

# 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-Eighth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

---

1917

---

AUGUSTA  
KENNEBEC JOURNAL PRINT  
1916

## HOUSE

Tuesday, March 27, 1917.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Brokenshire of Hallowell.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Senate report, majority and minority report; majority report of the committee on judiciary on An Act to make uniform the law of negotiable instruments, reporting the same "ought not to pass" signed Barnes, Farrington, Cole, Davies, Hutchins, Gurney and Baxter; minority report from same committee on same subject matter reporting "ought to pass," signed Gillin, Dearth, Deering. Came from the Senate minority report accepted.

On motion by Mr. Sisson of Island Falls the bill and reports were tabled pending concurrence or non-concurrence with the Senate until Wednesday morning.

From the Senate: Majority and minority reports from the committee on judiciary; majority report on An Act in addition to Sections, 44, 45, 46, 47, Chapter 86 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to attachments of property mortgaged or pledged, reporting "ought to pass," signed Davies, Dearth, Cole, Farrington, Deering, Barnes, Gurney, Baxter, Hutchins. Minority report from same committee on same subject reporting "ought not to pass," signed Gillin of Penobscot. Came from the Senate majority report accepted.

On motion by Mr. Farrington of Augusta the majority report was accepted in concurrence and the bill was given its first and second readings.

On motion by Mr. Reed of Bangor the rules were suspended and the bill given its third reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of committee on legal affairs on An Act to incorporate the Pilgrims' Home Cemetery Association in the town of Monroe, reporting "ought to pass." Came from the Senate, report read and accepted. Senate Amendment A adopted. Bill read the second time and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A as follows:

Senate Amendment A to House Doc. 597. House Document 597, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Pilgrims' Home Cemetery Association in the town of Monroe" is hereby amended by striking out the name "Edward Parker" in the sixth line of Section 1 and inserting in place thereof the name "Edward Parks," and by striking out the name "Martha W. Ward" in the 13th line of Section 1, inserting in place thereof the name "Martha W. Ward," so that said Section 1 shall read as follows:

On motion by Mr. Clason of Lisbon the House reconsidered its action whereby House Doc. 597, was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Farrington of Augusta, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in concurrence.

### Senate Bills in First Reading

Senate 294. An Act to correct typographical errors in Section 118 of Chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes, relating to illegal voting.

Senate 307. An Act providing for monthly payment of salaries of county officials.

Senate 377. An Act to extend the time within which the provisions of Chapter 186 of the Private and Special Laws of 1915, providing for reorganization or consolidation of the railroad companies constituting the Boston & Maine Railroad system, may be exercised.

Senate 380. An Act to amend Section 3, Chapter 21 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the care of ancient burying grounds.

Senate 381. An Act to incorporate the Investment Insurance and Guaranty Co.

Senate 382. An Act to authorize the construction of a weir in the tidewaters of Little Machias bay in the town of Cutler.

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

Senate 383. An Act providing for the control of the white pine blister rust and other fungus and insect pests.

On motion by Mr. Cole of Eliot, the bill was given its first and second reading.

Mr. Farrington of Augusta presented the following amendment

House Amendment A to Senate Bill No. 383.

Amend Senate Bill 383, being An Act for the control of the white pine blister rust and other fungus and insect pests, in a new draft by striking out the words "and six" in the 14th line of Section 6 so that said section shall read as follows:

"Sect. 6. The forest commissioner is hereby authorized and empowered to prohibit and prevent or to regulate the entry into the State of Maine or movement within the State from any part thereof to any other part, of any living five-leaved pine trees or any plants of the genus ribes, or other nursery stock or plants, which in his judgment may cause the introduction or spread of a dangerous plant disease or insect pest. The said official is hereby authorized to issue such orders, notifications and permits as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and any person violating any of the provisions of Sections 5 and 6 shall be subject to a fine of not more than twenty dollars for each offense. The expenses necessary for carrying out Section 5 of this act shall be paid from the appropriation for nursery inspection or other funds of the department of agriculture."

Amend Section 7 by striking out the words "and six" after the word "four" in the third line so that the section shall read as follows:

"Sect. 7. The sum of \$5000 is hereby appropriated to carry into effect Sections 2, 3, 4 and 6 of this act for

the year ending Dec. 31, 1917; and the sum of \$5000 dollars for the year ending Dec. 31, 1918."

The amendment was adopted and the bill then had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

Senate 384. An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Maine, relating to the collection of taxes and the commitment of poll taxes in incorporated places.

Senate 208. An Act to secure information relating to the yearly cut of timber from the wild land townships.

