

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-first Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE



1943

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

suspension of the rules, the resolve was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A in concurrence.

Joint Order, Increasing the Salaries of State Employees (H. P. 1341)

Comes from the House, passed as amended by House Amendment "A."

In the Senate, the Joint Order was read, House Amendment A was read, and on motion by Mr. Elliot of Knox, the Order and Amendment were laid upon the table pending adoption of House Amendment A, and especially assigned for this afternoon. (Ordered reproduced)

Joint Order, relative to Postage Stamp Allowance for Indian Representatives. (H. P. 1368)

Which was read and passed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Bethel Water District." (H. P. 1346) (L. D. 885)

Mr. DOW of Oxford: Mr. President, because there is one part of that bill which I would like to check, I would ask to have the bill laid upon the table and I will take it off this afternoon.

The motion prevailed and the bill was laid upon the table pending passage to be enacted, and especially assigned for this afternoon.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act Relating to Certain Carriers Under the Financial Responsibility Act. (S. P. 366) (L. D. 638)

An Act Increasing the Compensation of the County Attorney and Assistant County Attorney for Androscoggin County. (S. P. 369) (L. D. 635)

Finally Passed

Resolve, in Relation to Status of Paul J. Brown in Re Teachers' Retirement Association. (S. P. 82) (L. D. 880)

Resolve Relating to Retirement Pension for Ralph M. Chesley, of Thomaston. (H. P. 630) (L. D. 893)

Resolve, in Favor of Miss Mary A. Hughes of Frenchville. (H. P. 1150) (L. D. 892)

Resolve, Placing Sherman Graves of Mexico Under Law Relating to

Superintendents Retirement Plan. (H. P. 1351) (L. D. 890)

Emergency Measure

Bill "An Act Relating to Infectious and Communicable Diseases." (H. P. 1352) (L. D. 891)

Mr. HARVEY of York: Mr. President, inasmuch as this bill requires amendment, I would ask that it be laid upon the table until later in the day.

The motion prevailed, and the bill was laid upon the table pending passage to be enacted, and especially assigned for this afternoon.

Constitutional Amendment

"Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Limit to Highway Purposes the Use of Revenues Derived from the Taxation of Vehicles Used on the Public Highways, and Fuels Used for Propulsion of Such Vehicles." (S. P. 233) (L. D. 339)

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: Mr. President, one of the arguments presented by the proponents of this resolution, which is not an argument at all, is that we should let the people vote on it. The people should not be allowed to vote on the matter until we ourselves shall decide that it is necessary, because we are supposed to be leaders. I was present when this matter was voted on elsewhere the day before yesterday, and I found that some of the members took the tail of the dog to be the leading end while as a matter of fact, the brains of the dog face in just exactly the opposite direction, and I noticed that not only did they take the tail for the lead, but they ran with the tail! I say that we are leaders. We were chosen by the people to enact the laws. They chose us because they believed we were men of sound judgment, common sense, that we were able to weed matters out and so I say to you that we should be leaders not followers.

Now when a child asks for a pill, thinking it is candy, if you have good judgment you don't give him the pill. Now we should not give the public a pill just because they think it is candy. What we should do is to take the leadership in this matter ourselves. Let's pass judgment on it according to sound

principles and common sense. I have talked with many, many members who admit that the arguments that we put up in opposition to this Constitutional Amendment are sound. They cannot do otherwise because it is obvious that the reasoning is sound. The spending of money is not a Constitutional question. It is a question of sound judgment. There is not a man here but what has got to admit the logic and common sense in that statement.

When we find people saying they want this thing we should tell them why they don't want it.

Let me give you an illustration. During this session, there was a certain bill introduced into the legislature that was backed by a women's organization of this state. I received a letter from a prominent woman in that club organization, stating that she was hoping that I would support her measure. The measure was highly ridiculous. I wrote back to that woman and explained why I could not support such a ridiculous measure as that, and she wrote back to me and thanked me for sending her the explanation and she fully admitted that she did not know much about those things, and she hoped that sound judgment would prevail. Now the point was that when I explained to her, she had sense enough to see there was another side to this question. And when your constituents and mine say "We want this Constitutional amendment" now knowing what they are talking about, we ourselves, instead of saying "Let them vote, let us give them the pill because they ask for it", we should explain to them why that is not sound. Man after man that I talked with, and some of them were going to vote for it, admitted to me that the principle involved in this Constitutional amendment is unsound. Why should we pass unsound legislation when we have principles to guide us that will keep us off the rocks?

