

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

Seventy-Third Legislature

of the

State of Maine.

1907.

gation in relation to the Court house matter was taken from the table and on further motion by the same senator was assigned for second reading.

On motion of Mr. Houston of Piscataquis the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE.

Tuesday, Feb. 19, 1907.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Grosvenor of Augusta.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Donigan of Bingham the House non-concurred with the Senate in its reference of a petition in favor of the bridge bill to the committee on ways and bridges, and on further motion by the same gentleman the petition was placed on file.

Senate Bills on First Reading.

An Act to create a lien on manufactured staves and laths.

An Act fixing the compensation of the clerk of the municipal court for the city of Lewiston.

The House report reporting ought not to pass on Bill, An Act in relation to compensation for clerk hire in the office of the clerk of courts for the county of Androscoggin, came back from the Senate that branch non-concurring with the House in its action, and recommitting the bill to the committee on salaries and fees.

On motion of Mr. Newbert of Augusta the report and bill were laid on the table.

An Act to amend Chapter 151 of the Public Laws of 1905 relating to the compensation of register of probate of Knox county, referred in the House to the Knox county delegation, came back from the Senate referred to the committee on salaries and fees.

On motion of Mr. Montgomery the bill was laid on the table.

Resolve in favor of the town of Baring, referred in the House to the Washington county delegation, came back from the Senate referred to the committee on appropriations and financial affairs in non-concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Montgomery of Camden the House receded and concurred with the Senate in its action.

The following communication was received:

To the Speaker of the House:

I have the honor herewith to trans-

mit the county estimates for the year 1907 and 1908.

Very respectfully
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) A. I. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

On motion of Mr. Emery of Jay the communication was referred to the committee on county estimates.

The following petitions, bills, etc., were presented and referred:

Judiciary.

By Mr. Merrill of Monmouth—Petition of Hannah J. Bailey and 29 others of Winthrop for enactment of law to prohibit expectation on all public floors and sidewalks.

By Mr. Cobb of Gardiner—Petition of Sarah G. Payne and 26 others of Gardiner for same.

By Mr. Weld of Old Town—Bill, An Act relating to the limitation of the use of the word "prescription;" also Bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Old Town Water District.

By Mr. Cyr of Van Buren—Bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Van Buren Light & Power Company.

By Mr. Waldron of Dexter—Bill, An Act to incorporate the Vassalboro Electric Light & Power Company.

By Mr. Chase of Waterboro—Bill, An Act to legalize and confirm the acts of the Free-Will Baptist Parish of Limerick.

By Mr. Johnson of Waterville—Bill, An Act amendatory of Sections 67 and 68 of Chapter 79 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the Reporter of Decisions.

By Mr. Noyes of Augusta—Bill, An Act to confirm the incorporation of the Maine Children's Home Society.

By Mr. Knowlton of Monson—Bill, An Act to incorporate the Monson Light & Power Company.

By Mr. Hall of Dover—Bill, An Act to extend the rights, powers and privileges of the Brownville & Williamsburg Water Company.

By Mr. Smith of Patten—Bill, An Act relating to sales of land for taxes in incorporated places.

By Mr. Davies of Yarmouth—Bill, An Act to incorporate the Corporation Guarantee & Trust Company.

By Mr. Waldron of Dexter—Bill, An Act to provide a salary for the judge of the municipal court of Dexter.

By Mr. Lord of Parsonsfield—Bill, An Act to incorporate the Cornish Water, Light and Power Company.

By Mr. Blanchard of Auburn—Bill, An Act to repeal Chapter 137 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, entitled "An Act to amend the charter of the city of Auburn and to provide for a Board of Public Works," and all acts and parts of acts amendatory thereof.

Legal Affairs.

By Mr. Therriault of Fort Kent—Petition of Fort Kent Telephone Company to amend their charter.

By Mr. Gallagher of Waldoboro—Petition of the selectmen and others of Jefferson and Newcastle praying for an amendment to existing statutes, so as to allow the taking of alewives in Dyer's river.

By Mr. Waldron of Dexter—Petition of A. J. Knowles and 26 others of Dexter in favor of the law to prevent prize fights.

By Mr. Newbert of Augusta—Petition of Rev. C. G. Mosher and 21 others for same; of Rev. B. P. Hope and 27 others for same.

By Mr. Stearns of Norway—Petition of Rev. W. T. Boyd and 16 others of East Hebron and vicinity for same.

By Mr. Tolman of Portland—Petition of Hiram Knowlton and 32 others for same.

By Mr. Colcord of Searsport—Remonstrance of Rev. Harry Hill and 32 others of Searsport against prize fighting.

By Mr. McKinney of Bridgton—Bill, An Act to amend Section 13 of Chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes, relating to election of road commissioners.

By Mr. Merrill of Monmouth—Bill, An Act to make valid the acts of the Lewiston, Greene and Monmouth Telephone Company.

By Mr. Therriault of Fort Kent—Bill, An Act creating the Fort Kent Village Corporation.

By Mr. Hall of Caribou—Bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Island Falls Water Company.

By Mr. Pike of Eastport—Bill, An

Act to extend the charter of the Eastport Street Railway.

By Mr. Leighton of Westbrook—Bill, An Act creating the office of probation officer for the city of Westbrook.

By Mr. Stearns of Norway—Bill, An Act to amend Sections 4 and 5 of Chapter 508 of the Private and Special Laws of 1885, amending "An Act to establish a municipal court in the town of Norway" and to establish a salary for the judge of said court.

Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

By Mr. Leighton of Westbrook—Resolve for making historical sites in Maine.

By Mr. Allen of Mt. Vernon—Petition of Alton J. Choate, M. D., and 16 others of Mt. Vernon in favor of Maine Sanatorium Association.

By Mr. Hall of Caribou—Resolve in favor of Dana L. Therriault for expenses in contested election.

Education.

By Mr. Lord of Parsonsfield—Petition of A. Q. Mitchell and 16 others of Newfield in favor of an appropriation for the University of Maine.

By Mr. Chase of Waterboro—Resolve in favor of Limerick Academy.

Railroads and Expresses.

By Mr. Hill of Machias—Petition of I. A. Johnson and 16 others of Roque Bluffs for two-cent mileage on the Washington County Railway.

By Mr. Therriault of Fort Kent—Petition of V. M. Therriault and 2 others to incorporate the Northern Railway of Maine.

By Mr. Johnson of Waterville—Bill, An Act to authorize Somerset Railway Company to issue additional stock.

Mercantile Affairs and Insurance.

By Mr. McKinney of Bridgton—Remonstrance of W. M. Staples and 21 others against any change in the present fire insurance laws.