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

From the Senate: Senate 375. Resolve to appropriate money to aid in repairing roads and constructing roads and bridges and for other purposes. This resolve comes from the Senate amended by Senate Amendments A and B. The Chair read Senate Amendment A to Senate Document 375.

Senate Document 375, entitled "Resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing and construction of roads and bridges and for other purposes" is hereby amended by striking out the words "1917 and 1918" in the third and fourth lines of the seventh paragraph on Page 3 of said resolve, and inserting in place thereof the words "1916 and 1917," so that said seventh paragraph shall read as follows:

"In the town of Bingham, for reconstruction of road across Chase's Intervale, so called, \$2500; provided the State aid joint funds for 1916 and 1917 be expended for the same purpose."

On motion by Mr. Besse of Clinton, the House concurred in adopting Senate Amendment A.

Senate Amendment B to Senate Document 375.

Senate Document 375 is hereby amended by striking out on the 4th page and the 4th line, referring to the resolve for Hancock county, after the word "dollars" all the balance of section, so that the section shall read as amended:

"The townships Nos. 9 and 10 in Hancock county to repair the main highway leading from the town of Franklin in Hancock county to the town of Cherryfield in Washington county, \$1000."

On motion by Mr. Besse of Clinton, Senate Amendment B was adopted in concurrence and on further motion by the same gentleman, the rules were suspended and the resolve given its second reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence as amended by Senate Amendments A and B.

From the Senate: Final reports of committee on Indian affairs, committee on library, committee on salaries and fees, committee on telegraphs and telephones.

The reports were accepted in concurrence.

The following remonstrances and petitions were presented and, on recommendation of the committee on reference of bills, were referred to the following committees:

#### Placed on File

By Mr. Flint of Monson: Remonstrance of B. M. Packard and 15 others, residents of Piscataquis county, against passage of Act providing for a bounty on bears killed in the State.

By Mr. Harman of Stonington: Petition of Alonzo Smith of Solon, and 103 others, in favor of changing the date of biennial election from the second Monday of September to the first Monday in November.

#### Public Utilities

By Mr. Allen of Sanford: Remonstrance of C. A. Blanchard and 49 others against passage of An Act to regulate motor vehicles as common carriers; also remonstrance of John W. Brierly and 175 others against same; also remonstrance of Charles S. Holmes and 236 others against same; also remonstrance of Lincoln Holmes and 114 others against same.

Mr. COLE of Eliot: Mr. Speaker, before we pass to the next item of business, I wish to introduce a resolution out of order under suspension of the rules, and move its passage without

reference to a committee. The resolution is as follows:

#### "State of Maine

In the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventeen.

Resolve, in favor of the appointment of a commission for the study of the feeble minded.

Whereas, the State is incurring considerable expense on account of its care and treatment of the feeble minded, and

Whereas, the State is not in possession of definite information as to the needs of the future, and

Whereas, a study and survey of the conditions and needs would materially assist a future Legislature in determining a policy to be pursued in the matter,

Therefore, be it resolved: That the Governor with the advice and consent of the Council, appoint three disinterested persons to be known as a "Commission for the study of the Feeble Minded." The commissioners shall receive no salaries but their actual expenses shall be paid out of any funds in the treasury not otherwise appropriated. The commission shall make a thorough and complete study of the problem relating to the care, treatment and needs of the feeble minded within the State and report with recommendations as to the future policy of the State."

I move the adoption of the above resolution without reference to a committee, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to say a word in explanation. For a number of years the State has been pursuing a policy regarding the care of the feeble minded which has been exceedingly indefinite and has been the subject of more or less criticism. The needs of that institution are constantly growing; there is a large waiting list. Feeble minded are admitted to the institution indiscriminately, according to the waiting list without regard to the welfare of the communities from which they come or the welfare of the parties who are admitted. The officials of the State have no knowledge as to the number of feeble minded within the State, nor is there any definite policy regarding the care of those who cannot at the present time be committed to this

institution. The Rockefeller Foundation has assured the Governor that if some commission like this can be appointed by him it will put into the State a specialist whose salary will be entirely paid by the Foundation, and who will give a year of his time in going through the State and making a list of the feeble minded in the various towns according to the present methods of determining those; and after that careful study and survey will make recommendations for the State to follow in the future as to their care.

