

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 RESEARCH COMMITTEE

State House, Augusta, October 7, 1942.

Re: Legislative expense.

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

State House, Augusta, October 7, 1942.

Re: Legislative expense.

State House, Augusta, October 7, 1942.

Testimony of Mr. Harvey Pease and Mr. Royden Brown.

MR. WEBBER: May I introduce the witness, Mr. Harvey Pease, Clerk of the House.

Harvey, have you had an opportunity to make up any sort of a list of what you have got on hand of legislative property?

MR. PEASE: My office was broken up at the end of the session, and the files are stored away in such a way that it is impossible, without having them moved all out, to take a detailed inventory. I have been over the proposition in there, and what is in sight I have inventoried, and the rest of it is estimated, that which is in the cases, locked up. Do you wish me to read this into the record?

MR. WEBBER: I think so.

MR. PEASE: I have 3 Cardex cabinets and table; I have 14 sectional files and storage cases and 1 sectional bookcase section. I have one letter-size four-drawer letter file, borrowed from the W.P.A. or some abandoned federal organization stock. I have one wardrobe cabinet, one large supply storage cabinet, one legal transfer section, three desk-high steel cabinets, five pedestal typewriter desks; one small-size flat-top desk; three small typists desks, prison made; one short-legged oak table; two small typewriter tabs; three costumers; three oak leather arm desk chairs; one mahogany leather arm desk chair, four oak swivel chairs with no arms, two

typists chairs; one oak banker's side chair; 3 Line-a-times, 2 Flash-O-Call stations; 2 four by six transfer files, and the rug. I have two typewriters that were new in 1941 and one reconditioned typewriter. That equipment is all contained in the office here. I might add that office is supposed to contain at this time four typists chairs instead of two.

MR. WEBBER: You mean by that you think two of the typists chairs have been borrowed?

MR. PEASE: This is what I think, Don: I think the two typists chairs, I have no doubt, are out in the other office where they needed them when they moved in. At the end of the 1941 Legislature the cigarette tax division took over my office and equipment both, and then later the Superintendent of Buildings moved the furniture into the small office. The chairs are all tagged, and I have no doubt they are either in that office or the other one and have been borrowed.

Now of larger office supplies, I have one zipper binder with two-inch reams and one zipper binder with one-inch reams. The larger is in current use in connection with the House daily journal. I have probably here and at home 6 ream binders, imitation leather, that contain data and records of the session. I have two or three pencil sharpeners, three numbering machines, two or three staplers, hand punch fastener, a fountain pen desk set,

three or four wastebaskets. I have two binders that are used^{for}/temporarily keeping permanent journal sheets; a tape dispenser; a large paper cutter, a Hammer punch, two unabridged dictionaries, a copy of the Holy Bible; clipboards, and six or eight cheap zipper brief cases used for sending bills to and from the printer. I have copies of the 1931-3-5-7-9-41 session laws and a copy of the '40-41 Maine Register.

In addition to that I have a considerable supply of smaller items: pencils, erasers, penholders, typewriter ribbons, carbon, that are in the cabinets that I haven't inventoried because I have not asked the Superintendent of Buildings to move the cabinets out and take a detailed inventory. In addition to that, I have at my home, shipped there to be used in connection with completing the journal and my legislative work and also the legislative index, a typewriter, a small table, like the stenographer's table here, and I have a two-drawer three by five card file. I have one desk lamp and some of the binders that I previously mentioned. I believe that I also have a stapling machine. Those are in Wiscasset.

MR. WEBBER: Are those things all or practically all in such condition that they are available for continued use?

MR. PEASE: They are. I am sorry I made one omission: there is also a desk-high cabinet that these things are

stored in there, together with some legislative files that will come back to the next session of the legislature, as has been my custom in the past.

MR. WEBBER: Now I have some items here that were supplied to me by the Department of Audit at my request. There seems to have been, if you study purchases at past sessions, a great many fountain pens and fountain pen and pencil sets purchased by the Legislature under order of you and Mr. Brown, and a good many briefcases and ring folios, most or all of which seem to have been quite expensive type of items. Now can you comment on those, Mr. Pease?

MR. PEASE: Well, it has been the custom always to purchase an expensive fountain pen and desk set and also a pocket set for the Speaker of the House. That has been just a custom. And at times there has been such a set purchased for the Clerk of the House. I have supplied during the past few sessions of the Legislature each member of my staff with a very good fountain pen. When they have been holdovers they have not been supplied in successive years. It is for use in connection with their office work.

So far as the brief cases are concerned, outside of the purchase of, I think it was a dozen brief cases at less than a dollar apiece, I purchased no brief cases that I recall. I have purchased two zipper binders with handles. One of those I used for some years as Clerk of the House for my journal, and I found it was too small, and then I think last year I requisitioned through the

State Printer a larger ring binder, and both of those binders I still have in my possession and have listed.

MR. WEBBER: I notice here among other items one ring folio, lettered, ordered by Mr. Brown; one ring folio, lettered, ordered by you, from Roberts Office Supply, at \$15.29 apiece. What are those for?

MR. PEASE: I think both of those are for carrying our journals into the House, keeping them together and so forth, and they are used year after year. I have also purchased during the last two or three sessions each session a ring binder, zipper ring binder, for the use of the Speaker of the House in keeping his advance journal, and also a much cheaper grade one for the use of the floor leader.

MR. PAYSON: Which I have.

MR. PEASE: And which of course, under the custom at least, went to those gentlemen.

MR. WEBBER: We want to establish what the custom has been, not particularly with the idea of criticizing what has gone on in the past but in estimating to what extent it might be advisable to recommend altering the custom in the future.

MR. PEASE: I think that idea is very commendable. If I might make one statement here. I have at times said that if I had any conscience or if I was inclined to be worried I would not sleep nights because of the things that I felt I had to do around here that there was no

real legal authority for. For instance, in setting up the Legislature someone has to sign a requisition for supplies. Now it is only by custom that the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate signs that requisition. It is quite necessary that you have certain supplies at the beginning of the session. If those supplies were not here, we would all hear about it, and rightly so. I have been reasonably careful, tried to be, in signing these requisitions. I have stated many times that I felt there should be some continuing organization of the Legislature that had the responsibility and authority to do those things, and I have also stated that I felt it should be separate and distinct from the executive departments; that the Legislature should operate completely in and of itself, asking assistance from the departments, rather than give authority to the departments to do things for the Legislature.

At least six weeks ago the purchasing agent importuned me as to what I was going to do as to getting desks and equipment for the next Legislature, and I told him we had got to have so many desks, because they were given away: The Speaker and President of the Senate and the House of Representatives voted away the desk of the Clerk to the Assistant Clerk. Those have got to be replaced, and I think they have been already ordered.

CHAIRMAN DOW: That was by order?

MR. PEASE: By order of the Legislature. I have in my

office two desks and two chairs that have been given me by order of the Legislature.

CHAIRMAN DOW: I don't think anyone questions that.

MR. PEASE: Now if I may continue: The matter of other supplies for the Legislature, Miss Towle, who has the responsibility of departmental supplies, always worries a good deal about this. As I say, I always sign a requisition for what appears to be absolutely necessary, and she has given me a list this morning approximately of what she supplied to the last Legislature. I do not know whether Don has that or not or whether you want anything on that at this time, but she would like to know and the purchasing agent would like to know whether they should go ahead and get Pease to sign a requisition for necessary things for the 91st. Legislature, or what they should do about it. I told her I would bring the list up here this morning and talk it over with you people and perhaps could give her some idea what to do. In all probability if nothing is done the supplies will be purchased because they have got to be.

On this list here there is an item of 5 gross of playing cards. Now prior to any session of the Legislature I never authorized the purchase of playing cards. I would not buy them this year. We came here and started out, and the boys began to shout for playing cards, and, by direction of the Speaker, I had purchased, I think it was one gross of playing cards.

MR. WEBBER: Wouldn't it have been two gross of playing cards at \$70.56?

MR. PEASE: Yes; that is against use in former sessions of five gross. But those were bought under direction of the Speaker and after conference with legislative leaders, and they were issued one at a time, and I think the Sergeant-at-Arms had quite a complete record of who they were issued to that he probably has torn up long before this.

There are also a good many items that have to be purchased in advance of the Legislature, like cuspidors, card tables for the retiring rooms, blue committee binders, cartons for shipping home wastebaskets, gavels, black string binders, wastebaskets.