After that vote was taken, I was talking with a friend of mine who said, "Judge McGlauffin, I agree with your argument absolutely. The principle of it is right, but" he said, "I had to vote the other way because the political pressure

brought upon me was so great that I did not dare to do otherwise." A very frank statement.

For the purpose of illustrating a point, I want to tell you briefly the story of the play or drama known as *The Man From Home*. Those of you who saw that play will remember that a certain American in Indiana was the guardian of a girl who was then in Italy, and there was a politician who wanted to marry this girl. But as she was under age she had to have the consent of the guardian. The guardian was disturbed and he went to Italy and he took with him this politician. He refused to give his consent at first, but while he was standing by his automobile, an Italian prisoner escaped and the American had him hide under the automobile and the officers failed to find him. This politician saw all that and he thought he had the hook on the American so he went to the "man from home" and he said, "Let us suppose that the law of Italy is that a person who helps a prisoner escape gets two years in state prison, and let us suppose that a certain American helped a certain Italian to escape and therefore is liable to two years in prison." And then he said, "Let us assume that a certain man comes to him and asks for the hand of his ward, and by granting it he can escape prison. What do you think that man would say?" And this was the answer, "That depends upon the man. If it is a man I know, he would say, 'I will see you in hell first.'"

That story thrilled me. An American who can stand on his own feet and tell the politicians and the lobbyists to go to hell before he will change his vote or a principle, is a man that I admire.

I want to make another point and to do so I want to tell you of a court experience. Some years ago I was trying a case in Augusta before Chief Justice Cornish. I had as my opponents, Judge Philbrook and Walter Gray of South Paris. During the trial I wanted to introduce some evidence, and Judge Philbrook objected, and Judge Cornish said "The objection is sustained." That meant I could not introduce my evidence but I said to Judge Cornish, "I did not come here wholly unprepared. Before you

make that decision I want to read to you some law, as I have four cases that are squarely involved. And Judge Cornish said, "I will hear you." I started to read from one of my cases and I had not gone one-half way down the first page when Judge Cornish stopped me and he turned to Judge Philbrook and said, "Brother Philbrook, that evidence has got to go in."

Many years later, a short while before Judge Cornish died, we gave him a banquet at a hotel in Portland and on that occasion I went to Judge Cornish and I said, "Judge Cornish, I think you are a big man." He said, "Why?" And I said, "Judge Cornish, you are big enough to change your mind when you see you are wrong; a little man never does."

I want to call to your attention one more thing, a historical fact. Those of you who read history will recall that President Johnson—they attempted to impeach President Johnson and you will recall that the vote of one man changed the entire situation. The public clamor against President Johnson was tremendous. We cannot comprehend it today. He had failed, among other things to re-appoint members of Lincoln's cabinet as his own cabinet. He appointed his own cabinet as has every President since that time, but at that time that was an unpopular move. William Pitt Fessenden of Maine had the vote that decided that we should not impeach the President of the United States, and everybody today says that William Pitt Fessenden was right because he voted right on that day. William Pitt Fessenden has gone down in history as one of the greatest senators that ever sat in the Senate of the United States, and the point that I want to make to you men here today is this. The question that we are about to vote on may depend on one vote. It was close in the other branch and it may be your vote, what you vote today may be to your credit or your discredit for the next twenty-five years. Now, is it not safer to vote according to sound principles rather than to take the chance to vote the other way?

Now, in closing, I want to say just this. You have heard the hymn

"I am serving the Lord, in my own weak way
I am serving the Lord in my own weak way
I have nothing good of my neighbor to say
But I am serving the Lord in my own weak way."
When you go home, some of you Senators can say:
"I was serving the state in my own weak way
I was serving the state in my own weak way
I had a vote but I threw it away and
I served the state in my own weak way."