Those of you who have given the matter any thought at all or studied regarding the matter as conducted by other states will realize that the feeble minded is one of the largest problems that we have at the present time. It is estimated by experts that two per cent. of the children of the public schools come within the category of the feeble minded. That does not mean that a feeble-minded person is an idiot or an imbecile, because the danger to the community does not come from that class of people. The danger comes from the high-class feeble-minded who are known as morons. They are in our public schools, and if you will cast your minds over your own communities you will find coming within your purview a number of children probably who have arrived at the ages of 15, 16 or 17 years who have been unable to get beyond the third, fourth or fifth grade in the schools, who have not been able to keep up, and who as early as the law allows drop out and become members of society. These people are taken in as members of society, they become our voters, and as the years go by they marry and more likely than not intermarry. The offspring of those people are like the parents. It is said by those who are in a position to know that six times out of six feeble minded parents produce feeble minded children. The problem came up to New York City a few years ago regarding its care of the feeble minded. It started a number of colonies, one at Letchwood, whereby they thought they could take care of the feeble minded of the State by segregating them in colonies. When they had segregated some 30,000 they found they had not got all of them in

New York City even or only a small portion of those in the State. Then they started and formulated a plan and took those who needed to be taken and removed them from society in order that society in the future might be protected.

Our marriage laws allow the marriage of any persons who can have the ceremony performed. There are no restrictions, and as the years go by the more marriages there are among feeble minded people the more feeble minded the State will have to take care of, and the problem and menace is increasing each year. Our insane hospitals are filled with feeble minded people. Our State's prison and our houses of correction are filled with people growing up as boys and girls who are either feeble minded themselves or are the offspring of feeble minded parents. I believe this is a subject that needs to be studied by the State, and as this is one of the few commissions which will be established without any salary, or without expense to the State, the expense being entirely assumed by the Rockefeller Foundation, according to its assurances to the Governor, I move its passage at the present time, and that the rules be suspended and unanimous consent given for its introduction without reference to any committee.

The motion prevailed and the resolve had its first reading.

#### Orders.

The rules were suspended and unanimous consent given Mr. Redman of Ellsworth to introduce a bill out of order.

Mr. REDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will read the bill, if I may be permitted to do so:

"An Act relative to the operation of traction engines, motor and other vehicles upon highways and bridges.

Be it enacted by the people of the State of Maine, as follows:

Section 1. Between May 1 and November 1 no traction engine, trailer, motor or other vehicle in excess of a total weight of eight tons, including load and vehicle, or the width of the load thereon which is in excess of eight feet, and between November 1

and May 1, no traction engine, trailer, motor or other vehicle in excess of a total weight of three tons, including load and vehicle, or the width of the load thereon, which is in excess of eight feet shall be operated upon or over any highway in this State outside of the thickly settled portions where the buildings are situated at such distances as will average less than 200 feet between them for a distance of one-quarter of a mile or over, without first obtaining a permit from the authorities having charge of the repair and maintenance of such highways.

Section 2. Any person violating the provisions of this act or the regulations made or permits granted under the authority thereof, shall be liable to a fine of not more than \$100 for each and every offense, and such fine shall be paid into the treasury of the State for use on State highways or bridges when State highways or bridges are injured, and into the treasury of the city, town or county when any highway or bridge is injured which is under the care of said city, town or county for the use on the highways of said city, town or county in addition to any other moneys that may be available for that purpose."

The object of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to prevent heavy trucks coming down into the State of Maine and ripping up our roads. This is a problem that other states are seeking to deal with at the present time, and it is a very difficult problem because the heavy trucks have already arrived in these other states—in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and other states where large cities exist. Now these heavy trucks have not yet arrived in the State of Maine. The highway commission, however, has found out that a circus is contemplating coming down here into the State of Maine next summer and conveying its paraphernalia on motor trucks. Sooner or later we are bound to have a great many motor trucks in this State. I think at the present time we can pass a law which will in effect keep them out and protect our highways, at least to the extent of making it necessary for any of these people who contemplate putting these heavy trucks on the

highways to get a permit from the proper authorities which would perhaps enable them to use the roads when the roads are in condition for use, but which would keep them out when the frost is coming out of the ground or when the roads are wet, at which times, as you know, these trucks will cut right down through to the very rock foundation. Down on the Boston Post Road in Connecticut last year, a road made of bituminous macadam, the frost was coming out of the ground, and those heavy trucks, some of them, cut right down through it, and it cost the State of Connecticut \$100,000 to repair the damage done in two or three weeks time. Up here on our roads, where we have so much of the gravel surface, and surface which is not so hard and will not hold up the heavy weights that the bituminous material will hold up, our roads are going to be damaged even more. I move you, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be passed without reference to a committee and that it have its several readings at this time.

Mr. BARNES of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire through the Chair, of the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Redman, having in mind Section 30 of Chapter 26 of the Statutes of Maine, whether it would be agreeable to him to have this resolve or order tabled for printing?

Mr. REDMAN: I will say, Mr. Speaker, that it will be very agreeable to me. This resolve, I might say, is prepared in the Highway Commission office, and they have gone over this thing pretty carefully along the lines of a similar bill which is being presented in Massachusetts at the present time. I readily consent to its being tabled for printing.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the bill presented by the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Redman, be given consideration and be tabled for printing?