By Mr. Lord of Parsonsfield—Remonstrance of A. Q. Mitchell and 5 others of Newfield against same.

By Mr. Hall of Dover—Bill, An Act to incorporate the Central Maine Insurance Company.

Banks and Banking.

By Mr. Dyer of Buckfield—Bill, An Act to incorporate the Paris Trust Company. (Tabled for printing pending reference on motion of Mr. Stearns of Norway).

By Mr. Weld of Old Town—Bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Old Town Trust Company.

Agriculture.

By Mr. McKinney of Bridgton—Petition of Chas. R. Dodge and 79 others of Bridgton against any change in taxation or control of dogs.

By Mr. Tarbox of Harrison—Petition of V. J. Jordan and 47 others of Harrison against same; of Geo. L. Hancock and 24 others of Harrison against same.

By Mr. Allan of Dennysville—Bill, An Act to assent to the purpose and provisions of an act of the Congress of the United States entitled, "An Act to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations and regulating the expenditure thereof."

Interior Waters.

By Mr. Newbert of Augusta—Bill, An Act to incorporate the Baker and Spencer Brook Dam & Improvement Company.

By Mr. Johnson of Waterville—Resolve in favor of a breakwater in Moosehead Lake near Kineo.

By Mr. Donigan of Bingham—Bill, An Act to provide for damages by flowage.

Ways and Bridges.

By Mr. Hill of Machias—Petition for the passage of a resolve in favor of the inhabitants of the town of Whitneyville by Cornelius Sullivan and 152 others; Resolve in favor of the inhabitants of Whitneyville.

By Mr. Harriman of Bucksport—Resolve in favor of the town of Bucksport to aid in the repair and rebuilding of Verona bridge.

Fisheries and Game.

By Mr. Gleason of Mexico—Petition of E. G. Child of Peru for an act to prohibit fishing in Spear Stream except on Tuesday and Thursday of each week; Bill, An Act to regulate fishing in

Spear Stream and tributaries in the county of Oxford.

By Mr. Decker of Weld—Petition of Guy M. Hazeltine and 29 others, citizens of Denmark and vicinity, praying for the enactment of a law prohibiting all fishing in Pleasant Pond in Denmark in Fryeburg for a period of five years.

By Mr. Allen of Mount Vernon—Petition of B. F. Allen and 39 others of Mount Vernon in favor of an act amending Sec. 30 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to license for buying and selling skins of wild animals.

By Mr. Tarbox of Harrison—Petition of Jesse P. Scribner and 71 others of Harrison and Otisfield in favor of bill relating to throwing waste into certain streams.

By Mr. Decker of Weld—Petition of W. N. Taylor and 25 others, residents of Portland and vicinity, praying for the passage of a law to regulate the taking of firearms upon the wild lands of the State in close season; of G. M. Shaw and 33 others of Cumberland county for same.

By Mr. Lord of Parsonfield—Petition of John H. Merrill and 16 others for close time on the Fenderson Brook in Parsonfield; of Frank W. Towne and 12 others of Parsonfield for same; Bill, An Act to establish a close time for fishing in the Fenderson Brook in Parsonfield.

By Mr. Decker of Weld—Bill, An Act to annul the lease or contract between the Fish and Game Commissioners of the State of Maine and the Lake Auburn Fish Protective Association.

By Mr. Charles of Mechanic Falls—Bill, An Act to prohibit the throwing of sawdust and other mill waste into Bog Brook and tributaries in the counties of Oxford and Androscoggin.

Shore Fisheries.

By Mr. Baldwin of Boothbay Harbor—Remonstrance of E. S. Marr and 52 others of Phippsburg and Georgetown against private legislation affecting the fisheries in Kennebec River and its tributaries; of Wm. N. Beal and 59 oth-

ers, citizens of Phippsburg and vicinity, against same.

Claims.

By Mr. Hibbard of Perry—Resolve in favor of the town of Meddybemps.

Pensions.

By Mr. Preston of Cherryfield—Resolve in favor of Elmira H. Dunbar of Cherryfield.

By Mr. Dyer of Buckfield—Resolve in favor of Daniel R. Palmer.

Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. Emerson of Stow—Remonstrance of H. C. Bacon and 12 others of Woodstock against the removal of the State Capital from Augusta.

By Mr. Hill of Machias—Remonstrance of G. W. H. Watts and 18 others of Roque Bluffs against same.

By Mr. Allen of Columbia Falls—Remonstrance of V. H. Trask and 24 others of Addison against same.

By Mr. Waldron of Dexter—Remonstrance of H. W. Brackett and 45 others of Newport against same.

By Mr. Gallagher of Waldoboro—Remonstrance of C. W. Besse and 24 others of Jefferson against same; of M. I. Johnson and 18 others of Jefferson against same.

By Mr. Allen of Mt. Vernon—Remonstrance of J. Frank Hammond and 16 others of Mt. Vernon against same.

By Mr. Reynolds of Winslow—Remonstrance of D. P. Foster and 19 others against same.

By Mr. Haskell of Deer Isle—Remonstrance of Geo. W. Redman and 29 others against same.

Temperance.

By Mr. Hill of Machias—Remonstrance of Murray E. Bridgman and 21 others of Whitneyville against resubmission.

By Mr. Merrill of Monmouth—Remonstrance of R. G. Clough and 53 others of Monmouth against same.

Labor.

By Mr. Donigan of Bingham—Bill, An Act limiting the number of hours of labor for river and stream drivers on the Kennebec river and streams amendatory thereto.

Taxation.

By Mr. Loring of Pownal—Petition

of G. W. Dayherty and 25 others of Pownal for law exempting young livestock from taxation.

By Mr. Gallagher of Waldoboro—Petition of A. J. Bond and 24 others for enactment of school mill tax bill.

By Mr. Hall of Caribou—Petition of C. L. Taylor and 20 others of Albion in favor of increasing school tax fund by one mill.

By Mr. Dunton of Belfast—Bill, An Act to amend Sec. 24 of Chap. 8 of the Revised Statutes relating to taxation of railroad companies.

By Mr. Newbert of Augusta—Resolve in favor of the City of Augusta.

Cumberland County Delegation.

By Mr. Scates of Westbrook—Bill, An Act to amend Chap. 213 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903 as amended by Chap. 355 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905, authorizing the county commissioners of Cumberland county to erect a county building in Portland.

Somerset County Delegation.

By Mr. Folsom of Norridgewock—Bill, An Act to amend Sec. 1 of Chap. 117 of the laws of 1905 relating to compensation of the county commissioners of Somerset county. (Tabled pending reference on motion of Mr. Milliken of Island Falls.