MR. WEBBER: Now right on that, Mr. Pease, the matter of the members of the Legislature taking home such things as wastebaskets and ash trays and spittoons, and whatever else they take hom, that also has been simply a matter of custom?

MR. PEASE: It has been a matter of custom almost with the force of common law. I am not trying to be facetious about it; but it has always been understood, and I think you all know it, that the small items that the members or officers of the Legislature use in connection with their work and have on their desks, to take those home after the session. It is somewhat different than it was when I first came here in 1927 -- probably none of you

were coming then, when the Secretary of State used to maintain a vault with jackknives and diaries and fountain pens and scissors that he used to hand out to the members of the Legislature. Gradually we have cut down, and I think the expense of the Legislature has been cut down substantially since 1927.

(Off record discussion)

MR. WEBBER: You might note that Judge Royden Brown is also present, and we can have discussion from both of these gentlemen as it goes along.

MR. ROYDEN BROWN: May I at this point say this on the matter of cuspidors: neither the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate had any control over those, but with wonderful sagacity the Superintendent of Buildings has seen to it at the last of the session very few were distributed, because before at every session of the Legislature when the Legislature went out the cuspidors went out with them; so he just puts a few out now, and the result is he has made a very substantial saving.

Did you remark, concerning legislative expenditures, it would be well to refer to the thrift of doing away with the House Journal and Senate Journal by making three copies, saving the State quite a number of thousands of dollars?

MR. PEASE: Of course that was done before I came in. As you all know, prior to about '23, at the end of the

legislative session the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate sent to the printer his journal and had it printed and bound at quite an expense to the State, and Mr. Brown and the then Clerk, Mr. Chapman, I think, conceived the idea of making three copies of the journal, an original and two carbons, and having those bound, one for the Secretary of State's office, one for the Library, and the other for office use, and thereby the saving to the State was very substantial. Then of course, following that, the legislative printing was entirely overhauled in 1929 or 1931 at a substantial saving to the State; so there is a good deal in what your Chairman referred to as "The good old days."

MR. PAYSON: Just what was that journal? Would that be the advance journal?

MR. PEASE: The corrected advance journal would be sent to the printer, the only legal record of the branches.

MR. ROYDEN BROWN: And that seemed to Mr. Chapman and me to be very foolish. You see in the stenographic record you had the records of each body, and it seemed a duplication, and we saved thousands of dollars by inaugurating that change, because in the stenographic record you get what appears in the House and Senate Journal anyway.

MR. WEBBER: If we got away in part from the souvenir customs, fountain pens, for example, of the type and quality

that have been purchased, and such things as pencil sharpeners, staplers, good quality brief cases, and ring folios, ~~Hammer~~ punches, and that type of supply would be reasonably durable items which, if they were treated as legislative property, might be continued from session to session, at least for a reasonable period?

MR. PEASE: You are entirely correct. Of course the Clerk of the House has more opportunity to preserve that stuff than does the Secretary of the Senate. I have more space, and I have accumulated and been able to keep, on account of the fact I have more space, storage cabinets, and I have kept over from session to session some supplies. Now that was absolutely contrary to the theory fifteen years ago. In 1927, when I came here, the only thing the House had to start with was a couple of covers that were used for the Advance Journal: there was nothing else.

MR. WEBBER: Royden, I have been attempting to compile for the committee an approximate inventory of what might be termed present legislative property for the House, and I have what Mr. Thompson knows of or has control of, and Harvey has supplied us with a fairly long list this morning of what he has on hand. Now can you give us an idea of what you have on hand, either here or in Skowhegan?

MR. BROWN: I think I can. I might say this: I have always been hopelessly handicapped in the matter of not

having any space to keep any of the legislative property in. While we pass an order at the end of the session that the Secretary of the Senate's office shall be under his control, as a matter of fact we hardly get away before it is occupied by somebody else, consequently anything that is left there disappears between sessions. Now, further than that, I went out into the toilet and we had some cupboards fixed there with locks on them. Every time when we have come back somebody has either forced those locks, but, generally however, the stuff has been there that we have left there. Now I can tell you what I have, if you would like to have it.

I have a typewriter; I have a typewriter table; I have a big stapler -- those are at Skowhegan -- I have a large paper cutter, I have a copyholder, one of those attachments that go onto a typewriter for holding manuscript; and here there should be a considerable amount of supplies, like some pencils, some bands, some paper, copying paper and journal paper, binder paper, staplers, ink, carbon paper, typewriter ribbons' and some other small supplies.

MR. WEBBER: Do your heavy equipment purchases run about the same as those of Mr. Pease?

MR. BROWN: I think they do.

MR. WEBBER: So you would say your stuff has disappeared: that is apparently you have no such long list of heavy

items on hand as Mr. Pease has here?

MR. BROWN: You now refer to the furniture?

MR. WEBBER: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Well, in regard to the furniture, I have come back here several sessions and I have gone all over the building. In the President's office there is a revolving bookcase. Apparently several of the department heads have found it quite convenient. Well, I have located that several times and got that back. Then we have in there a small mahogany typewriter table; we have two large mahogany chairs, armchairs, in the nature of a Morris chair, and I think there are four of these chairs (indicating) and I think in the other office I have there are two chairs, three desks, I believe, or four desks, and two large desk chairs.

Now of course as you know, at the conclusion of the session the President has sent to his home his fountain pen, desk set, his chair, and his desk set, also all other matter that he is using in connection with the office, including his brief case and supplies, stationery and so forth.

MR. WEBBER: I notice that at each session you gentlemen have purchased quite a number of clocks. Can you tell us what becomes of the clocks?

MR. BROWN: Well, I have got one, a small clock.

MR. PEASE: I have one also somewhere, and the other one I purchased simply went to pieces and the electricians took

apart and couldn't fix it, couldn't get it into operation; but I do have a clock somewhere in these cabinets.

MR. WEBBER: The regular and special sessions from July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1941, I have notes of the following clocks: One black clock, Mr. Pease, Graybar Electric Company, \$3.38, one clock Mr. Brown, Mansur's Inc, \$7.68, one electric clock, Mr. Brown, Mansur's Inc. \$7.40; one Seth Thomas clock, House Speaker, Westinghouse, \$6.45 -- and I have noticed in checking the expenditures of other sessions that there have been somewhat similar clock purchases. Now do some of these clocks become souvenirs for the Speaker?

MR. PEASE: The Speaker.

MR. BROWN: And President of the Senate.

MR. WEBBER: What about this electric clock you got, Mr. Brown? Do you know where that went?

MR. BROWN: What was the price of it?

MR. WEBBER: \$7.40.

MR. BROWN: That may be the clock that we now have. I think there was one of them we got that lasted a very few days and somebody knocked it off the desk and that was the end of that. Now I might say this: that during the closing of the last session -- and I don't know whether Mr. Pease was interviewed or not -- but there was some expression of concern about some carbon paper, and I told

them to go and see Mr. Pease. I don't know whether they have got their paper for this session or not. They felt they might not be able to get it. Do you recall anything about that?

MR. PEASE: Yes, I do. In connection with that, I think that Mr. Brown and I know that my office uses a special type of carbon paper in making up the permanent journal, because the type that they use currently here in the office smuts too badly, and I have considerable difficulty in getting the type that the girls have found the most satisfactory. I don't know whether there has been any order for this session or not. I know I have some left over from last session.

MR. BROWN: We make so many copies of the journal, both for the office use and for the stenographer and for the press that we have to have a very good quality of carbon paper in order to get a copy. I do not know whether that has been ordered or not; if it has not, it should have been.

MR. WEBBER: Now here is a matter that was brought to me for investigation by the Controller and the State Auditor jointly: In February, 1942, each of you gentlemen ordered 250 sheets and envelopes with official letterhead, showing your capacity as Clerk and Secretary, and 250 sheets and envelopes of personal stationery -- and samples of the stationery were supplied me by these gentlemen. The

stationery of Mr. Brown simply carries the name "Royden V. Brown;" the stationery of Mr. Pease carries the heading, "Harvey R. Pease, Attorney at Law, Wiscasset, Maine," and that item seems to be subject to some criticism by the department heads. Is there any comment you have about that?

MR. PEASE: That is entirely true. I think without doubt the personal stationery should have been billed to me, but probably it wasn't. At some former session I had some printed with this letterhead, with the Wiscasset address on it, but this time they got my own letterhead on it. I do not think there is any question I should have paid that bill. I probably approved it in the rush and didn't look at it.