Mr. BUCK of Lincoln: Mr. President, there is only one thing, I think, which is swaying me in the way I am going to vote. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the proponents and the opponents of this measure and the first time we voted upon it I was still doubtful as to how I should vote and so, being somewhat on the fence, as we might say, I decided that I would vote for this, and permit the people, our constituents to say how they felt about the matter. I believe that back in English history we learned that Gladstone and his followers gradually broadened their number of constituents in England and they placed their confidence in them, and I am happy to place my confidence in my constituents in whatever they may do.

Mr. VARNEY of York: Mr. President, I don't want to repeat anything that was said before, but I do feel that I should call to the attention of the Senators, two things which perhaps have not been discussed.

It so happens that I believe the people have made already one mistake by putting into the Constitution the amendment which says that we shall issue bonds, or can issue bonds but only to a certain figure. I think that when that was first put into the Constitution it was a very low figure. We had had to increase that figure, or have increased that figure by Constitutional amendment six or seven or eight times.

Now in this very session of the legislature, there was brought a bill involving the refinancing of certain bridge bonds. If we could have enacted that law all the Appropriation-

tions Committee agree that it would have resulted in a saving to the state of Maine in interest charges of approximately \$700. We all favored the idea. We reported the bill out "Ought to Pass" and sent to the Supreme Court for an opinion and found that it was unconstitutional. Now I don't object to the principles that there should be a limitation in the Constitution on the issue of bonds, but I say that it is written in there wrongly when you set an arbitrary figure, and I would be perfectly happy at some time to see that amendment changed to read something like this. That no legislature shall increase the bonded indebtedness of the state without first submitting it to the people for their approval or disapproval.

One other thing, and then I shall come back to this for just a moment. I heard one man use this argument. He said, "We want to put this amendment in the Constitution so that no future legislature can do what the legislature did in 1937" and I say that that is one reason why I do not want to see this thing put into the Constitution. I was a member of the legislature in 1937, and as I look around this Senate, many of you were members of the legislature in 1937 and let us look for a minute at what we did in 1937. You bear in mind that just previous to that session, the people of the State of Maine, including myself and I think most of you, initiated a bill and made it a law that no highway funds should be diverted. I was for that, and I am still for it. I still say that was a good law. Shortly after we had made that a law, we came down here for the session of 1937 and as I remember the picture, it was something like this. We had thousands of aged and needy people in the state of Maine. Many of them had already had their cases investigated and had been receiving old age assistance from the state. In the month of December their checks were stopped — or it may have been November, it was either November or December. They did not receive their old age assistance and they did not receive it because there were no funds in the general funds of the state of Maine to pay those checks. We came in 1937 with those

old people having been refused their pay in December. No funds in the general funds of the state.

Over in the highway funds, more than a million. I don't remember now exactly how much. My brother says five million and I think that is correct. We had the courage and I will say that many of you who are now asking us to put this into the Constitution voted with us, and I was not ashamed, I did not think I was doing something that the people had told me not to do. We had the courage then to borrow that money from highway funds and see that the needy and suffering people of Maine got their checks from then on, and as I understand it, or understood it then, that money has been since repaid, every dollar of it, to the highway fund. I call this to your attention, that if you put this amendment into the Constitution now and you come back here two years from now and find the same story that we found in 1937 — and I hope you won't — you will suddenly discover that you can't do a thing for the old people in the state of Maine no matter how much you may want to. You can't do a thing until you amend the Constitution. And you can't amend the Constitution until you have submitted it to the people for a vote at the following September election.

Now if you would say why not put into the constitution the principles of non-diversion of highway funds? Why not put into the Constitution that no legislature can divert money from the highway funds until they have submitted the question to the people at a special election; not require a Constitutional amendment but say that we will take the right away from the legislature to do this until they have asked the people if it is all right, by a majority vote, I would go along with that. Put it in that way. I would do the same thing with the bond issue and then I would turn around and say, "But that principle is already in the Constitution because if we try to divert highway funds at the present time, the people of the state of Maine have under the Constitution, the right to ask for a referendum on that subject.

Now I concede that it is true that the Constitution in providing for the initiative and referendum did assume that there might be some case when it was so important to do the

thing at once that we should not leave with the people the right to ask for a referendum and thereby delay action. And so there is the provision in the Constitution that when that occasion arises, this legislature may declare it to be an emergency and if it is an emergency and two-thirds of the legislature think so, the people are willing to leave that to our judgment, and you all know that we have stretched the emergency provision beyond its actual intent. All we actually do when we declare a matter an emergency and therefore make it effective at once, is to take away from the people of the state of Maine, the right to obtain a referendum on it and that is the only reason that the emergency provision was written into the Constitution.