York County Delegation.

By Mr. Lord of Parsonfield—Bill, An Act to amend Sec. 1 of Chap. 173 of the Public Laws of 1905 relating to compensation of register of deeds, for the county of York. (Tabled pending reference on motion of Mr. Milliken of Island Falls.

Placed on File.

By Mr. Gleason of Mexico—Petition of C. H. Bonney of Sumner and 33 others in favor of the Denigan Bridge Bill.

By Mr. Donigan of Bingham—Petition of John H. Pollard and 11 others for same.

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Milliken from the committee on interior waters reported ought not to pass on bill, An Act to establish a bench or water mark in Sebago Lake.

Mr. McKinney moved that the bill be substituted for the report, and pending

that motion that it lie on the table for printing.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Leighton of Westbrook Thursday next was assigned for its consideration.

Mr. Merriman from the committee on appropriations and financial affairs, on resolve in favor of the town of Stockton Springs, reported that the same be referred to the committee on claims.

Mr. Smith from the committee on the judiciary reported in a new draft bill, An Act to incorporate the Kezar Falls Water Company, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Smith from the same committee reported ought to pass on bill, An Act to amend the charter of the Caratunk Power Company.

The reports were accepted and the bills ordered printed under joint rules.

Passed to Be Engrossed.

An Act relating to the ferry across the Penobscot river, between the town of Orono and the town of Bradley.

An Act to extend the charter of the Maine Water and Electric Power Company.

An Act to authorize the American Thread Company to erect and maintain piers and booms in Sebec river.

An Act to extend the charter of the Jackman Water Company.

An Act authorizing the Umbagog Paper Company to locate, erect and maintain piers and booms in the Kennebec river.

An Act to authorize the State land agent to sell Little Island in Mosquito harbor in the town of St. George.

An Act to amend Section 23 of Chapter 18 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the State laboratory of hygiene.

An Act to amend Chapter 158, of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, incorporating the Brunswick and Topsham Water District.

An Act to authorize John H. Walker to extend and maintain a wharf in Squa Pan Lake.

An Act to set off part of the town of Bancroft and annex the same to the town of Weston.

An Act to enable the Sebago Lake,

Songo river and Bay of Naples Steamboat Company, to construct and maintain a wharf at the west shore of Sebago lake, in the town of Sebago, in the county of Cumberland.

An Act authorizing and empowering the Aroostook Lumber Company to erect and maintain piers and booms and store lumber in the Presque Isle stream.

An Act to incorporate the Lincolnville Water Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the Carrabasset Dam Company.

Resolve in favor of Lee Normal Academy.

Resolve in favor of the town of Bowdoinham.

Resolve in aid of navigation of Lewey, Long and Big lakes.

Resolve in favor of roads in the Indian townships, Washington county.

Resolve in favor of the Maine State library. (Tabled pending passage to be engrossed on motion of Mr. Scates of Westbrook.)

Resolve authorizing the land agent to release the interest of the State in the islets called "The Nub" in Bluehill in Hancock county.

Resolve in favor of Maine Children's Home Society, Augusta.

Resolve in favor of the Bangor Children's Home.

Resolve in favor of the Augusta City hospital.

Resolve relating to the documentary history of Maine.

Resolve in favor of The Webber Hospital Association.

An Act to amend Chapter 31 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905, entitled "An Act to authorize the Houlton Water Co. to generate, sell and distribute electricity."

An Act to amend Chapter 145 of the Private and Special Laws of 1887 entitled "An Act to provide sewerage in the town of Houlton."

An Act to repeal Chapter 6 of the Private and Special Laws of 1891, entitled "An Act additional to and amendatory of An Act granting a new charter to Bates College.

Resolve in favor of a bridge on the St. John river at Van Buren,

An Act to amend Chapter 227 of the Private and Special Laws of 1880, entitled "An Act to supply the people of Houlton with pure water," as amended by Chapter 497 of the Private and Special Laws of 1889, and as amended by Chapter 148 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, and as amended by Chapter 3 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

The Donigan Bridge Bill.

On motion of Mr. Weid of Old Town, Bill relating to maintenance of bridges by the State, was taken from the table.

Mr. WELD: Mr. Speaker, in taking this bill from the table I do so with the conviction that no more important measure to the interests of the citizens of our State has been or will be presented to this session of our Legislature.

My object in tabling the bill was simply to give ample time and notice to all members of the Legislature that the measure might be fully understood and to give it a free and impartial discussion. Permit me to state at the outset that this bill comes before you from the committee by unanimous report that it "ought to pass," and I am informed that, although this subject of bridges has been widely discussed and heralded throughout our State by the press, not one single individual of our State has appeared before the committee to protest against it.

The committee has worked earnestly and faithfully upon this matter and I congratulate each and every member upon the result of their labor and this unanimous report.

Although representing a municipality having a large number of bridges to support, I have no selfish interests or motives in supporting this bill, and were the measure as a whole inimical or dangerous to the State or our citizens at large I would cast my vote and raise my voice in opposition to its passage just as earnestly as I now advocate its passage.

I am deeply interested in this measure, not because of my constituency, but because it is, I believe, legislation along the right line. Legislation which

removes the burden from our already overtaxed cities and towns and their residents and places it where in all justice and equity, as it will be my endeavor to show you, it rightfully belongs. Legislation which is along the same lines with State appropriation for insane hospitals, paupers and the many similar objects, matters and things, including and not for a moment forgetting, as I shall have occasion to again refer to the subject, the wise and beneficial provisions made for State roads.

If I was going to offer any material amendment to the bill, it would be in substance like this, to substitute for the word "forty" the word "ten" so that the measure shall include all bridges in the State ten feet or more in length. This may seem to some like radical legislation, but if I cannot convince you that we can just as well, just as easily, just as economically take care of all bridges from ten feet in length and upwards as we can bridges forty feet and upwards in length then, it were useless to make any argument whatever upon this matter.

At the cost of considerable time and labor, to myself, although most cheerfully rendered, I have prepared certain tables of facts and figures, the substance of which I desire to place before you at this time that we all may act and vote intelligently upon this measure.

I assume that every member of this body has read this bill and is fully as well acquainted with its provisions as am I.

First, you will observe that, unlike other measures that have been presented to the Legislature in previous sessions, the State is not required to appropriate one dollar for the purchase of bridges now supported by our cities and towns. It is sufficient for my purpose to state that the fee in these bridges passes to the State, in consideration of the assumption by the State of all future repairs and construction of bridges.