MR. WEBBER: Not a very large item: in each case it would amount to \$8.94. Did you have any comment, Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: I don't recall -- just my name on it?

MR. WEBBER: Let me show you. (Handing paper to Mr. Brown)

MR. PEASE: I might add that between sessions there is some correspondence connected with this job. I know last week in one day it so happened I had four legislative inquiries, and at one time I had some stationery printed with my Wiscasset address on it, but I have that stationery and there is no question about it.

MR. WEBBER: I think probably you gentlemen would agree it would probably avoid criticism if all stationery that you used carried "Clerk of the House" or "Secretary of

the Senate."

MR. PEASE: That is right; it always has in the past.

MR. WEBBER: Now I wanted to get your comments on this: I have a general summary of expenses, grouped by totals, to offer a comparison of 1939 and 1941, indicating incidentally a saving of 1941 over 1939 of about \$10,000, slightly less. Most items, therefore, show some reduction in 1941, but some items show an increase, and I thought perhaps you could throw some light on how the increase may have occurred: for instance, printing, total increase from \$46,588.62 to \$48,314.03. Would you have any thoughts as to what might have brought that about?

MR. PEASE: Well, of course it is just a thought: there are no two sessions of the Legislature that the volume of legislative printing runs the same: there are some sessions that we have more bills, and there are some sessions that we have groups of bills, like town charter bills, more of them at that session.

MR. WEBBER: Your thought would be that represents an increase in volume rather than an increase in price?

MR. PEASE: Absolutely, I should say so. Last session, my recollection is we had quite a number more legislative documents than we had the session before, and that fluctuates.

MR. BROWN: Might I remark: This time the Committee on Reference of Bills ordered practically everything printed, and then there is a growing demand for more and more of the legislative documents; even as far away as Texas they

call for these legislative documents, and consequently all the time the document clerk is coming to the Clerk of the House and to me for additional orders for printing. Certain things are in greater demand than others. Consequently, that has increased quite a bit, I think.

MR. PEASE: Just another comment on that: I think also that the legislative record ran about a hundred pages more.

Now if I might make a suggestion to the committee without seeming officious about it: I know some of the states adopt this idea to take care of the expense of legislative documents: The state pays for printing all public documents: the sponsor, when he files a private bill, makes a deposit to pay for the printing of the private bill. That has been discussed around the Maine Legislature some.

CHAIRMAN DOW: I see some advantages besides saving money on that too.

MR. PEASE: So do I, Mr. Chairman.

(Off record discussion)

MR. WEBBER: Now here, on a percentage basis, is quite a substantial increase: Binding increased from \$1982.13, approximately two thousand dollars, to \$4329.29. Now what would account for that?

MR. PEASE: Well, you want me to guess?

MR. WEBBER: If that is all you can do.

MR. PEASE: It may have been that some of your reports of the Investigating Committee and other things that were printed, the binding charge was put in separate from the

printing. That may have accounted for it. I know, for instance, in one year an investigating committee and also private auditors, particularly the private auditors, brought out a rather elaborately bound volume. Now that may have contributed to it if that was in the year. I do not know that it was. It is probably some special item: I do not know of any general increase that would bring it about.

MR. WEBBER: What is it that gets bound?

MR. PEASE: Well, your record is bound, there is a binding charge that is separate, and stitching and folding, whether that is included in that I don't know. When the documents are billed in by the printer they are billed in so much for printing and also so much for binding. That binding includes the trimming, folding, stitching and punching for those that are punched.

MR. WEBBER: The reason that seemed curious to me was that although there is some increase in the printing bill, the percentage increase represented by passing from \$46,000 to \$48,000 is far less than the percentage increase of jumping from \$1900 to \$4300, and it seemed to me perhaps they might be expected to be in proportion.

MR. PEASE: I do not think that would necessarily follow. It might be the other way. If you printed a hundred extra documents, you would get a printing charge on them but you wouldn't get anything extra on the few copies that were bound. If you had a hundred extra pages in your

legislative record the printing charge would be about the same. I think the State Printer could explain that charge to you, because he is the man who has charge of it by direction of the Legislature.

MR. WEBBER: You have no thoughts on it, Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: No; I do not understand it.

MR. LIBBY: Would it be by chance we had extra binders to keep legislative documents?

MR. PEASE: No; I do not think that is included in the binding charge; I think that comes in the supply charge.

MR. WEBBER: Here is a substantial percentage increase in an otherwise small item: electrical supplies increased from \$186.78 to \$552.73.

MR. PEASE: Well, I will answer that one to some extent: there was installed in the Clerk's office and the President of the Senate's office flurorescent lighting this past year. That may explain part of it.

MR. HILDRETH: You refer to an installation charge?

MR. PEASE: No; electrical equipment; the equipment was bought. There are six lights in this office here, and I think four at the other end were put in last year. That may explain part of it. And then part of it may also be purchase of Flash-O-Calls which carried the proceedings of the House and Senate to the newspaper room and the executive office as well as to the recording offices. That may explain part of that. Neither of these items, of course, will be recurring. You understand all these

explanations are just thoughts on the subject.

MR. WEBBER: Now to pass on to the question of salary schedule, would it seem fair to you, in order to estimate what the real pay for these various jobs is, to break it down by the number of legislative weeks, which, at last year's session was sixteen and a half, I believe, and the number of legislative days, the actual days that the legislature was in session, which, as I recall, was sixty-eight, in order to determine about what basis of pay we are giving the various employees of the House and Senate during the session?

MR. PEASE: Well, perhaps some of them, yes. Very few. Others, I would say it would not be actually fair. There is considerable that has to be done before a session starts that the Secretary and Clerk has to attend to, and there is considerable cleaning up.

MR. WEBBER: That is as to your own salaries. Of course your own jobs are continuing jobs.

MR. PEASE: The Attorney General does not say so.

MR. WEBBER: Take, for instance, Mr. Humphrey, the Sergeant-at-Arms, who on a basis of sixteen and a half weeks gets \$41 a week, and on the basis of number of legislative days gets ten dollars a legislative day, isn't that a pretty high wage schedule for anything he is expected to do?

MR. PEASE: I would not say it was exceptionally high. You gentlemen have been in the Senate -- I will say this because

I know Royden would say so if I didn't --you gentlemen who have been in the Senate know how efficient Humphrey is and how much more efficient he makes your work there, and if you started a green man into his job everything would not be done the way it is done.

CHAIRMAN DOW: Could I change your language a little, Mr. Pease, by saying this: According to your way of thinking you pay Roy Humphrey for two things: what he does and what he knows?

MR. PEASE: Absolutely. We are paying him some for the experience he has gained down through the years there.

MR. WEBBER: You refer to knowledge of the formalities?

MR. PEASE: Some, and some to the little details of seeing certain things the Senators may need are on their desks that they take just as a matter of course.

CHAIRMAN DOW: But which if he wasn't there they wouldn't get?

MR. PEASE: That is right; and they would miss them if they didn't get them.

MR. WEBBER: If he is being paid for that responsibility, then what does the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms do that makes him worth \$7.50 a day?

MR. PEASE: You mean under the present scale that is being paid?

MR. WEBBER: Well, this wage schedule has been continuing some time, regardless of present wartime wage levels.

MR. PEASE: One thing, you are asking people to come here for a short period of time for a short job, that is one of the things, and it has to be taken into consideration, and of course they come, a great many of them, from their homes outside Wiscasset and their expenses are more here.

CHAIRMAN DOW: To clarify that a little, Mr. Pease, it is your thought that the type of people you want are not always available, and that type of people cannot always get time off?

MR. PEASE: That is right.

MR. WEBBER: Here is Inez Wing and E. Mae Chapman, who each make approximately \$60 a week. Are they worth it?

MR. PEASE: They are worth considerably more than that to the legislature, any legislature that comes here. You have women in the State's employ who are permanently located and drawing salary every month in the year that are getting very close to that figure. Now both these ladies are experienced -- and I say without any fear of being contradicted they are highly efficient, and the legislative machinery goes on smoother and faster because they are in those jobs, and they are not jobs that you can take any typist and set them to work on. I have had, about every session of the legislature, I have had to go down and plead and beg and even threaten to the Appropriations Committee in order to get what I considered adequate compensation for my subordinate officers and assistants. At one session, for instance, the salary of

Mrs. Chapman was fixed at \$55 a week. It was a fourteen week session. That was the general understanding, kind of a gentlemen's agreement all around. At the session following that it ran sixteen weeks and I couldn't get the same total amount from the Appropriations Committee for Mrs. Chapman.