I feel that a majority of the people of the state of Maine do not sufficiently understand our system of constitution and laws to intelligently vote on whether or not they want to make this a Constitutional affair and for that reason alone I think it is our duty to lead them by saying to them, "We do not think we should submit this to you for your approval or disapproval."

Mr. DUNBAR of Washington: Mr. President and member of the Senate, as I sat here this morning and listened to the two arguments that have been presented by the legal profession, I wondered if we were really super-men. I wondered if we really possessed greater and bigger analytical minds than the people who elected us to the office we now hold. I want to go on record, as one Senator, in saying in analyzing myself—and I do it many times—I don't consider myself a super being. I can think back to the county of Washington from which I come and I know of many many men and women who possess greater ability than I possess. I do not believe there are many children that can be fooled by passing to them a coated pill. I believe when this question, if submitted to them, they can decide it as intelligently as any member of this Senate can decide it. I have faith in the people of Maine.

I have been told, and I believe it is a law of physics, that the water rises no higher than its source, and I for one Senator do not want to take the position that I can rise higher than the people who elected me to this body.

When the able Senator (Senator Varney)—I have come to learn to love him—tells you the people of Maine made a mistake in the constitutional amendment in which they did not provide for sufficient size of the bond money to be provided by the state and for that reason it was necessary to refer it back six or eight times for additional amendments, who for heaven's sake was to blame for that? Was it the people of Maine or was it the legislature which submitted the constitutional question to them, because they can only vote on what was submitted to them? As it was submitted to them six or seven times they voted to increase the bonded indebtedness of the state.

When the Senator from Cumberland, Senator McGlauffin, says that all we hear here is not an argument but an excuse, I cannot agree with him on that proposition. I say that under the constitution of this state there is a necessity to prevent the diversion of the highways funds of this state, and although the legislature in 1937 borrowed, which they had a right to do, the Senator from York, Senator Varney, says that money was paid back. That was commendable.

I say to you, as I said in a previous speech on this floor, that I know of instances in this state and I believe it was in 1933 in December when \$400,000 from a fund in which there was \$425,000 was diverted, and it has never been paid back. That is what the people of Maine would like to have an opportunity to vote upon, to see that this does not occur again.

You will recall that only a few years back—I think it was the session of 1939 we passed a Title law which provided every person who owned an automobile had to prove to the Secretary of State that he owned it before he could get a license, and that law became so unpopular when they put it into effect, increased by the pressure of the Democratic convention in the spring of 1940 that the Republican convention that followed that convention adopted a like plank to repeal the law, and the Governor of the State immediately convened the legislature in special session to repeal it before the opposite party could make an issue of it in the campaign.

Now, that money was highway money and there was \$140,000 of it

left, and that was diverted and that has never been put back into the highway funds of this state.

Maine, as you all know, Senators, is a big state. Some of you have covered it from Fort Kent to Kittery and from Jackman to Eastport, and I say and I believe that there isn't a child being born at this minute that will live to be old enough but what every dollar of that revenue that is raised from the sources from which it came, won't be needed to apply on the roads of this state. If that is so, why don't we safeguard the fund? As I say, as I read this resolve, if the people adopt it there is nothing in it at all that will prevent future legislatures from borrowing from it in an emergency provided they pay it back. I do not want to take the chance of some future legislature or some future administration diverting money from this fund and not putting it back, and losing our federal aid. That is the thing that is controlling me. It is not the lobby. I have been lobbied on this bill, and I believe, Senators, I have been lobbied more inside the Body than out of it. I have probably done my share of the lobbying, too.

From my experience in and around the legislature, someone wants to try to defeat a measure the last and final arguments are that it is unconstitutional because it is class legislation, or that there is a big lobby in favor of the bill. Well, the lobby hasn't influenced me. I know two gentleman who are in the lobby who have been working for the bill and I have the highest regard for them and no one has threatened me that my political future, if I decide to try to stay in politics, will be affected by how I vote on this measure.