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will call the attention of the House to the fact that this evening, on an order passed

by the House, the hall of the House of Representatives was given up to the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Pinchot; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Baxter, who wishes to give a notice in regard to the lecture.

Mr. BAXTER of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I will inform the House in a few words why Mr. Pinchot could not come and address us, and it is a source of real regret to us that he is not going to be heard this evening. I have been trying ever since the last week in February to get Mr. Pinchot to come and he has been anxious to come. We had it all arranged for the 21st of this month, but some business engagements unexpectedly arose which prevented his coming. He had, however, planned to come for tonight. Regardless of how the members feel in relation to the question of conservation and water power, I thought it would be a real opportunity for the members of this Legislature to meet one of the big men of the country and hear his views; but much to my disappointment I received this telegram from him last night addressed to me at Augusta:

"As I wired you from Washington, my father-in-law is suddenly stricken with pneumonia. His physician advises me on arrival in New York that his condition is critical and asked me not to leave. I can do nothing but comply, of course. Please present my warm thanks and real regret to Governor Milliken, and believe me I would come if I could. I am deeply sorry to disappoint you."

I think that it is really a source of regret to everybody here in the House. I know a good many people were planning to come, some from Portland, some from Lewiston and from other places to hear Mr. Pinchot, and I want to make this statement so that the members of the Legislature will thoroughly understand that everything has been done and that this sudden illness absolutely prevents his coming. I do not think it is necessary for us to take any formal action; but having invited Mr. Pinchot through a formal order passed by both House and Senate, I felt under obligations to report back

and tell you the situation. Governor Milliken had kindly consented to preside at the meeting this evening and all the arrangements were made; but I am afraid we shall have to give it up at this session.

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: Mr. Speaker, I would like consent to read a communication.

Unanimous consent was given.

Mr. DUTTON: Early in the session, as you all know, I introduced in this House a measure providing for State ownership and development of water power systems. I introduced this measure at the suggestion of Mr. H. B. Whipple of Bingham, Me., who is interested in the proposition, and who has done much in the interest of conservation of water powers; and lest there may be a false impression go forth relative to Gifford Pinchot's real attitude toward conservation in Maine, I desire to read the following communication:

"Washington, D. C., March 10, 1917.

"Mr. B. H. Whipple, Bingham, Maine.

"Dear Mr. Whipple: Through some mistake your letter of February 16th has not been answered. Although I have been busy with the Maine bills, I ought to have acknowledged and thanked you for it long ago. Under all the circumstances, with war so near us, would it not be wiser to put off a hearing on the water power bills until the next Legislature, especially since your letter says your own bill does not stand a ghost of a chance? I am for it, much more so than I am for Mr. Baxter's bill, and I have so written him; and if I can be of real use, of course I shall be glad to come. It seems a pity, however, under the pressure of the moment to make the effort if you are sure it is going to fail. How does it strike you?

"Sincerely yours,

"GIFFORD PINCHOT."

On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland the following order was passed:

Ordered, that the use of the hall of the House of Representatives be granted to the Anti-Suffrage League of Maine for Thursday evening, March 29, 1917. (Applause.)



On motion by Mr. Packard of Rockland, it was

Ordered, that House Document No. 520 be recalled from the committee on engrossed bills, and that the clerk be instructed to procure the said document forthwith.

Mr. FARRINGTON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of inquiry. We just passed an order relating to bringing back from the Engrossing Department the so-called smelt bill. I do not know what the purpose of the order is in having it come back here as it will come before the House in the natural order of business in its passage to be enacted. I cannot see any purpose unless it be to amend it in some way; and I move that we reconsider the vote whereby we passed the order recalling it from the Engrossing Department.

Mr. PACKARD of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I took the liberty of asking to have this order recalling the bill from the Engrossing Department for the simple reason that I thought it would come up in regular form this morning, but through some oversight it did not come up. I thought it would be a saving of time to the House to have it brought back this morning, that was my only reason—to get it out of the way quickly.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, the reason why I made the motion to reconsider is in order that we may save time. I understand this was passed to be engrossed by the House and went to the engrossing department in regular order and it comes up in regular order on its passage to be enacted. I do not consider that we gain any time by the passage of the order and I move its reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: Of course the Chair is not aware of the purpose of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Packard—whether he wishes to move a reconsideration. It is fair to the House under our rules, I suppose, if the gentleman wishes a reconsideration to so state. Is the object of the gentleman from Rockland (Mr. Packard) to move a reconsideration of House Document No. E20 which was passed to be engrossed? If so, it should be included in the notice. The Chair is of the opin-

ion that if the gentleman proposes to move a reconsideration of the action of the House that notice of that fact should be included in the order. If the papers have to be recalled they are of course recalled for some purpose.