In my office -- I speak for my side now -- I have two almost indispensable women; it would be very difficult to replace them and do the work that office requires to be done in the time that we have been doing it and in the time that the members expected it to be done; and in order to get them to come here year after year I believe their salaries should be very remunerative, and I do not consider them high at all. I consider those girls worth at least \$75 a week to the legislature; and, again, Mr. Chairman, you are paying them a good deal for what they know about it, their particular job.

CHAIRMAN DOW: I brought that out because I thought that was what you were driving at.

MR. WEBBER: That is against pay for a highly skilled and trained law office secretary, for instance, who is capable of drawing writs and all that, running perhaps from \$25 to \$35 a week. Do you still feel they are worth twice as much as the going price?

MR. PEASE: Yes, I do.

MR. BROWN: If I might be permitted to add to that: In some instances the Presidents of the Senate have brought their

stenographers up, who were very competent office stenographers, but they were wholly unfamiliar with it. It is a routine that taxes experience to work into. Consequently the result was in one instance one of them stayed two days and in the other instance one of them stayed three days. It is a type of work in which experience counts a great deal.

MR. WEBBER: Well, how many sessions, for example, has Inez Wing done this job?

MR. BROWN: Let's see: she has, I think, been there five or six or seven sessions. I cannot say whether she followed the lady that is up there in the tax division, Mrs. Griffin.

MR. PEASE: Mrs. Chapman has been here eleven sessions.

MR. WEBBER: What did Mr. Slosberg do?

MR. BROWN: Well, Mr. Slosberg was attached to the office and he worked largely doing errands for the President and he assisted in the distribution of the documents in the morning session and so forth.

MR. WEBBER: Did he work throughout the full session?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. WEBBER: And did you have anybody in the House that was comparable to his position?

MR. PEASE: No. What is his title.

MR. WEBBER: He didn't have any. That is why I asked Mr. Brown.

CHAIRMAN DOW: Could I ask a question? Did he correspond

to the office I abolished when I came down here in 1937, to messenger? Didn't they have the job of messenger in 1937?

MR. PEASE: Yes; we had a messenger here.

CHAIRMAN DOW: Prior to 1937.

MR. PEASE: He was rather misnamed "messenger." He was really special clerk in the clerk's office.

CHAIRMAN DOW: But he was called "messenger?"

MR. PEASE: He was called "messenger," and he did general errands for the speaker of the House and the Clerk, and some clerical work in there.

CHAIRMAN DOW: And he was dropped in 1937?

MR. PEASE: He was dropped in 1937. He was only here one or two years.

MR. BOUCHER: May I ask a question here: Mr. Brown, didn't Mr. Slosberg, besides having this job of messenger or whatever you call him, also do some clerical work for committees and get paid besides that?

MR. BROWN: I do not think he was paid anything besides that. I do not know that he was. I was not responsible for the employment of Mr. Slosberg. I know that an arrangement was made whereby the Kennebec delegation was very anxious to have him employed, and I must say he was very useful throughout the session.

MR. BOUCHER: I know he was quite busy, but I was just wondering if he didn't get paid besides his salary in clerical work.

MR. BROWN: He was conscientious and willing to do everything he was asked to do.

MR. PEASE: If I may add one thought here: Back in 1927 and 1929 we used to have the same number of legislative officers plus two folders in each branch. We had an additional document clerk, we had an additional assistant document clerk, and we had an additional postman; and sometime about 1929 or 1931, Mr. Brown and myself, in cooperation with the legislative committee, worked out the present set-up of legislative officers and set their salary up at that time with the distinct understanding that these legislative officers after that, these subordinate officers, should not take committee assignments. Prior to that time their wages had been considerably lower, and in order to get enough to pay their board they had to act as clerks and messengers and what not of committees, but since that time they have rendered no services to committees and received nothing from committees. That is just a matter of history.

MR. WEBBER: In answer to Senator Boucher, I just looked through this list of committee clerks and Mr. Slosberg's name does not appear.

MR. PEASE: May I continue with that thought a minute:

We had considerable difficulty in working that plan out, but we finally worked out a plan that took politics pretty well out of the legislative subordinate

officers. This is the good old times, but it happened in the 30's, there was one young man that received \$150 as a legislative officer, and all that he did during that session was hang his hat and coat in one of the legislative offices. Now that has not happened since then. You gentlemen know me well enough to know I don't get redheaded very often, but when I was trying to get what I thought was reasonable compensation for my assistants, to find this young man getting \$150 for doing nothing, I was a little bit hot under the collar.

(Off record discussion)

MR. WEBBER: I would like to ask Mr. Brown about this matter: I observe that Mr. Hanks here and Mr. Lyford are each getting the same pay for their work during the session, and their assistants apparently get the same pay. I had a little fun for myself and counted up the number of pages of the legislative record for the House and for the Senate, and I observed that at least in the last session Mr. Hanks and his assistants did by volume about two and a quarter to two and a half times as much by volume as the Senate reporters. Now does that in your mind, Mr. Brown, offer any opportunity for any saving on the part of the Senate reporting, if we can proceed on the assumption that Mr. Hanks and his assistants were fairly paid, or are there other things that enter into it that necessitate an equality in pay?

MR. BROWN: I think there are. Of course the Senate is, as

you know, a much smaller body. However, I think there have been occasions when we have had members of the Senate who were more given to oratory than has been the case the last few sessions; in fact, at one session of the legislature the oratory in the Senate exceeded by quite a large amount that in the House. But they are there ready to take whatever occurs, of course, in the Senate, and I do not see on the matter of volume how it could be worked out. It is regrettable that it is that way. I think that the last session or two there has been considerably less. The Senate is a very judicial body now, very calm, they are not disputatious, but it has not always been so.

MR. WEBBER: Well, out of my ignorance I perhaps erroneously took it for granted that the ratio was about in proportion to the number of members of the House and the number of members of the Senate. Apparently from what you say you do not consider that was formerly true?

MR. PEASE: We have at times what we call a "talking House" and at other times they are unfortunate enough over in the Senate to have a "talking Senate." It all depends on the type of membership.

(Brief recess)

MR. WEBBER: You brought out something during the recess, Mr. Pease, that it might be well to have on the record, and that is the matter of employing reporters for the House

and Senate. As I understand it, you and Mr. Brown do not understand that you have technical authority to employ the reporters?

MR. PEASE: Why, it is my understanding under the law we have no authority whatever to arrange for a reporter of the House or Senate.

MR. WEBBER: And yet that should be done substantially in advance of the session, should it not?

MR. PEASE: In order to have a reporter here. If you are not fortunate enough to make arrangements with your reporter for the last session, I am frank to say I don't know where either one of us would find a reporter.

MR. WEBBER: How has it been done as a matter of custom?

MR. PEASE: The reporter has been chosen by order of the House or Senate, as the case might be, designating him as reporter after they meet.

MR. WEBBER: But have some advance arrangements been made?

MR. PEASE: Mr. Brown, I assume, has made arrangements, and I know I have for my reporter to come back, with one exception in the case of the House, and in that case arrangements were made for the assistant reporter to take over on the death of the former reporter.

MR. BROWN: And this time I might say it would be necessary to go through the Personnel Board. Mr. Lyford has to be relieved beyond a certain length of time. He told me I would have to address myself to the Personnel Board, requesting him.

MR. PAYSON: That is on his contributory pension proposition?

MR. BROWN: I don't know.

MR. WEBBER: So it might be well to have some sort of machinery to take care of some of these things in advance? Is that correct?

MR. PEASE: Well, probably it would. On the other hand, I can conceive of situations where it perhaps would not work. Such situations very rarely come up, but there might be a contest for my office and I had made arrangements for one reporter and another fellow had made arrangements for another reporter. There might be some conflict. On the other hand, I assume also that probably a body ought to be permitted to choose its own officers. That is a constitutional provision. It ought to be done, but I don't know just how you could work it out.