I firmly believe that the bridges constituting as they do a large and important part of the highways of our State should be the property of and supported by the State. The cities and town-

having bridges to support, have borne the burden long enough. No more should our cities and towns be required unaided to construct modern and expensive bridges for the convenience of the general public and to meet the ever increasing demands of our time and rapidly developing civilization.

This is the age of electric lights, telephone, wireless telegraphy and the automobile. The vehicles of today that are seen upon our public highways weigh tons where a few years ago pounds or at the outside a few hundred pounds was the limit in weight. Steel bridges are being thrown across our large rivers here and there throughout our State.

Better and stronger bridges are required to support the burdens put upon them, and to meet the demands of the times, among which might be noted the ever increasing thousands who annually visit our State in search of health or pleasure.

Another feature of the bill is that it provides an adequate and systematic bridge inspection, which in itself furnishes an additional safeguard to the public.

The main features of the bill, it seems to me, and the ones likely to provoke the most discussion, are those relating to the cost to the State and direct taxation by the State to raise the amount necessary to meet it.

During the session of 1903 the Legislature directed the State assessors to collect "information in regard to the large bridges within the State." The assessors made a very comprehensive report to the Legislature of 1905, and using this report as a basis and the annual reports of the State assessors, I have prepared several tables of statistics to fortify, if need be, the argument which I am making in behalf of this measure.

(Table A will be found on page 277.)

In one table I have arranged by counties the number of bridges, appropriations for bridges and appropriations for highways and bridges.

The total number of bridges in the state, fifty feet or more in length at the time this report was made, 1905, was

BRIDGE STATISTICS.

TABLE A.

Counties.	No. Bridges.	Appropriations for repairs for 5 years prior to 1904.	Appropriations for new bridges for 5 years prior to 1904.	Total appropriations for both repairs & new bridges for the 5 years.	Average appropriations per year for 5 years prior to 1904.	Total appropriations for highways & bridges for 1904.	Percentage of appropriations applied to bridges.
Androscoggin	47	\$22,400	\$11,500	\$33,900	\$4,780	\$96,850	about .05
Aroostook	76	52,375	35,870	88,245	17,649	90,087	.19 6-10
Cumberland	65	55,693	4,550	60,243	12,048+	229,119	.05 2-10
Franklin	59	13,280	2,882	16,242	5,228+	40,425	.13
Hancock	23	9,100	9,397	18,497	3,699+	75,541	.04 9-10
Kennebec	42	13,653	33,100	46,753	9,350+	107,320	.08 7-10
Knox	25	15,790	459	16,250	3,230	46,385	.07
Lincoln	40	3,250	1,000	4,250	850	29,850	.02 9-10
Oxford	76	12,350	56,109	68,459	13,690	67,975	.20
Penobscot	66	61,922	8,982	70,904	14,180	124,294	.11 4-10
Piscataquis	30	7,800	14,515	22,315	4,463	28,100	.15 8-10
Sagadahoc	17	4,450	—	4,450	890	39,325	.02 3-10
Somerset	69	15,088	32,075	47,163	9,432+	73,448	.12 8-10
Waldo	28	5,050	1,059	6,100	1,220	50,125	.02 4-10
Washington	57	18,828	9,512	28,340	5,668	42,047	.13 5-10
York	62	22,050	18,159	40,200	8,040	103,425	.07 8-10
Totals	782	\$333,089	\$239,113	\$562,202	\$114,417	\$1,244,316	1.52 3-10

Average number of bridges per county about 49. Average appropriations per county per year for five years prior to 1904, \$7151+. Appropriations for highways and bridges for 1904, \$144,077. Average per cent. of appropriations per county, .09 5-10. Average cost per county for year 1904 for repairs and new bridges based upon appropriations for that year and average per cent. for five preceding years would be \$7388.13.

an average per county of 49. The aggregate appropriations for five years prior to 1904 was, for repairs of bridges \$333,089, for new bridges \$239,113, a total for the five years of \$562,202, or an average annual appropriation of \$114,417. The total aggregate appropriations for highways and bridges for the year 1904 was \$1,244,316. Taking this total and the average appropriation for bridges for the five preceding years we can obtain an approximately correct percentage of the annual appropriations which were used for bridges in 1904. And the same would be true for any other year.

We find that the average per cent. of the total appropriations for 1904, which was raised for bridges would be 9-2-10. The total appropriations for highways and bridges for 1904 was \$114,477 and the average per county would be \$7,154. Note that, these figures include all bridges of all lengths and descriptions

that are now supported by our cities, towns and plantations. The cost for all bridges forty or more feet in length would be much less than \$7,154.

(Table B and C will be found on page 278.)

I have other interesting figures, showing entire State valuations for 1904 arranged by counties, with the total number of polls and last population. With these figures I expect to be able to convince you that the State can easily take care of these bridges without materially increasing the burden of taxation for any municipality and can as easily take care of all bridges as of those forty or more feet in length.

A State tax of 1-2 mill would give on the valuation of 1904, \$168,321. The total estimated appropriation for bridges for 1904, as already given was \$114,477.

The State tax of ¼ mill would give

TABLE B.

Counties.	Population.	Polls paying State tax 1904.	Total taxable estates for 1904 exclusive of wild lands, etc.	Wild lands, and timber and grass on public lands as per valuation of 1904.	Total taxable property as per assessors' return for 1904.
Androscoggin	54,242	14,138	\$29,261,930		\$29,261,930
Aroostook	60,744	14,797	15,922,833	\$7,675,769	23,598,602
Cumberland	100,869	28,371	78,581,444		78,581,444
Franklin	18,444	5,214	8,018,331	2,312,245	10,330,576
Hancock	37,241	10,527	17,276,683	880,479	18,157,112
Kennebec	59,117	15,796	31,536,707		31,536,707
Knox	30,406	8,642	14,774,795		14,774,795
Lincoln	19,699	5,282	7,518,209		7,518,209
Oxford	32,238	10,777	14,233,466	1,943,984	16,177,450
Penobscot	76,246	21,702	34,068,067	2,406,533	36,473,600
Piscataquis	16,949	4,977	5,923,094	7,338,829	13,261,923
Sagadahoc	20,330	5,407	11,028,473		11,028,473
Somerset	33,849	9,050	14,295,398	5,682,978	19,978,376
Waldo	24,185	6,344	9,746,039		9,746,039
Washington	45,232	10,896	12,066,324	1,631,147	13,697,471
York	64,885	16,995	32,401,307		32,401,307
Totals	694,466	188,915	\$336,643,050	\$29,870,964	\$366,514,014

Assessors' report for 1906 gives corresponding figures as follows: 190,456, \$357,173,611, \$37,559,379, \$394,732,990; an increase in taxable estates of \$20,530,561 and an increase in wild lands, etc., valuations of \$7,688,415. Estimated acreage of wild lands of Maine, \$9,000,000.