So in closing, Senators, I have already spoken too long because I think and I know your minds are made up, I want to go on record as saying, and I will paraphrase in my humble way what Senator McGlaulin said, just a line—I want to go home feeling that I have served the people in my weak way.

Mr. MCGLAULIN: Mr. President, I'd like to comment on one remark made by the Senator from Washington, Senator Dunbar. If I understood him correctly he said that if we adopt this constitutional amendment and the legislature had occasion, when they needed that money, that he had no objection to

their borrowing money from the highway funds provided they paid it back. If we borrow money now we are, under the law, obliged to pay it back, and if the State owes that highway fund \$400,000 it should be paid back. But the point I am arguing is this, if the legislature can now borrow money and not pay it back, and if the Senator from Washington, Senator Dunbar, says if they pass this bill he is willing for them to still borrow the money on their promise to pay it back, how are we going to be any more sure that they will pay it back after the constitutional amendment is passed than we are now when the obligation is identical?

Mr. SANBORN of Cumberland: Mr. President, I had not thought to make any further comments upon this question but I would like to call your attention to what seems to me to be the un wisdom of assuming that in the future there will be no development which may make it desirable to divert some of this money from highway purposes.

I confess that at the present time — I won't say I confess; I assert that at the present time — I would oppose the diversion of any of these funds. Nor can I see far enough into the future to divine the likelihood that anything may develop which would make such diversion desirable. But I say that we cannot safely assume that no such circumstances will take place, and if and when they do take place, if this amendment is submitted to and adopted by the people, then the entire state would regret their action.

I am reminded of an incident that took place down in my county some forty years or more ago. At that time Portland Bridge connected South Portland and Cape Elizabeth with the city of Portland. It was an old structure, very narrow, and the draw in that bridge fell into disrepair, it being a county structure, and the county commissioners found themselves under the necessity of replacing the old draw with a new one. That was, as I recall it, in about 1893 or 1894.

At that time the only public utility for street transportation in that vicinity was the Portland Street Railroad which had, within a short time, been electrified. There had already begun to be bruited about a suggestion that one of these days the electric road might want to go

across into South Portland. Having that in mind, the County Commissioners went to the then Portland Railroad Company. The President of the Portland Railroad Company was then Charles F. Libby and it is pretty well known that no more capable or astute lawyer or business man lived in Portland in those days than Charles F. Libby.

They told him they were about to replace this draw and asked him if he thought it likely that the electric road might have occasion to go across into South Portland and he fairly laughed them to scorn. "Why," he said, "it isn't within the wildest imagination of anybody that the time will come within the life of people now living that any electric road will ever want to go onto the Cape; you can go ahead and build your road without that construction."

They relied on that judgment of his, which was undoubtedly his considered judgment, and they replaced the draw with a draw just wide enough for two teams to pass. In 1897, three years later, the electric road went across that draw and it crippled traffic for the years which remained from 1897 until 1915 when the new bridge was built. Now there is a concrete illustration of the un-wisdom of assuming that conditions will not change.

The anecdote related by my learned colleague about Justice Cornish reminds me of another one which I will tell in closing, and I assure you that there is not the slightest personal application to it. I am telling it because I think it is a good story and too good to pass up.

Back in the days of greenbackism here in Maine you will recall, or the older people will recall, that great apostle Solon Chase, he of the cow-hide boots and "them steers," in 1880 toured the west for the greenback presidential candidate. He was unique in his methods and he had great audiences and made a big impression. By 1884 times had changed, the greenback doctrine had fallen into complete disrepute, and because of his personal admiration for the candidate and perhaps for some political consideration he espoused the republican cause and went out for Blaine, who was then a candidate for President.

The national committee thought that in as much as he was known to the West and had had great audiences there, they had better send him out again, so he went out and made a tour for Blaine. He was speaking in Indianapolis to a packed house and vehemently laying down the Republican doctrines and expounding the Republican platform when someone in the audience broke in and said, "Uncle Solon, aren't you singing a little different song from what you sang out here four years ago?" Solon drew himself up, faced about and said, "My friend, men sometimes change their minds; mules never."

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. FRIEND of Somerset: Mr. President, when the vote is taken I asked for a division.