MR. WEBBER: Well, we might tie it in with this thought, and I invite your comment to this suggestion which I will read: Suggested that a small committee of the House and Senate be constituted at each session to be responsible for legislative inventory purchases: that this committee first inventory property previously purchased and still on hand and make all requisitions for new purchases and charge to each committee officer or subdivision of the House or Senate the purchased items: that at the close of the session it inventory the property of all, giving credit for items returned, and make its report from which it may

be determined what supplies were used up and what returned and by whom. Legislative supplies can then be returned to the purchasing department for credit and larger items of furniture and equipment can be placed in custody of Superintendent of Buildings for safekeeping. The Legislature can earmark by order any items which it intends for souvenirs or gifts to members, and the balance of legislative property should be dealt with as strictly as property of the State of Maine. It should be perfectly possible for such committee to arrange sharing of equipment and supplies by committees which have little business to transact, as the complete outfitting of committees which function only once or twice a session is one of the extravagant features of the session.

It occurs to me, in the light of what you said, that it might be possible, if that were a good suggestion, to tie in perhaps some other matters in the way of getting ready for the next session, the committee carrying over to that extent, perhaps being delegated with authority to hire a reporter in advance for the session, or something of that kind.

Now what comments would you have on the general scheme of a committee on supplies and purchases and inventory?

MR. PEASE: I think it is a very fine idea, something that has been needed for some time. It places authority and responsibility in an established place.

MR. WEBBER: Are there practical difficulties?

MR. PEASE: There are no practical difficulties as far as that goes: there might be practical difficulties in their arranging for officers of the succeeding legislature. You members have all known of attempts being made to amend the rules in the last week of the Legislature, and the cry has always gone up that this Legislature ought not to attempt to make rules for a succeeding Legislature. It seems a foolish objection, but it is more or less a practical objection also. A great many of these matters do not come up in quite a few of the states where they have a personnel that is a full-time personnel. They have them in Massachusetts and some of the other states: some of their legislative officers are supposed to be full-time officers and their compensation is spread over the entire period for which they are chosen, and they are available for legislative work any day, and they are there as responsible officials of that legislature.

CHAIRMAN DOW: They have an office and so forth.

MR. PEASE: They have an office. In Massachusetts, for instance, the Clerk of the Massachusetts Senate and the Clerk of the Massachusetts House are full-time employees of the State, and the Sergeant-at-Arms also. In most every legislature practically all of this detail and duty you have outlined here is the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Legislature, and they have one Sergeant-at-Arms, with assistants, that look after the details in the different branches. The Sergeant-at-Arms in some states is a constitutional

officer and he is the man that looks after supplies and equipment and is responsible for it.

This down here, where we have sessions only every two years, seems a very desirable undertaking.

MR. BOUCHER: Going along with your talk that this State could save a good deal of money if secretaries of the minor committees were arranged by the committee -- here is what I am getting at -- I think if you will look up the clerks of committees you will find nobody has been paid less than \$150, from \$150 to \$600. Now I served on six committees in this last Legislature, and there were only two of those that were fairly busy, and four others did not meet more than two or three times during the whole session, and those clerks had to be paid \$150 for what little work they did. Now if you had a clerk assigned to three or four of these minor committees, or half a dozen, I think you would save some money.

MR. WEBBER: That was the next thing I was going to bring up. There is the last paragraph here on my set-up. That suggestion has come from several different places, and it has come from within the State House here. One suggestion that has been made has been on the idea of having these clerkships as political plums, if the Legislature could be prevailed upon to give up that patronage and put it on a purely business basis, because there is so much disruption here in departmental activities while the Legislature is in session anyway, that it might

be possible to make up a pool of three or four girls who would be borrowed from state departments simply during the session; and that committee, for instance, like the one suggested, might have the authority to assign those girls from the pool to committee work and take care of these relatively inactive committees. Certain committees we know have to have a full-time staff.

As I recall it, Mr. Pease, you have already, at one time or another, indicated you thought that was a pious idea. Perhaps I am wrong.

MR. PEASE: When a Clerk of the House ventures into the realm of committee clerkships, he is on rather dangerous ground.

MR. WEBBER: We are talking purely in terms of efficiency and economy. We request your opinion as an expert.

MR. PEASE: There is no question but what probably more efficient committee work could be done through less committee clerks and more experienced committee clerks, the lesser number to be more experienced. I repeat what I said once before, earlier in this hearing: that I believe the Legislature should operate as a distinct branch of the government, just as the court, the judiciary does, separate and distinct from the executive.

Now as a matter of history in connection with this subject, a bill was drafted, and my recollection is it was presented to the Legislature, that gave the control of

committee clerks and stenographers to a state department. Now I do not hesitate to go on record as saying that would not appeal to me at all. I think the Legislature should govern itself, look after its own affairs, have control of its own affairs right down through. As to taking stenographers from state departments, I will go on record as saying I do not think it would work, for the reason that I had experience along that line when I needed additional help in the Clerk's office at a former session. I took up the matter, and the suggestion was made that I get a girl from the Secretary of State's office. I went down and asked for the girl and she came upstairs. We had seven pages of journal to type that day. Well, before she got through she had typed a total of one or two pages, and then one of my girls had to type five pages of journal.

Under that system you are getting girls that are dispensable to the department: you can't pick them out. I think you have got to build your own organization, because no department is going to give to the Legislature their best secretary if they can help it. Incidentally, I have tried to hire girls out of departments without legislative sanction, and I haven't had any luck at all with their letting them go, because I wanted to pick the girl.

MR. WEBBER: You might get at it perhaps by giving the committee we are talking about authority to hire two or

three people who might have the ability to serve as clerks, and make a pool that way and assign them and they be independent of state departments. Is that possible?

MR. PEASE: That is possible.

Of course you do not propose to go near as far as the proposition put up to this legislature four or six years ago proposed to go. They proposed to have a chief clerk of committees and four or five committee clerks, and a sufficient number of stenographers. All bills were to pass through that Chief Clerk and a report come back through that Chief Clerk, and that Chief Clerk was to assign clerks and stenographers and messengers to the committees, which, from an efficiency viewpoint was ideal, but from the point of patronage, well---

MR. WEBBER: It has seemed to me also there was a definite opportunity through some sort of committee control to curtail to a large measure the complete outfitting of inactive committees, because, unfortunately, the committee material they are outfitted with never comes back, and there is not very much indication, from the records at least, that very much use is ever made of it: it is either simply carried home by the committees, or, in some instances, given by the committees to state departments who happen to be in their good favor. That in itself might not be so bad, because the state still has the benefit of the material, but ~~where~~ it throws the actual

realistic expense and economy of the state departments to some degree, large or small, out of line and interferes with control.

MR. PAYSON: Does that amount to anything in money, the equipment of a committee? What do you have in mind for equipment of a committee?

MR. WEBBER: Well, I don't know. I am afraid I cannot give you figures. But I think you would be surprised, because every single one of these inactive committees, as I get the picture from the people that I talk with in the purchasing department and so forth, take a complete outfit of stuff as if they were going to do the work of the Appropriations Committee and going to be in session day and night for a while, and then they don't do anything.

MR. PAYSON: They have ten notebooks, ten of the binders for committee work, and perhaps they have a dozen pencils, and they have committee stationery. I do not know how much it amounts to, but I do know the poor fellow who has got a lousy committee with no work to do, if he can't get stationery to write people and make them think he is doing something, he is going to be kind of mad.

MR. HILDRETH: I served on a committee two meetings, and all I got was pencils, and I guess stationery and one paper notebook.

CHAIRMAN DOW: Didn't you have typewriter desks and a typewriter, stapling machine and pencil sharpener?

MR. HILDRETH: The clerk may have.

MR. WEBBER: I have been given to understand that they take such things as stapling machines, just to use an example, and certain types of durable equipment which you might expect a committee to have some use for, and it never comes back.

MR. PAYSON: I imagine if a committee has any bill at all the clerk probably has a stapling machine so he can staple it, and a notebook. I think that is probably the biggest service that the clerk renders, almost.

MR. PELLETIER: Perhaps I can throw some light on the proposition. My first term here, I was on, I don't recall whether one or two inactive committees, and, if I recall, at that time our clerk did not furnish us with these looseleaf ring binders, in fact, as I recall, on one of these committees there wasn't even any stationery printed, as Mr. Payson has remarked. That might have been due to the fact that the clerk we had was new and green and probably didn't know where to get this stuff.

MR. BOUCHER: In connection with that, I would like to state that towards the last of the regular session in 1941 some of these clerks of these committees I belonged to came to me and wished stationery on me that I didn't wish for: they just left it on my desk, and I had enough of those notebooks so I didn't know where to put them. I had one for each committee. I was the only member of the legislature that had six committees.