TABLE C.

Counties.	No. bridges.	Average appropriations.	Population.	Valuations.	Tax at rate of 1/2 of mill on valuation of 1904.
Androscoggin	47	4,780	54,242	\$29,261,930	7,315
Aroostook	76	17,649	60,744	15,922,833	3,981
Cumberland	65	12,043	100,869	78,581,444	19,643
Franklin	59	5,223	18,444	8,018,331	2,005
Hancock	23	3,694	37,241	17,276,683	4,319
Kennebec	42	9,350	59,117	31,536,707	7,884
Knox	25	3,230	30,406	14,774,795	3,687
Lincoln	40	350	19,699	7,518,209	1,879
Oxford	76	13,690	32,238	14,233,466	3,553
Penobscot	66	14,180	76,246	34,068,067	8,517
Piscataquis	30	4,463	16,949	5,923,094	1,481
Sagadahoc	17	890	20,330	11,028,473	2,757
Somerset	69	9,432	33,849	14,295,398	3,574
Waldo	28	1,220	24,185	9,746,039	2,436
Washington	57	5,668	45,232	12,066,324	3,014
York	62	8,040	64,885	32,401,307	8,100
Totals	782	114,417	694,466	\$336,643,050	84,161

us on the valuation of the State assessors for 1904, not including wild lands, etc., a total of \$84,161, by extending the assessment so as to include the nearly \$30,000,000 of wild lands and according to assessors' valuation of 1904 would give us an additional \$7465, making a total State tax of \$91,626. This amount would, in all probability, take care of the State bridges 40 feet or more in length. The assessors' report for 1906 shows the net increase in valuation of estates in cities, towns, etc., \$20,530,561 and the same report shows an increase in the valuation of wild lands of \$7,688,415. This increase at the same rate of taxation, would give us an additional \$7054, making a total, at the rate of $\frac{1}{4}$ mill on the last valuation of \$98,680. By a slight increase on the rate proposed or say the rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ mill per year, would, I feel certain, take care of all bridges in the State 10 feet or more in length. If this could be made to cover a period of years the results would be far better in my opinion than to cover one or more years at a time, but whether it costs $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ or 1 mill it will not in the end cost the State one cent more than it does today. It is estimated that the cost to the State to support bridges would be \$150,000. I have shown you by figures quoted, as near as figures can be made to show, what the probable expense would be. The taking over by the State of these bridges does not increase taxation, but, on the other hand it tends to lighten the burden of the taxation of the average citizen of our State. It equalizes the burden of taxation, furthermore it places some of the burden upon wild lands, which at the present time do not bear one cent of the expense of the maintenance of our bridges.

I believe in the equalization of taxation. This measure if enacted will be one step and a long step toward the equalization of taxation and in the right direction. Our large cities should not object because the construction of bridges in large places is naturally more expensive than in rural districts, and hence an excess in taxation is equalized by better construction, neither should the small town object because the entire burden is spread throughout the State according to valuation and

population, and the burden upon the smaller places, if anything, would be lighter, even, than at the present time. Most of our bridges, certainly the greater majority of the larger bridges, are a part of the public highways and are of a public nature and character to such an extent that the present system constitutes one of the most unjust forms of taxation, of which it is possible to conceive. We are asked to do something for good roads, to enact legislation which will give us better highways. Certainly the bridges in our State constitute a large part of our highways and it seems to me unwise to expend large sums of money on the extension of State roads on either end of a poor bridge. The arch of masonry is typical of the perfect form of construction and the key stone is the most important part in the arch. The key stone of good roads is good bridges. The key stone for the problem of equalization of taxes is this measure which is now presented for your consideration, and in closing I want to say this, that I feel it is wrong to appropriate anything more for good roads until the bridges of the State have been taken care of.

Counties where wild lands and timber and grass on public lands are located.

Counties.	Valuation for 1904.	Tax at rate of $\frac{1}{4}$ of mill on valuation of 1904.
Aroostook	\$7,675,769	1918
Franklin	2,512,245	578
Hancock	880,479	221
Oxford	1,943,984	485
Penobscot	2,405,533	601
Piscataquis	7,338,829	1,834
Somerset	5,682,978	1,420
Washington	1,631,147	408
Totals	\$29,870,964	7,465

I move an amendment to the bill by adding another section.

"Section 14. To carry out the provisions of this bill, a fractional part of a mill shall be assessed upon the total valuation of the property of the State, not to exceed one-half a mill in any one year.

"Section 15. This act shall take effect when approved."

Mr. TOLMAN of Portland—Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of this bill today; and I do not think this House

is prepared to act on it. There is an order in here for the commissioner of highways to report information on these bridges, and until that report is made I object to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. DAVIES of Yarmouth—Mr Speaker, this is a matter of serious import. I am surprised that a bill so far-reaching in its effects and weighted with such permanent interests should have received only a passing glance from some sections of this State. My purpose is to counsel mature deliberation. If the provisions of the bill are desirable and just, it will not be wanting my endorsement. My mind, however, does not resist the impression that the bill is crudely worked out and ill-considered. Witness—the second word in section one, “selectmen.” Does it not appeal to the members of the House that the words “municipal officers” would have been better in that place? Now in line five we find the word “approaches.” It is naturally suggested in one’s mind, what are approaches? Does it mean that part which is to be found between the abutments? If not, what does it mean? On page two, beginning with line 21, we find: “All such bridges shall after the first day of July, 1907, be the property of the State of Maine, in consideration of said State maintaining and repairing the same, and shall thereafterwards be known as State bridges.” Is that perfectly fair? I think it is always just to consider a matter of a city or of a county or of a town as we would consider a matter pertaining to an individual. All of you know of towns which have bridges that have been built by that town or municipality, and the matter of repairs and maintaining those bridges would be extremely insignificant. Do you think it is perfectly right and proper that those bridges should be surrendered to the State of Maine on the consideration and for the consideration only that the State of Maine shall maintain them and keep them in repair?

The next item that suggests itself to my mind is the item of expense. How much is it to cost? The gentleman’s amendment provides that it shall not exceed in any single year more than one-half a mill. It seems to me that that is an enormous expense. It is something we should consider with extreme care. Further, is it not true that in a great many places where at the present time there are fer-

ries, bridges would be asked for? Is it not true that the matter of political influence in a question of this kind is to be considered? I am told that the city of Portland pays about one-seventh of the amount of the tax of the State of Maine. Do you think it is perfectly right and proper that the city of Portland should be taxed one-seventh of the amount which would be necessary for the building of bridges in a county like Franklin, for instance, where they have a great many streams and a great many bridges? And in the event of a flood do you think that the city of Portland, for instance, should bear that part of the burden which would fall to her under this bill? Now I would like to ask the gentleman from Old Town if he has consulted with the highway commissioner in regard to this bill, and is the commissioner in favor of it as drawn?