Mr. PACKARD: It was my intention, Mr. Speaker, to bring it up for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The action on these papers having been on Friday last, and the House having had a session Saturday, the Chair rules that a reconsideration would not be in order today. Our rules state that a reconsideration must be had either the same or the succeeding day.

Mr. PACKARD: When the bill comes up to be enacted I have a motion that I want to make, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: That will come in regular order on the passage to be enacted. It was understood on Friday afternoon that nothing was to be put out of reach of anybody. The question now is on the order, and is it the pleasure of the House that the order receive a passage?

On motion by Mr. Farrington of Augusta the House reconsidered its action whereby the order was given a passage and on further motion by the same gentleman the order was indefinitely postponed.

### Reports of Committees

Mr. Bowman from the committee on agriculture reported "ought to pass" on resolve making appropriation for the bureau of inspection for the years 1917 and 1918.

Mr. Grant from the same committee reported same on bill "An Act to amend Chapter 38, Section 7. Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to licenses of agents and dealers in nursery stock."

(The rules were suspended and the bill given its two several readings.)

Mr. Washburn from the committee on education on bill "An Act to amend Section 85 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes providing a maximum annual tuition in secondary schools of the State;" reported the same in a new draft, under same title and that it ought to pass.

Same gentleman, from same committee, on bill "An Act to amend Section 108 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to teaching of principles of kindness to birds and animals in the public school," reporting same in a new draft, under the title of bill "An Act to amend Section 108 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to teaching of the principles of kindness toward birds and animals in the public schools;" and that it ought to pass.

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

Mr. Merrill from the committee on public utilities, on Petition of Fred A. Black and 29 others of Stockton Springs relative to An Act to incorporate the Penobscot Ferry Company; Petition of W. D. Bennett and 36 others of Bucksport on same, Petition of Harvey W. Clark and 45 others of Belfast on same; Petition of G. T. Hodgman and 25 others of Camden on same; reported that the same be placed on file.

Mr. Washburn from the committee on Indian affairs reported "ought not to pass" on bill, "An Act to amend Section 12, Chapter 14, Revised Statutes 1916, relating to adoptions into the Penobscot Tribe of Indians."

The reports were accepted.

From the Senate: Communication from Hon. Gifford Pinchot to W. E. Lawry, secretary of the Senate. Came from the Senate ordered placed on file.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the rules be suspended and that the letter be placed on file in concurrence with the Senate?

Mr. BAXTER of Portland: Mr. Speaker, if it is not too long I would like to have it read.

The SPEAKER (Reading)

"Washington, D. C., March 23, 1917.

Mr. W. E. Lawry,

Secretary of Senate,

Augusta, Maine.

Dear Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your courteous letter of March 20, inclosing or-

der passed by the Legislature of Maine, inviting me to address that body. Mr. Baxter has notified me that the date has been changed to the 27th, and I take pleasure in accepting for that date.

Sincerely yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT."

On motion by Mr. Baxter, the rules were suspended and the letter was received and placed on file in concurrence with the Senate.

#### First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

House 682. An Act to amend Section 45 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the amount to be paid for clerk hire in the municipal court of the city of Portland.

House 683. An Act relating to the department of electrical appliances of the city of Portland.

(On motion by Mr. Anderson of Portland, the rules were suspended and this bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed.)

House 684. An Act to amend Section 15, Section 38 and Section 40 of Chapter 26 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the speed of motor vehicles.

House 685. An Act to insure the collection of taxes in unorganized townships.

House 686. An Act to amend Chapter 9, Section 33 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to taxation of owners of parlor cars.

House 687. An Act to amend Section 51 of Chapter 82 of the Revised Statutes, providing for order of trial at Supreme Judicial Court for Aroostook County.

House 688. An Act amending Section 14 of Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes in relation to the license fee for itinerant vendors.

House 689. An Act to amend Section 7 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, relating to payments of proportional part of salaries to retired justices of supreme and superior courts.

(Tabled by Mr. Rounds of Portland pending its second reading.)

House 690. An Act to make valid the doings of the annual town meeting of the town of Jackson, Waldo county.

(On motion by Mr. Reed of Bangor,

the rules were suspended and this bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed.)

House 691. An Act to incorporate the Casco Water, Electric Light and Power Company.

House 693. An Act to amend Paragraph 10 of Section 45 of Chapter 117, Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to clerk hire in county offices.

House 694. An Act to amend Chapter 82, Section 72, Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to appropriations of attorney general.