(Off record discussion)

MR. PAYSON: You have got the opposite extreme, Gene. There are not enough committees in the House so every man in the House can have a working committee: someone is just left out on the limb so he hasn't anything to show when he goes back home, not even a hunk of stationery, and he is pretty mad. He may be on Mines and Mining, which probably never will meet, but if he can write to his constituents showing his name on that letterhead, that saves his pride a little bit. It is not economical, but, nevertheless, it has to be considered in politics.

MR. BOUCHER: You are talking from the political angle.

MR. PAYSON: That is right.

CHAIRMAN DOW: I have no question but certain things can be turned back and used over and over again.

MR. PAYSON: No question about it.

MR. ROYDEN BROWN: Mr. Webber, couldn't you add that to the duties of your committee as you have outlined there, that they should have general supervision over distribution of these things. I think the psychology of that is right, because a man comes down here and is put on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and that is all he gets, and if he doesn't have a little stationery to sustain his ego it is a pathetic situation. I think if you had a committee that had charge of the distribution of that stuff it might have a salutary effect so purchases would not be excessive.

MR. PAYSON: And if the committee not only had charge of distribution but inventory afterwards, you would salvage a lot of stuff. There is no reason why stapling machines and clippers should get away if somebody is responsible.

MR. BOUCHER: There is something there. Stationery, I quite agree with you that should be kept, because there may be a political angle there that is very good.

Last year one of the committee clerks came to me at three different times and wanted me to take playing cards. I do not believe in carrying playing cards in my pocket. I did take one set of playing cards he wanted to give me and kept it in my desk all through the session; I didn't even open it, and I took it home finally; but the other two sets I refused because I had no use for them and didn't want to clutter up my desk. If those sets cost forty cents apiece, there was eighty cents going around for somebody to pick up because I didn't want it. Those things should be controlled, and I think what Don has got in his mind would answer that perhaps.

MR. WEBBER: Doesn't that all stem from the fact you have a clerk chosen on the basis of political patronage, and then he wants to make some sort of a showing of some political nature of his own, and he becomes officious about those things that don't amount to anything, whereas if you had two or three people that were doing the work of all of the clerkships of these semi-inactive committees and

they were interested simply in the working details of making the committee function properly, you wouldn't have this unnecessary running around.

MR. PAYSON: Do you understand this: that these clerkships are pretty much senatorial prerogatives of the chairman of the committees? The chairman, a Senator, a big shot, will come into the committee and say "I want so and so as clerk, and you gentlemen can confirm my nomination."

MR. BOUCHER: How did you find that out?

MR. PAYSON: I have been told enough times.

CHAIRMAN DOW: What is wrong with that?

(Off record discussion)

MR. WEBBER: It is exactly that that the young crusader is seeking to change.

MR. PEASE: There is one thought, Mr. Webber, in connection with that that I wish to bring out, and that is this: that unless a great deal of judgment is shown in the selection of this committee it is not going to function, for the reason that members of the Legislature pretty much have other things more important on their minds than checking up to see whether Mines and Mining has got two stapling machines rather than one. That is something you have got to take into consideration. You may get a conscientious committee that will actually work. Take, for illustration, two committees, one from each branch, which we always have had ever since we were a state, and that is the

Committee on bills in the second reading, and Committee on bills in the third reading -- we had a member of that committee quite a number of years ago that sat down and read every bill as a part of the duties of that committee. At a great many sessions that committee does not even meet and select a clerk and authorize him to sign the reports. Now there is a danger in this thing of dropping into a situation where the committee would not function. That committee at least should be given somebody to do the work for them: they can't do the work themselves. I doubt if you would find three or five members of the Legislature who would do the necessary detailed work that job requires. That is the practical objection to a very fine idea.

MR. BROWN: I still think the idea is commendable.

MR. WEBBER: Why isn't there this possibility: You have just said, Mr. Poyson, and we all know it is true whether we have been in the Legislature or not, that your new men coming to the session for the first time, unless they are unusually fortunate, are quite apt to end up with a committee that is of no relative importance, because the older men coming back are perhaps getting the better committees. What is the reason, however, that two or three of these relatively new men, who perhaps do not rate important committees but they may nevertheless be ideally suited to handling a purchase inventory -- I can think of a concrete instance of a new man who is coming

to this next session from Auburn, who may, for all I know, not be going to rate anything important in the way of a committee, yet his work in business all his life has been just exactly that inventory and purchase control, and he knows it from A to Z, and he has been successful in business.

(Off record)

MR. PAYSON: That is possible; but if I were Speaker of the House I would have that difficulty if I were putting a new man on that committee in that the new man would know nothing of the routine procedure. Perhaps we are trying to break down routine to a certain extent, but you can't break that down completely; and, secondly, your fairly bright men are going to get something to do in most cases.

MR. DOW: Isn't the practical result this: that five of us are on that committee, we don't know particularly what the legislature needs, so as a practical result we speak to Harvey and ask him to submit a list, and speak to Royden and ask him to submit a list, and be careful there are no playing cards or dominos, and ask him about some of the big items that scare us to death, and we buy justabout what he would have requisitioned for us, and wouldn't it work all right?

MR. WEBBER: Of course it would work all right. In other words, to speak perfectly frankly, if you saw a requisition

for about eighteen fountain pens or pen sets, he would get a satisfactory answer before he signed that purchase order.

(Off record)

MR. WEBBER: The result would be Mr. Pease and Mr. Brown would get what they really needed, and they would get something else, they would get off their necks something that might be at times very disagreeable.

MR. PELLETIER: In respect of committees, of course while all supplies come through the supply department, the committee clerks have to go down to the supply department and get them?

MR. PEASE: That is not required: that is the custom.

MR. PELLETIER: If it were required that they have to go down, and, if you wanted to, you could have each member sign, and you could have a list of goods returnable, and those that were not just skip them, and those that are returnable could be charged up to each member of the committee, and if he didn't return them he would be charged with them and have to pay for them.

MR. PEASE: In connection with that, I think you will find that the supply department have required for the last two sessions all legislative requisitions to be signed by the Chairman of the Committee before they get any.

MR. WEBBER: But they follow the strict policy that the

legislature is entitled to whatever it asks for, and no state department can purchase on anything like the basis that the legislature does.

Now this is what I run into, gentlemen -- and I am in a unique position from the rest of you: I am over here all the time working, and I am in constant contact with these state departments, and I sense this thing in a way you do not: that some of the things that the Legislature does and permits in connection with its own affairs do not sit well with state departments who are held down very tightly on everything all along the line, and it puts you in a bad position to go out and offer very much criticism of what state departments are doing. You holler "Economy, economy, economy" at state departments, and you do not practice economy in the Legislature, and it is not good business.

MR. PELLETIER: Not so much the amount as the principle.

MR. WEBBER: It is the principle of the thing that doesn't sit well. That is why I was asking these gentlemen about these wage schedules. I had an idea what the answer was going to be, but I wanted to get it in the record. One reason for asking about it is that the per diem and per week and those things are no secret to the people that work in the State House, they know what is going on, and it is so far out of line with our underpaid state employees -- and they are almost uniformly underpaid, in my opinion, particularly under the present wage schedule -- that does not sit very well. You may have

a fellow like Chick Weed, Chief Clerk of the Motor Vehicle Division, one of the most important jobs in the State House: you men have had him here and you all know he is one of the brightest men you have here, making, I forget exactly, but somewhere around \$45 a week, and he is competing on a state pay schedule with a man named Humphrey, who gets \$41 a week, and I claim Humphrey does not have to know one-tenth as much as Weed does.

MR. PEASE: Chick Weed gets his \$45 a week fifty-two weeks in the year, and Humphrey comes up here and gets it for say seventeen weeks.

MR. BOUCHER: I admire you defending the employees of the State, but what about us poor fellows coming up here?

MR. WEBBER: I admit absolutely the members of the Legislature are underpaid.

MR. PAYSON: That is our own fault.

MR. PELLETIER: One more thing I would like to emphasize at this time on these committee clerks and stenographers' salaries: they come up here to the Legislature, and, as a general rule, they leave their home when they come up here and take on added expense of living here, while people who are employed at the State House either live in Augusta or nearby and make their homes here, so there is a substantial saving in their cost of living, and that must be taken into consideration.

MR. WEBBER: I have been given the impression, perhaps erroneously, that a number of these people were engaged in

pursuits that were perhaps seasonal, so that it might be very handy for them to have this employment during the particular season when the Legislature was in session.