Mr. WELD—I don’t think he has any objection.

Mr. DAVIES—Did he forecast at all what it would cost? I ask the gentleman from Old Town or the gentleman from Bingham.

Mr. DONIGAN of Bingham—He could not tell exactly. He gave an idea of it.

Mr. DAVIES—Now another thing that it seems to me should be embodied here is the matter of a veto power on the part of the highway commissioner. Under this bill the office of the highway commissioner becomes a most important one; and it seems to me, in an office of that kind which is to have so wide a scope, and so many things are to come under his jurisdiction, that it would be perfectly proper to lodge in that individual some veto power.

Now providing the State is paying a certain amount, as here indicated in the bill, for the matter of bridges or for the matter of expense, and the town is to pay first and is to be recompensed by the State, suppose a case where there happened to be some difficulty over the amount paid, and the State refused to do so. What then? Also this point occurs to me, that in negligence cases which are brought against the town for the purpose of recovering certain amounts of money for damages or for injury, does it not occur to you that the towns might be more liberal in dealing with its inhabitants and persons who are well known

there, than they would in dealing with strangers?

My purpose was not to discuss the bill particularly this morning; it was for the purpose of endorsing the motion of the gentleman from Portland.

The SPEAKER—The Chair will state that the Chair did not understand the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Tolman) to make any motion. He said he objected to the consideration of the matter at this time.

Mr. TOLMAN—I introduced an order yesterday calling on the commissioner of highways for a report on bridges of 40 feet and upwards. Now I ask that this bill be laid on the table until we can get that report from the commissioner. I don't believe that the people want to act in the dark; I don't believe this House wants to act until they get that information.

Mr. THOMAS of Howland—Mr. Speaker and Fellow Representatives:

I am sure that any attempt at oratory on my part would utterly fail, a fact you will soon find out, but Mr. Speaker, I could not sit here in this House and listen to the opposition offered by the opposers of this measure without a voice in its favor. It seems to me, gentlemen, that no bill that has been offered in this House carries with it the benevolent aid and justice to poor towns in this State as does this general bridge bill, and I am surprised at the apparent selfish opposition that is manifested by some of the gentlemen from the richer towns and cities, and I ask you, gentlemen, if the poor farming towns outside your cities have not directly or indirectly by the trade you are constantly receiving from them helped to build up your cities and helped in the prosperity which you now enjoy. If this is not so, gentlemen, you are under no obligation to help them, but, gentlemen, do you wish to live wholly within yourselves and could you continue to do so providing that all these farming towns were stricken off the map? I say no, for I believe one is essential to the other. It may be a fact that you are amply able to take care of your own bridges, but do you not often use ours, who are less able to keep them in repair?

I speak of this, gentlemen, showing the selfishness there is in the opposition to this bill. We do not oppose you when you come year after year asking for appropriations for the many institutions clustered around your cities. We are only too glad to help you for I believe this to be right, but I don't think it right for you to oppose a measure which is of so much importance as is this one to so many towns in the State. There are a great many men through the State of Maine, and many of them are within the hearing of my voice, that are continually crying out against the wild land owner because he doesn't pay taxes in proportion to other property owners, and all the time asking what can be done to reach him. Do you expect to reach him by reducing your State tax which is all the tax he has to pay? I say no, let the State tax be a little higher and let the State have more money to work with and give them more to do, and I assure you that the money could not be expended in a more satisfactory manner than by repairing our bridges, thus relieving the burdened towns who have to raise so much money for the building and repairing of their bridges and thus leaving them the more for the building and repairing of their highways, which you will all agree with me are in a sad condition throughout the State, and especially in the towns where there are as many bridges as there are in the town of Howland. This town raises \$1200 a year and expends \$525 a year on its bridges alone, over 43 per cent. of the amount raised for its roads and bridges. Do you think this bill would not help us? I think so.

Why, gentlemen, this bridge bill, to my view, is the very key to better roads throughout the State of a Maine. Why, I have heard it repeatedly said by those people that if the State would maintain our bridges, we would raise the same amount of money as we do now for roads and bridges, and use it on our roads, and in this way soon have good roads. I know this would be the result in all the 11 towns which I represent, and gentlemen, I

plead with you to not try to turn down one of the most considerate and beneficial measures that was ever brought before any Legislature in this State of Maine, unselfish in its motive and only aiming at the best interests of our State at large. Weigh well its motives and let us all work unselfishly as one man for the best interests of our State at large. We are here in a common cause, and let us do away with party lines and work honestly and unselfishly for the best interests of our State, so that when we go home to our constituents they can say of us "well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. FLAHERTY of Portland—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that it does not necessarily follow that, by considering this bill a little longer, we are opposed to it. This matter is of vital importance to every large city as well as every plantation in this State, and I think it will be well for the members to get a little more light on the subject. I agree with the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Tolman) in his motion and I trust that the members will give us a chance to look further into the matter and to get this report from the highway commissioner. It does not necessarily follow that we are opposed to this bill at all but we would like a further time for its consideration.

Mr. DUNTON of Belfast—Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the question now before the House is not on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Island Falls to the order introduced by the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Tolman)?

The SPEAKER—The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Tolman) to lay on the table the original bill together with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Old Town.

The question being put, a division was had, and the motion was lost by a vote of 44 to 66. (Applause).

The question then being on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Old Town.

Mr. TOLMAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the rules of this House, and I claim that the proceeding is entirely out of order. I call your attention to rule 27:

"The unfinished business in which the

House was engaged at the time of the last adjournment shall have preference in the order of the day and shall continue to be among the orders of the day for each succeeding day until disposed of and no motion or other business shall be received, without special leave of the House, until the former is disposed of."

Mr. WEEKS of Fairfield—Mr. Speaker, upon this point of order I desire to make one or two observations. The House proceeded to the consideration of this bill upon the motion of the gentleman from Old Town, and not one word of objection was raised thereto. Now, I submit if, under the circumstances, we did not proceed to the consideration of that bill by unanimous consent; and I suggest to the Chair and to the House that we may proceed now properly either to conclude this business or dispose of it in some other way.