**Passed to be Engrossed.**

Senate 71: An Act to repeal Section 12 of Chapter 128 of the Revised Statutes of 1916 relating to intention to defraud the lumbering operations and commonly known as the Peonage Law.

Report of committee on bills in third reading accepted.

Mr. Barnes of Houlton offered House Amendment "A", to amend by striking out all of the title thereof after the word "statutes", and inserting in place thereof the words "relating to intention to defraud in lumbering operations", so that the same as amended shall read as follows: "An Act to repeal Section 12 of Chapter 128 of the Revised Statutes relating to intention to defraud in lumbering operations", and moved its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The House has heard the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Barnes, who moves its adoption. Is it the pleasure of the House that the amendment be adopted?

Mr. DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Houlton what change that makes in that bill. I do not exactly understand the amendment.

Mr. BARNES of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, the first change is striking out the words "of 1916" in the title. "Revised Statutes of 1916", it was originally drawn. We are taking that out of a great many. The second change is to make the title conform to the title in the statutes. The section in the statutes is "relating to intention to defraud in lumbering operations"; to this

there were added several words, and I simply strike them out so that it will exactly correspond with the title that is printed in the book.

The amendment was adopted, and the bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A".

Senate 103: An Act to amend Chapter 295, Public Laws of 1915, relative to compensation to employees for personal injuries.

(On motion by Mr. Wilson of Portland, tabled pending third reading and assigned for Wednesday, March 28.)

House 657. An Act to amend Chapter 117, Section 18, of the Revised Statutes of 1916 relating to the Insurance Department.

(On motion by Mr. Cole of Elliot, tabled pending third reading.)

House 603: An Act to amend Section 10 of Chapter 137 of the Revised Statutes relating to the appointment of Probation officers.

House 659: An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 204 of the Private and Special Laws of 1883, in relation to the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court of the city of Westbrook as amended by Section 2 of Chapter 119 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903.

House 660: An Act relating to the trustees of the Windham Ministerial Fund.

House 661: An Act to authorize The American Thread Company to erect a bridge across Sebec river in the town of Milo.

House 662: An Act to amend paragraph 3, Section 1 of Chapter 282 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909, relating to the salary of recorder of the Municipal Court of the city of Westbrook.

House 664: An Act to establish a Superior Court in the County of Androscoggin.

House 665: An Act in relation to the term of office of the Commissioner of Agriculture.

House 666: An Act to amend Section 13 of Chapter 132 of the Revised Statutes of 1916 of Maine, relating to licensed detectives.

House 667: An Act to better define the duties and to increase the number of medical examiners.

House 668: An Act to prevent officers and employees of life, accident and fire insurance institutions from making copies of records.

House 669: An Act to provide for mothers with dependent children.

House 670: An Act to ratify, confirm and make valid the acts of incorporation and proceedings of Abou Ben Adhem Lodge, number 23, Independent Order of Odd Fellows.

House 671: An Act to incorporate the Calais Water and Power Company.

(On motion by Mr. Baxter of Portland, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.)

House 673: An Act to amend Paragraph 10 of Section 45 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, relating to clerk hire in Oxford county offices.

(On motion by Mr. Hutchins of Mexico, tabled pending third reading.)

House 674: An Act fixing the salary of the recorder of the Old Town Municipal Court.

House 675: An Act to increase the salary of the judge of the Municipal Court of Dexter.

House 676: An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the salary of the State auditor.

House 677: An Act to improve the public highways of Maine by regulating the width of tires upon wagons and carts for carrying heavy loads.

(On motion by Mr. Flint of Monson, tabled, pending third reading.)

House 678: An Act to Regulate the Operation of Jitney Busses, or any other Steam or Motor Driven Vehicle.

(On motion by Mr. Descoteaux of Biddeford, tabled, pending third reading.)

House 626: Resolve, to reimburse cities and towns for money expended for the support of dependent families of members of the National Guard.

House 647: Resolve in favor of improvement of the navigation of the Fish River Lakes in the County of Aroostook.

House 648: Resolve in favor of Land Agent.

House 658: Resolve, to enable the town of Millinocket to raise money for the maintenance and support of Sourd-nahunk Road, so called, between the town of Millinocket and Millinocket Lake.

House 681: Resolve directing the Highway Commission to make surveys, plans and estimates for an Interstate Bridge between Kittery, Maine, and Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

House 680: Resolve, continuing unexpended balance of appropriation provided by Chapter three hundred and ten of the Resolves of 1915 entitled "Resolve Appropriating Money to Aid in the Construction of Substructure of a Highway Bridge Across the St. John River between the Town of Madawaska, Maine and the City of Edmundston, New Brunswick."

This resolve was given its second reading.