MR. HILDRETH: I think that is unquestionably true.

MR. WEBBER: And it didn't represent any particular sacrifice for them to come over here.

MR. HILDRETH: I know of plenty of people in Washington County who would give their shirts to get some of these jobs. They might be green men the first year, but they would come here willingly year after year, because it does fit in exactly with their seasonal operation.

MR. PAYSON: It is in the winter, when they don't fish.

MR. WEBBER: One of these men, I can't remember the name, that I asked about particularly, and I asked about these various men, one of these men I happen to know is in the tourist business in the summer, and in the winter he has his feet up unless he is over here working for the Legislature.

MR. PAYSON: We had an example in the last Legislature of a committee clerk who got through and jointed the anti-tobacco lobby.

(Off record)

MR. HILDRETH: I would like to ask Royden and Harvey both: these days we are running into girls doing all kinds of new jobs, and if you have a good man such as Roy Humphrey, so far as you assistants are concerned -- I can't even keep them straight -- why can't two or three girls do just as well

as they can, if you have a good top man? I see the value of experience in the top man, but is experience necessary in putting out documents?

MR. WEBBER: You are talking about, for instance, the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, page, folder, and so forth.

MR. HILDRETH: It galls me no end to think of a doorkeeper sitting there swinging a door. I do not think we need one: I think it is an insult to the people of Maine and the Legislature to have that on the record: it just makes us ridiculous, that is my feeling.

MR. BROWN: Of course these offices I do not feel responsible for, because they were created by the Legislature. Of course government is always expensive, we know that, but I do not know just what can be worked out. I should leave that to the wisdom of you gentlemen, but the statutes set up these different officers.

MR. PAYSON: Harvey, may I ask you a question: Who sets the salaries of these different officers outside of committee clerks?

MR. PEASE: The salaries of the subordinate officers are fixed by statute, but of course that statute is not binding on any Legislature. It has been increased some in the last two or three sessions.

MR. PAYSON: How is Mrs. Chapman's salary fixed?

MR. PEASE: Fixed by the Appropriations and Financial Affairs Committee.

MR. PAYSON: If that is the case, it seems to me we are slightly afield on that phase, because it is referred to a committee of the Legislature; but on the proposition of committee clerks and committee set-up and procedure, that type of stuff, I think we are well within our province, and the suggestion of the committee was the suggestion I made over a year ago and I am heartily in agreement with it.

MR. PEASE: I think Mayo will recall at the time the Personnel bill was passed that the original bill took in the Legislature and everything, and Mr. Brown and myself succeeded in getting legislative employees and so forth taken out from under that, because we did not want the personnel department sending up someone into our office anymore than the Governor wanted the personnel department to pick his cook over in the executive mansion.

MR. PAYSON: We pretty nearly amended that right out of the window, as I recall it. But I do have the feeling that on the subordinate officers' salaries which is already handled by a committee of the Legislature, the Appropriations Committee, which has to do with salaries and wages and that sort of stuff all the time, that perhaps we are somewhat out of our province in that, but it is obvious that this matter of committee clerks is within our province.

MR. POULIN: I may say something regarding the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, because I was on that committee last year. The request comes to us on the closing

days of the session -- it came to us a week, probably, before the session closed -- and the salaries are already set up -- at least that is the way I understood it -- a certain amount specified for each position; and the argument, as far as I can find out, has always been used that while some of us on the committee thought they were rather high that here was a situation where these people had been earning the same thing in previous years and they had worked on that same assumption during that entire session, and that it would not be fair for us to cut them at the last minute after they had already worked -- and, as a matter of fact, as far as I can see, those salaries are not paid at the end of the session.

MR. PEASE: They draw some advances, I think about fifty per cent.

MR. POULIN: In other words, a clerk's salary comes in to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs with a certain amount specified of \$500, or whatever it might be, and the chances are he has already drawn \$400.

MR. PEASE: You mean a clerk in my office, or a committee clerk?

MR. POULIN: Well, somebody in your office, for instance.

MR. PEASE: Well, they wouldn't draw as high as that.

MR. POULIN: They draw part of it? ~~XXXX~~

MR. PEASE: They draw part of it, yes.

MR. POULIN: What I am trying to point out, as far as the

Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs is concerned, even if we wanted to actually do something, we are not in a position to do it.

(Off record)

MR. PEASE: When we start a session and when we go ten weeks, we do not know whether this session is going thirtgen or seventeem weeks. In that connection, I might say that Mr. Brown's and my salary were set when no session, with the exception of one, had gone over thirteen weeks. We are going seventeen on the same pay.

MR. POULIN: What I am pointing out is what Mayo refers to as the list of salaries set up by the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, and, in answer to that, I say I do not believe that is true.

MR. HILDRETH: I agree with you. Technically, Harvey's answer was right, but practically it just isn't so.

MR. POULIN: I will say it is approved by the Committee.

MR. PEASE: Let us put it the other way: Before either one of you gentlemen were connected with the Maine Legislature, I went to this committee once -- and I am not reflecting on the committee, because that committee has got a lot to do, and fixing of salaries in the clerk's and secretary's office is rather a minor thing and they do not have the time to bother with it -- but I went down to that committee and sat down with the then committee and we worked out this schedule for girls in the office, which

seemed to be fair, we worked it out in advance, and at the end of the session if it was \$30 a week it was multiplied by 16, or 13 or 14 -- I think it was 14 that year. It seemed perfectly satisfactory to everyone. It ran from thirty to fifty-five dollars a week for girls in my office. The next session of the Legislature came in, and I do not recall whether it went sixteen or seventeen weeks, and nothing was said about it and I didn't have to go down before the committee. When I got ready to make up my payroll, I made it up on the same basis per week that had been paid at the legislative session before, and the committee wouldn't approve it: they gave them the same amount of money for two or three extra weeks, which really didn't seem fair. Now it should have been fixed early in the session.

MR. PAYSON: The whole thing is cockeyed, and I will leave it to Horace. I argued my head off on the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on something that happened there relative to, I think his name was Peters. Anyway, he came down before the committee with the idea of allowing the clerks of committees to draw in advance so much a week or so much every two weeks. Now I made this proposition: How can you pay them without first knowing how much you are going to get? They go ahead and draw on an anticipated salary that has not been set and has not been approved, and at the end of the session

they come in at the last minute and want \$250. That is all cockeyed.

MR. PEASE: I agree with you generally that the thing is pretty much cockeyed, for the reason we meet only once in two years, we have no continuing officers or anything, and at the end of a legislative session most of them feel as I do, that we never want to see another legislature again -- and the next session I would be sick if I wasn't coming back.

MR. POULIN: Wouldn't it be better to say this: Referring not to any particular job, but say that a certain job or a certain position would pay so much a week -- I mean make it by law if you want to.

MR. PEASE: You can't do that, for the reason in 1935 or 1937 you could hire stenographers for ten or twelve dollars a week that are getting thirty-five or forty now. I do not think you could put it in the law, but you could put it in some committee.

(Off record)

MR. POULIN: Wouldn't it be sound business, before you hire somebody in your office -- and I am not talking particularly about your office -- to have it understood how much they are going to get?

MR. PEASE: Absolutely; but how can you say they are going to get \$35 or \$40 a week? If it goes fourteen weeks --

MR. PAYSON: You can't do it. (Off record)

That committee is not going to have a substantial enough background to sit in the place of the Appropriations Committee

on this type of salary proposition.

MR. POULIN: I think their hands are tied myself.

MR. PAYSON: But there is no reason why Royden Brown and Harvey Pease can't come down to the Appropriations Committee on the first week or second week of the Legislature and take up all their regular salaries with them, and there is no reason why that should not be required.

CHAIRMAN DOW: Provided the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House have got a committee appointed by that time.

MR. PAYSON: As soon as the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs is appointed, there is no reason why those officials couldn't do that.

MR. POULIN: You can see my point.

MR. PEASE: I understand your point, and I have known it was wrong all along, but there was nothing much I could do about it.

MR. POULIN: As far as the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs is concerned, when they come in the last few days of the session and say "Here, this is what they have been getting and that is what we would like to have them get this year," after all the work has been done and they have been hired possibly on that anticipated salary, there is not much we can do.

MR. PAYSON: What about at the beginning?

MR. POULIN: If it is done at the beginning, that is a different story.

MR. PAYSON: No reason why it cannot or should not be.