Mr. MONTGOMERY of Camden—Mr. Speaker, I hardly think the gentleman's position is correct. It could not have been by unanimous consent because there are members who have come in since this proceeding began; they could not have been here at the commencement of it. Nothing can be by unanimous consent except it so appears of record. It must appear of record in order to be by unanimous consent. This is a body where things are recorded, and we proceed by the records of what we do, consequently it was not by consent; and when we are out of order, as I understand it, at any stage of the game, it is time to get in order; and the position of the gentleman from Portland must be correct.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will say that he will rule—

Mr. DONIGAN of Bingham: Just one word. There are over 70 bills before the committee on ways and bridges that have been waiting for a number of weeks for the disposition of this bill, and it seems to me that after deliberation here for two weeks we ought to take some action. The gentleman from Portland asked me at the time when this was laid on the table by the gentleman from Old Town if we could lay it on the table over Sunday, from Friday until Tuesday. And I want to say that they asked us for another continuance, and we continued it again. We have no disposition to railroad

this bill through, but I want to say, with these 70 bills asking for appropriations for bridges and roads, we ought to dispose of this bill immediately; but I leave it to the members of the House.

Mr. TOLMAN: The gentleman from Bingham has asked me for a continuance in regard to this bill; he has asked me and the gentleman from Old Town has asked me to let it lie on the table. I tried to get from them an assignment of some day for this bill, and I have failed as yet to do so.

Mr. WELD: I take exceptions to those statements. (Applause) The gentleman from Portland (Mr. Tolman) on Friday asked me when I would bring this up. I said on Tuesday or Wednesday following the laying of it on the table. I further continued it at his request, not mine.

Mr. DONIGAN: I acquiesce in the statement made by the gentleman from Old Town. He also asked me to let it lie on the table; and we delayed it day after day until this time, over two weeks.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that unanimous consent means the unanimous consent of those who are present at the time the matter is taken up. (Applause) And the Chair will rule further that the matter under consideration is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Old Town.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

The question then being on the first reading of the bill.

Mr. GOODWIN of Sanford: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised and a good deal disappointed at the temper of this Legislature that they should attempt to railroad any bill through the House without any knowledge of its effect. Why, sir, there isn't a person in existence who can come within one, two or three hundred thousand dollars of the amount which will be called for to be appropriated if this bill should become a law. There is no attempt to estimate the number of new bridges which will be called for. It is not for the large cities of this State that I plead, it is for the little towns, little rocky road towns where they jump and

jolt over the rough roads to get to these thoroughfares; and I submit that this State will be more prosperous if we would fix the country roads where our common folks live than to fix the bridges in the thoroughfares. As I travel over main road and cross road, for one I prefer to have a decent road and be jostled over a bridge than to be jostled for miles over the rough roads and then go over a sand-papered and planed-down bridge. The county commissioners are the tribunal which you face, whether we shall make a bridge across the Kennebec or the Androscoggin or the Penobscot. It is true that you refer it to the commissioner of highways, but where shall he get his information as to whether that bridge is a necessity or not? It is from the county commissioners, I submit, of that particular county; the people who are directly interested in that particular bridge are the ones where you get your information. Who would dare or would have the inclination to say that he would not build a bridge in Kennebec if the county of York paid the bills, or vice versa? You know, gentlemen, as well as I know that there would be no end to the expenses which would be placed upon the bridge commission. In this amendment you can see the spirit of the bill. This is the third bill practically which has been produced here. Did you ever think that two years hence how easy it might be to repeal the amendment whereby half a mill only could be assessed? Did you ever hear, gentlemen, of anything being passed by the Legislature of this State when in future years you have it saddled upon you and you cannot get from under it? In common fairness I submit that we are wrong in passing this bill or any other bill which carries an appropriation of a large or small amount unless we are in some respects cognizant of what it will cost us. I submit for that reason and for that reason alone that this bill should be indefinitely postponed instead of passing this House at the present time. It is admitted by the members on this floor that it will take three or four months even for the trained commissioner of highways to ascertain in any degree what

appropriation this bill would call for for the repairs and maintenance of bridges other than the number of new bridges which it must be necessary for us to build under this bill.

Mr. BLANCHARD of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at this time at the discussion which is going on in regard to this question. The date of the introduction of this bill was January 18th. I submit to you as being competent men to judge that we have had ample time to discuss the important provisions of this measure. If it were necessary for us to rely on any report of the commissioner of highways, why did we not earlier in the game propose such a measure? I submit that this is merely a form, in a stealthy manner if you please, of delaying action and for virtually postponing for this session any action upon this bill.

It was my pleasure to serve as one of the members of the committee to which this important measure was referred. During the time that this bill was in the hands of the committee, so far as is known to me, no opposition was made. Our committee have reported it; and considering the great number of bills that are now under consideration by the committee I believe it is unfair and unjust to defer action longer upon this measure, whether you are for or against it. I ask only that you act upon it at this time on the ground that you have had ample opportunity for its consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will say that there is a rule of this House which says that no member shall speak more than twice upon a matter. We have been quite lax in regard to the rule. Without unanimous consent of the House a member cannot speak but twice.

Mr. GOODWIN—I would ask the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Blanchard) if he can give us any information in regard to the number of bridges over 40 feet in length, the number of toll bridges affected by this act and the cost to the State, and the number of ferries in operation at the present time.

Mr. BLANCHARD—I haven't the data.

Mr. TOLMAN—Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

Objection was made by Mr. Donigan. Mr. MURPHY of Portland—Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we are sufficiently well informed on the bridge proposition, at least in Portland. We have a peculiar condition of affairs in Portland; and in talking with the different members here I find a difference of opinion even among those who advocate the bill. For instance, we have one bridge there under process of construction which will not be finished for a few years which will cost us \$400,000 or \$500,000. What I would like to know is, if that bridge will be included in the provisions of this bill? This bill says that all bridges shall be taken July 1, 1907. Now, some of the gentlemen informed me that this bridge, partially completed, would be included in this bill. The newspapers of Portland, one in particular which always knows just what is right, says it will not be included. Every bridge down there running from Portland to the adjoining towns is a draw bridge and has two tenders. We want to know who is going to pay the salaries of the tenders. I believe the promoters of the bill say that the State would pay the bills.

We have another bridge there, the Martin's Point bridge. I want you to consider it. It is also a draw bridge, something like 2000 feet long, which will have to be rebuilt pretty soon. I want to say also that we do not want any outside help. We are perfectly willing to take care of all bridges built in Portland, but if this bill is going to become a law we want it understood just what it means. We have another bridge, an overhead bridge, which some gentlemen tell us is not a bridge, that it is a crossing; but a pamphlet published by some department of this State says that it is a bridge and it is catalogued as such, and that is the Clark street overhead bridge. Now, if the gentlemen who advocate this bill will make this matter plain to us we will perhaps be satisfied with it. I notice the gentleman says that each county would pay about \$7000, but accord-

ing to his own figures the county of Cumberland will pay about \$50,000. Gentlemen, what we want is information in regard to this. If you are thoroughly satisfied that this bill is all right, let it go.