Mr. WASHBURN of Perry: Mr. Speaker, I have House Amendment A which I would like to offer. I would say that this amendment is intended only to correct what is evidently an error in the printing of the resolve.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, offers House Amendment A to House Document No. 679, to amend by striking out in the third line thereof the word "hundred" and substituting therefor the word 'thousand,' and moves its adoption.

The amendment was adopted, and the resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

House 679: Resolve continuing unexpended balance of appropriation provided by Chapter 321 of the Resolves of 1913 entitled "Resolve in Favor of Aid in the Construction of a Highway Bridge Across the St. John River between Fort Kent, Maine, and St. Francis, New Brunswick."

This resolve was given its second reading.

Mr. DAIGLE of Wallagrass: Mr. Speaker, was the amendment read before relating to No. 679 or 680?

The SPEAKER: The one just passed as amended was 680.

Mr. DAIGLE: Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment was intended for 679.

On motion by Mr. Washburn of Perry, the House reconsidered its vote whereby House Document No. 680 as amended by House Amendment A was passed to be engrossed, and, on further motion by the same gentleman the House reconsidered its vote whereby House Amendment A was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Farrington of Augusta, the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, was given unanimous consent to withdraw House Amendment A and on further motion by the same gentleman House Document No. 680 was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would inquire from the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, if he wishes to propose House Amendment A to House Document No. 679?

Mr. WASHBURN of Perry: No. 679, Mr. Speaker, was the number I intended the amendment for.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, proposes the following amendment to House Document No. 679. Amend House Document 679 by striking out in the third line thereof the word "hundred" and substituting therefor the word "thousand."

The amendment was adopted.

House Document No. 679 was then passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

#### Passed to Be Enacted.

An Act to Amend Section 1 of Chapter 52 of the Revised Statutes relating to the office of bank commissioner.

An Act to regulate the payments of appropriations for the care, treatment, support and education of persons in charitable or benevolent institutions not wholly owned or controlled by the State.

An Act to amend Chapter 121 of the Private and Special Laws of 1913 to enable the annual meetings of Madison Water district to be held at any time during the month of July in each year;

An Act to amend Section 57 of Chapter 53 of the Revised Statutes, relating to guaranty capital of mutual insurance companies.

An Act in relation to vacancies in public offices.

An Act to confirm and make clear certain powers of the Bangor Railway and Electric Company.

An Act to regulate the sale of milk in bottles or jars, within the town of Eden, Hancock county.

An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, providing for the payment by the county of expenses incurred by county attorneys;

An Act to establish a legislative reference bureau in the State library.

An Act to amend the Charter of the York Beach Village Corporation.

An Act to extend the Charter of the Livermore and Augusta Railway Company.

An Act to extend the Charter of the Casco Bay Water Company.

An Act to amend Section 65 of Chapter 126 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the appointment of Cruelty officers.

(On motion by Mr. Hutchins of Mexico, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 145 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the examination and commitment of persons to insane hospitals.

An Act to amend Section 157 of Chapter 53 of the Revised Statutes, and providing for the payment of premiums on official bonds of county officials by the county.

An Act regulating the appointment of the members of the police force of the city of Brewer.

An Act amending Section 50 of Chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes, authorizing complaint by a utility against itself, and empowering the public utilities commission to order refund.

An Act to amend the Charter of Coburn Classical Institute.

An Act to incorporate the Birch Point Village corporation.

An Act to amend Sections 1, 8 and 12 of Chapter 126 of the Public Laws of 1844, relating to the preservation of salmon, shad and alewives in Georges river and tributary streams.

An Act to make uniform the law of warehouse receipts.

An Act to change the name of the Unitarian church of Augusta, Maine.

An Act to enable the register of deeds of Cumberland county to procure durable copies of plans recorded in Cumberland county registry.

An Act amending Section 14 of Chapter 56 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the construction of extensions of railroads.

An Act to amend Section 12 of Chapter 43 of the Private and Special Laws, 1899, entitled "An Act to establish the Rumford Falls municipal court."

An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes relating to the election of county treasurers.

An Act additional to Chapter 53 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the payment of benefits.

An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 141 of the Private and Special Laws of 1887, entitled "An Act to amend An Act creating the Phillips Village Corporation."

An Act to prevent the sources of domestic water supply from becoming polluted.

An Act to ratify the doings of the town of Winthrop in reference to the Charles M. Bailey public library.

An Act authorizing the appointment of the United Baptist convention of Maine as trustee and to excuse said corporation from furnishing surety on its official bond.

An Act to amend Section 24 of Chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes relating to prosecution of violations of the lobster law.

An Act to amend Section 4, of Chapter 64 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the recording of intentions of marriage.

