I believe is so, and if this bill goes through, I further believe that there ought to be an amendment attached to the voting statute which would permit paupers to vote. In order to have time to look into the matter a little further and let the members think about that angle a bit, I now move to table the bill.

The motion prevailed and the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending motion by the Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes, that Senate Amendment A be adopted.

On motion by Mr. Ela of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report "Ought Not to Pass" from the Committee on Legal Affairs on bill, An Act Relating to Membership of State Racing Commission, (S. P. 186) (L. D. 399) tabled by that Senator on March 6 pending acceptance of the report.

Thereupon, the "Ought Not to Pass" report of the Committee was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boyker of Oxford, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report "Ought to Pass" from the Committee on Transportation on bill, An Act Relating to Penalties for Violation of Truck Weight Laws (S. P. 460) (L. D. 1074) tabled by that Senator on March 22 pending acceptance of the report; and on motion by Mr. Christensen of Washington the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending acceptance of the report.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table, Senate Report "Ought Not to Pass" from the Committee on Transportation on bill, An Act Relating to Anti-Splash Equipment on Certain Vehicles (S. P. 399) (L. D. 946) tabled by that Senator on March 22nd pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. HASKELL of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, on Thursday last I tabled this report as a courtesy in the absence of Senator Allen. I understand he has no objection to acceptance of the Ought Not to Pass report of the Committee and I so move.

Thereupon, the "Ought Not to Pass" report of the committee was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President, I would like to inquire if Senate Paper 171, L. D. 345, An Act to Incorporate the Kittery Sewer District is in possession of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state the document is in the possession of the Senate having been recalled by joint order from the engrossing department.

Upon motion by Mr. Dennett, under suspension of the rules, the Senate voted to reconsider its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. DENNETT: Mr. President, I now move we reconsider our action whereby we adopted Committee Amendment "A" to this bill. To more or less clarify what it is all about I will merely state to the

Senate that this is simply a matter of clarification of a little miswording in the Kittery Sewage District bill. It is purely a local matter.

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

On motion by Mr. Dennett of York, the bill was passed to be engrossed, in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Ela of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report "Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment 'A'" from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on bill, An Act Assenting to Act of Congress Relating to Fish Restoration and Management Projects (H. P. 525) (L. D. 287) tabled by that Senator on March 8th pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator the report of the committee was accepted in non-concurrence and the bill was given its first reading.

Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted, and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The PRESIDENT: The Senate is proceeding under Orders of the Day. The Chair will call the attention of the Senate to the fact there are approximately 41 matters on the table.

On motion by Mr. Ela of Somerset

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.