Mr. SMITH of Patten: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended at this time to offer any observations upon this bill. But one thing strikes me very forcibly as I have been listening to the views of the people throughout the State. For the last few months in every country store, in every blacksmith shop, by every fireside, has been discussed the question of the equalization of taxation. It is the opinion today, I believe, of the vast majority of the people of this State that you can best equalize taxation not by constitutional amendments but by taking some of the burdens from the municipalities and placing them upon the State where they belong—not the municipal burden of building water works which are solely for local use, not for the purpose of building city halls, not for the purpose of building town houses, but for those purposes which all the people of the State are interested in in common. Every bridge in the State of Maine, whether it crosses an arm of the sea in York, whether it crosses the Androscoggin at Lewiston or the Kennebec at Augusta or any other point from its source to its mouth—

Mr. MONTGOMERY—Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question. I understood the Chair to say that, this bill not having had its first reading, discussion of it is not in order. I suggest that the gentleman is out of order.

The SPEAKER—The Chair will rule that the gentleman from Fatten (Mr. Smit) is in order. (Applause).

Mr. SMITH—As I observed, every bridge whether it crosses those broad highways to the sea or the smaller streams throughout the State, is a public highway over which all of the people of the State travel. Why should not all the people of the State support them? What reasons can be given for not doing it? My friends from Portland complain that Portland will be assessed probably an additional tax. If that is true, then it follows that they have not heretofore been bearing their equal share of the public

burdens, because that is a public burden; and if the country bridges under the new order of things for all the people of the State add more to their burdens, it follows that my friends from Portland or my friends from Bangor or my friends from anywhere else from whence complaints come have not heretofore borne their just share of the burden. There has not been on these subjects of public utility an equalization of taxation. That is what is the trouble now. We are up against that proposition, with the voice of the people calling for equalization of taxation. Are the members of this House and of this Legislature going to turn down the first proposition which comes before them that has a tendency in that direction? I do not believe it.

It is said that they have not had time. Do they ever intend to take time? This bill in its original form was introduced on the 18th of January. They have had more time behind them in which to inquire into the expediency of it than they have before them. If they could not inquire into it from the 18th of January to the present time, they won't have time to inquire into it from this moment up to the time of adjournment. Is it true that nobody has given this bill any consideration? Every Granger in the State has given it consideration. Every member of this House ought to have given it consideration. I am speaking now of the principle. As for the bill itself it must have been formulated with great care because gentlemen interested in it have made it a study. It was heard before a competent committee. My friend who has just spoken upon the bill (Mr. Weld of Old Town) has prepared elaborate statistics. The same opportunity was open to any member on the floor of this House; and I say now, while I want to do all justice to my friends who have spoken in opposition, that if they had seriously intended to look into this matter they would have done it before. Many of these motions are motions for delay; and I suggest that the time has now come when we should say to the people of this State that we are going to listen to the voice

of the people and sustain propositions for the equalization of taxation. (Applause.)

Mr. CHARLES of Mechanic Falls: Mr. Speaker, as the time has nearly arrived for our committee work I move that we now adjourn.

The motion was lost.

Mr. NEWBERT of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of adding much to this discussion. I do feel that this House at this time is entirely competent to act upon this question. It has been before us long enough. Our session is two-thirds on its way. It is one of the great measures which we are bound to consider and upon which we shall be asked to go on record. It is a surprise to me that the opposition to the measure comes from the delegation from Portland or from the delegations from Cumberland and York. I have failed to hear from any member from any other Maine city who is opposed to this bridge bill.

I live in the city of Augusta. I think I fairly represent my constituents when I say that we are willing that this city should bear its additional burden of taxation in order that the State of Maine may take under its control these great bridges of the State. I believe that this idea of State control of bridges is inseparable from the idea of good roads. It is an injustice that the little town, because of its geographical location, should be called upon to maintain half a dozen great bridges while the whole State passes to and fro across them. I would like to have good roads in Maine, I would like to have good bridges in Maine, so that all comers shall go on the surface of our roads and not be compelled to use submarine vehicles, and when they come to a bridge that they may pass it in daylight in safety and in the night time and not be afraid. I hope this bill will have the support of this House. (Applause.)

Mr. MURPHY of Portland—I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentlemen who advocate this bill have not seen fit to inform me whether it includes the bridge I have referred to in Portland. If they would be willing to accept an amendment to include the Portland bridge which is being

built; we might agree to it. We want an understanding in regard to it. I would like to hear something about this.

The question being shall the bill receive its first reading,

The motion was agreed to, the bill received its two readings and was assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion of Mr. Haskell of Deer Isle the three petitions, tabled by him yesterday, relating to a close time on lobsters in Washington county inside Boisbubert Island and Cape Split were taken from the table and referred to the committee on shore fisheries.

On motion of Mr. Newbert of Augusta, the report of the committee on salaries and fees reporting ought not to pass, in relation to clerk of courts in Androscoggin county, was taken from the table, and further motion of the same gentleman the House concurred with the Senate in its reference to the committee on salaries and fee.

On motion of Mr. Montgomery of Camden, bill relating to the salary of the register of probate for Knox county, was taken from the table, and on further motion by the same gentleman the House receded and concurred with the Senate in its reference to the committee on salaries and fees.

On motion of Mr. Milliken of Island Falls, bill relating to the compensation of the county commissioners of Somerset county, was taken from the table.

On motion of Mr. Folsom of Norridgewock the bill was then referred to the committee on salaries and fees.

On motion of Mr. Milliken, bill relating to the compensation of the register of deeds for the county of York was taken from the table.

On motion of Mr. Lord of Parsonsfield the bill was referred to the committee on salaries and fees.

Mr. Milliken moved that the order requesting the commissioner of highways to furnish information as to bridges, be taken from the table.

Objection was made by Mr. Tolman of Portland.

Mr. MILLIKEN: If there is objection to lay on the table I will withdraw my motion.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

The order was then given a passage as amended.

Mr. Mayo of Foxcroft, moved to take from the table report and bill in regard to bench mark on Sebago lake.

A division being had the motion was agreed to by a vote of 52 to 21.

On further motion by Mr. Mayo, the report and bill were re-committed to the committee on interior waters.

On motion of Mr. Folsom of Norridgewock.

Adjourned.