Mr. BROWN of Aroostook: Mr. President, I move that when the vote is taken it be taken by the Yeas and Nays.

Mr. BRAGDON of Aroostook: Mr. President, before the vote is taken I would like to make a brief statement. I perhaps am not capable of analysing this matter as I should, but I shall vote as I think is right on it and I am greatly impressed by the fact that there seems to be a very great demand on the part of the people for this constitutional amendment and I more or less feel that the senators will agree with me, perhaps, that most of the time the people are right. It also impresses me a little that in regard to limiting the amount of our bonded indebtedness in the constitutional amendment there has never arisen an occasion where there was need for increasing that. I don't think we have ever experienced any great difficulty in getting an amendment to the constitution to take care of emergencies as they have arisen.

I shall continue to vote on this measure as I think the people of the state of Maine feel.

Mr. BISHOP of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, this debate would not be complete without a few elements from the brown soil. In regard to the demand on the part of the people, I attended a Pomona Grange meeting a week ago last night and just before the meeting came to a close the Master rose and said, "We have just had a communication" — and I don't know which one of the

group it was from — “We want you people to write your Representatives and ask them to favor this bill.” I rose and told them they need not write me because I did not favor it any more.

In my confusion a week ago I went along with the group and I stated that when this measure came up for vote on referendum, if it did, I would fight against it. Since then I have had a letter thanking me for my vote on the measure, from Portland Council 103.

I would like to offer a homely illustration. I have just one dollar left. The wife and I have planned to go to the movies with that dollar. If we get home this afternoon and find our little boy with a toothache shall we borrow that dollar and have his tooth fixed first, or go to the movies?

If we put this measure into the Constitution it will be settled so that the little boy's tooth will have to ache.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Brown, having asked for a vote by the yeas and nays, it requires the approval of one-fifth of the members present to order a vote by the yeas and nays. Those in favor of the vote being taken by the yeas and nays will please rise and stand until counted.

Obviously more than one-fifth of the members having risen, the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VARNEY of York: Mr. President, I have paired with my seat-mate from Penobscot, Senator Haskell. If Senator Haskell were present he would vote in favor of the passage of this resolve. If I vote I should vote against the passage of the resolve and I now ask the Senate to be excused from voting for that reason.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Senate approve of the request of the Senator from York, Senator Varney, to be excused from voting because of his desire to pair with the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Haskell, who is ill?

There being no objection, the Senator from York, Senator Varney, is excused from voting.

The question before the Senate is on the final passage of Legislative Document 339, Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Limit to Highway Purposes the

Use of Revenues Derived from the Taxation of Vehicles Used on the Public Highways and Fuels Used for Transportation of Such Vehicles. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll.

YEA: Senators Boucher, Bragdon, Buck, Clement, Dorr, Dunbar, Elliot, Emery, Farris, Friend, Hall, Hanold, Hodgkins, Megill, Owen, Peakes, Peters, Sterling, Townsend, Washburn, Woodbury, Worthen—22.

NAY: Senators Batchelder, Bishop, Brown, Dow, Good, Harvey, McGlauffin, Sanborn—8.

PAIRED: Senators Varney, Haskell—2.

The PRESIDENT: Twenty-two having voted in the affirmative, that being more than two-thirds of the Senators present in the Chamber, the resolve is now finally passed and will be signed by the President and presented by the Secretary to the Governor.

Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate, House Report from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, “Ought Not to Pass” or bill, “An Act Authorizing a Re-issuance of Kennebec Bridge Bonds” (H. P. 1072) (L. D. 561) tabled on April 7th by Mr. Varney of York pending acceptance of the report.

On motion by Mr. Varney, the bill and accompanying papers were retabled pending acceptance of the report, and this afternoon assigned.

The President laid before the Senate, Senate Report from the Committee on Welfare, Majority Report, “Ought Not to Pass,” Minority Report “Ought to Pass” on bill, “An Act Permitting Certain Aliens who have Applied for Naturalization Papers to be Eligible for Old Age Assistance” (S. P. 107) (L. D. 76) tabled on April 7th by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, for the same reason I have asked it in the past. I ask to have this retabled until the other bill regarding the care of neglected children is disposed of. Until the time it is signed by the Governor I would like to keep this bill here and I move it be retabled.