MR. PEASE: There was a case years ago where the Appropriations Committee, after quite a full hearing, increased the salary of legislative officers as much as \$300 a session.

MR. FOULIN: I can conceive of where it could happen, but that was some time ago.

MR. WEBBER: Well, it seems to me that it is at least a proper function of this committee to point out what the difficulty is and then recommend that the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate hereafter present their office schedule to the Appropriations Committee within one week after the committee is organized.

MR. PEASE: I think that is fine. If I may add just one more thing: I notice in certain figures Mr. Webber has here he is figuring on legislative days. I will take the House side of it. With perhaps two exceptions, I am here six days a week if not seven. You all know that my office is open six days each week; and some of the subordinate officers are around the Legislature, not all of them, but at least half of them are here six days a week, so that instead of figuring about fifty-five days in seventeen weeks, if you figure it six days it would change their per diem substantially. They are here performing legislative duties. And, in connection with the special session, it is usually about a two-day job for some of us to get the thing set up to start in with

and two or three days' job to get things taken down afterwards, and if you take that into consideration it throws your schedule of per diem way off from what it would be on legislative days. You all recognize that.

MR. PAYSON: What about evenings?

MR. PEASE: Well, I have had a girl at her desk put in eighty-four hours in one week in that office across the hall. That is more than should be expected of her, but she actually put in eighty-four hours at her desk in one week.

MR. PAYSON: I know from our experience in the last session that frequently in the evening I came up here and found the Clerk's office open and the people working.

MR. WEBBER: I do not like to start any controversy here, but I would like to know: is there as much work and as much activity involved in the Secretary of the Senate's office as there is in the Clerk of the House's office?

MR. BROWN: Yes, I think there is. There are the same number of papers that go through; and, in addition to that, in the Secretary of the Senate's office we have the responsibility of filing all of the ought not to pass reports and card-indexing them and so forth.

Now to get back to this per diem: that interests me. We always keep both offices open. We try, however, to do this: for instance, Waldo Clark, who is invaluable in our office, he will stay one weekend perhaps, and the other

weekend perhaps Roy Humphrey will stay, but the office is always open and they are available at any time, and they have always come out evenings if we needed them. We try to keep the office open all the time.

MR. PEASE: Mr. Brown's office also has the duty of keeping the record of all joint conventions. We have in this office what he does not have, the legislative docket.

MR. WEBBER: You think it about evens up?

MR. WEBBER: I think the same amount of business has to go through.

CHAIRMAN DOW: Isn't it true also that after the first three or four weeks quite a few members of the Legislature stay here all the time, even when the Legislature is no in session, and they spend considerable time up here using these particular offices on bills of their own?

MR. PEASE: That is correct.

MR. WEBBER: What happens to these numerous card tables that get bought every time? Do they get smashed up and destroyed?

MR. PEASE: How much do we pay for them? Ordinarily they buy a very cheap card table; sometimes they buy some good ones.

MR. WEBBER: They pay a little less than two dollars apiece.

MR. PEASE: Doesn't that answer the question fairly well, if they are used there seventeen weeks? Most of them are destroyed and broken up. I wouldn't wonder if some of them went where the wastebaskets go, but they are pretty

well battered at the end of the session.

(Off record)

MR. WEBBER: I want to ask this question: I note here several instances where people on the regular state department payrolls get additional compensation, and I wonder if that is sound practice. I do not think I have discussed this with Jim Mossman -- Jim Mossman is one of the ones who gets \$100 for his services to the Appropriations Committee. Alga Towle gets some compensation, I don't recall exactly how much, for services in connection with supplies apparently.

MR. BROWN: Joe Grenier is another.

MR. PEASE: And in the Engrossing Department.

MR. WEBBER: There are two or three others. I have had criticism of that from state department officials themselves who feel that they are simply working on the time they are already being paid for, and the only reason I could see for that would be work on a purely overtime basis. For instance, our Indian report is being typed by Miss Raymond and one or two girls she has employed to help her, but under a definite arrangement with them that it is being done on an overtime basis and charged to this committee, because it is too much of a job to ask anyone to do on straight time. Practically all of our other work, a lot of it has been done by two or three different girls here on a regular time basis and with no time back to this committee whatsoever.

MR. PEASE: Well, take your printing officer -- you are asking your state printer to handle \$50,000 of additional responsibility. You are asking the engrossing department girls to come back here and work all night if necessary, and they do some nights. You are asking Miss Towle, who has a fulltime job now, to assume keeping the accounts and records of all this small distribution. Now the theory has always been they were doing additional work in addition to their regular work for which their salary was set and they should receive some compensation.
(Off record)

MR. PAYSON: Is that one of the propositions that goes through the Appropriations Committee?

MR. PEASE: Yes.

MR. PAYSON: Who recommends those salaries?

MR. PEASE: I think the Secretary of State has made recommendation at different times. I know I have been consulted by members of the Appropriations Committee on additional compensation, and I have always gone on the same theory I stated here, that it was in addition to their regular work. We used to have -- I do not think we have had for the last two or three sessions, but we used to have certain clerks in the departments that acted as clerks of committees, Forestry, for instance, but that has been discarded pretty much.

MR. HILDRETH: Mossman falls into that category?

MR. PEASE: I think he put in considerable time.

MR. HILDRETH: I am in complete defense of Mossman: ~~no one~~ else could possibly have done it and he is fully entitled to it.

MR. PEASE: And I know I can speak for the Engrossing Department girls, they work overtime. There is a charge in here, I believe, for Helen Grenier down in the State Printer's office. She came back here night after night to be here to mimeograph amendments for the House.

MR. HILDRETH: It seems to me, Don, that it really is not a legislative problem. If the employee is not busy enough during ordinary times, they have got a departmental problem, they are overstaffed, and the problem is there and not with the Legislature. It seems to me that problem is on somebody else's desk and not that of the Legislature. I can see how it perhaps may cause some feeling. The only one I am thoroughly familiar with is in the case of Mossman, and it just saved the State a heap of money for him to put in overtime and act as clerk for that committee, rather than to bring somebody in that didn't know beans about it.

MR. WEBBER: My thought was there could not be any objection to what was overtime, but there was some question on some of these as to whether there was overtime involved.

MR. BROWN: In the case of Joe Grenier and Helen, I think the Clerk of the House will bear me out that they have come over here night after night.

MR. WEBBER: How does it happen you gentlemen have sometimes put in purchase orders, as, for instance, your ring folios that carried your names in gold letters that you bought through Joe Grenier?

MR. PEASE: The order of the different branches that authorized the purchase of supplies authorized us to purchase them. We do not go out and purchase them as we were authorized to do except in very isolated cases. They pass a joint order at the beginning of the session that places the control of binding under the control of the State Printer. Now somebody has construed the question of special ring binders and so on as a question of binding rather than a question of supplies, and so we have ordered them there. The purchasing agent has always said to me at the beginning of the session "You know the special things you require," and they have always told me to go ahead and buy them and report to them and they would issue requisition for them; because, as I have stated before, there are certain types of general supplies that are perfectly all right to use in a department, like, for instance, carbon paper, that we cannot use up here in the Legislature because we want something that produces a more permanent copy. Maybe we have overdone it in certain cases, but in very few cases do we go outside and buy supplies. We buy typewriter carbons, typewriter ribbons. I don't know whether you have had any experience with the the ribbons they furnish here, but we find they smut, and we

buy for two of our machines that work on the journal a better grade of typewriter ribbon, a special typewriter ribbon that is not so black to start in with and holds the color better.

MR. BROWN: To get at the brief cases, there was the very practical question of having the President's name put on them, so it had to be done over to the Kennebec Journal.

MR. PAYSON: Could I ask you this question, Harvey: If a committee were set up of seven, with neither the Speaker of the House nor the President of the Senate having any committee assignments except on reference of bills, would it be possible for them to act ex officio on that committee without taking too much of their time? And with their background they would have considerable knowledge.

MR. PEASE: I think it would, except you are getting into a delicate proposition: this committee, if it actually functions, is apt to collide with the ideas of the committee chairmen, and I don't know as it is fair for the Speaker and the President to have that responsibility.

MR. WEBBER: Wouldn't it help to have the prestige of the two officers to back up the committee?

MR. PEASE: I think so. I think it is ideal for a committee to control the expenditures of the Legislature. It at least sets up a body that has responsibility and authority. But as to its practical workings, I don't know, it has got to be tried.

MR. POULIN: It can always be amended.

(Off record)