An Act relating to bonds in the probate court, given by executors and administrators to obtain license to sell real estate, amending Section 3 of Chapter 76 of the Revised Statutes.

An Act to amend Section 31 of Chapter 3 of the Revised Statutes, so as to provide for maximum number of annual reports of the public utilities commission.

An Act to amend Section 38 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, increasing the salary of the judge of probate of York county.

An Act to amend Section 82 of Chapter four of the Revised Statutes, relating to instruction of librarians.

An Act to amend Chapter 244 entitled "An Act to provide a charter for the city of Gardiner," of the Private and Special Laws of 1913.

An Act to amend Chapter 67, Section 26 of Chapter 70, Section 44 of Chapter 68, Sections 9 and 10 of Chapter 72, Section 95 of Chapter 86, and Sections 14, 15, 20 and 21 of Chapter 92 of the Revised Statutes; and to repeal Sections 42 and 43 of Chapter 68, and Sections 16 and 21 of Chapter 92 of the Revised Statutes, relating to notice of appointment of executors, administrators, guardians of adults, and conservators; and to limitation of actions against the estates of deceased persons.

An Act to amend Section 22 of Chapter 52 of the Revised Statutes with reference to deposits in savings banks and institutions for savings.

An Act to incorporate the Mattakeunk Stream Dam and Improvement Company.

An Act in addition to Section 13 of Chapter 14 of the Revised Statutes relating to adoptions in the Penobscot Tribe of Indians.

An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 12 of the Revised Statutes, providing for notice by registers of deeds to municipal officers of real estate transfers.

An Act respecting removal of filth from docks in the city of Portland.

An Act additional to Chapter 52 of the Revised Statutes, providing a penalty for copying the records of banking institutions.

An Act to amend the second paragraph of Section 45, of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes increasing the amount of clerk hire in the Androscoggin county registry of deeds.

An Act additional to Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes, imposing an added duty on boards of registration and municipal officers acting as a board of registration.

An Act to repeal Chapter 453 of the Private and Special Laws of 1868, and all acts additional thereto and amendatory thereof, relating to a ferry across the Penobscot river, between Orono and Bradley.

An Act to amend Chapter 83, Section 5 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the time and place of holding the county commissioners court in York county.

An Act to amend Section 27 Chapter 120 of the Revised Statutes relating to offenses against the person of female children.

An Act to repeal Chapter 101 of the Private and Special Laws of 1911, relating to the Phillips village corporation.

An Act to amend Chapter 422 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, increasing the salary of the recorder of the municipal court of the city of Biddeford.

An Act to authorize the erection and maintenance of a bridge across that part of the Aroostook river known as the back channel.

An Act to amend Section 19 of Chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes, relating to trespasses on improved lands.

An Act to repeal Section 27 of Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes which requires cashiers of banks to return to Secretary of State names and residences of and number of shares owned by stockholders, and amount of stock paid in.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 346 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905, relating to the powers and duties of the probation officer of Cumberland county.

An Act to authorize the city of Lewiston to issue its bonds to the amount of \$200,000 to pay its bonds now outstanding and maturing in the year 1917.

An Act to amend Section 9 of Chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes, in regard to the wearing of badges.

An Act to grant certain powers to Acadia landing.

An Act amendatory of Section 27 of Chapter 52 of the Revised Statutes and to permit savings banks to invest in certain railroad bonds.

An Act to make uniform the law of bills of lading.

An Act to provide for the registration of teachers.

An Act to authorize the city of Augusta to acquire property.

An Act to make legal and valid the annual town meeting of Clifton, in the county of Penobscot, held March 19, 1917.

An Act to ratify the organization of Capital Park and give additional powers to said corporation.

An Act to amend Section 10 of Chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes relating to disposition of unused ballots on election day.

An Act to amend Section 30 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes, and pro-

viding for kindergartens as part of the common school course.

An Act to incorporate the Odd Fellows' Home of Maine.

An Act to incorporate the Casco Title Guaranty Company.

An Act to amend Section 75 of Chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes relating to free public libraries.

An Act to amend Section 81 of Chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes, relating to assistance to towns in establishing free public libraries.

An Act authorizing the maintenance of a bridge between mill and storehouse by Worumbo Manufacturing Company, Lisbon Falls, Maine.

#### Finally Passed.

Resolve, in favor of the town of Phillips.

(On motion of Mr. Stubbs of Strong, indefinitely postponed.)

Resolve, in favor of the town of Washburn.

(On motion by Mr. Day of Westfield, indefinitely postponed.)

Resolve, in favor of the reformatory for women for permanent improvement of the grounds and other purposes for the year 1917.

Resolve, in favor of the State School for Girls, for furnishings and equipment for the new central building, for the year 1918.

Resolve, appropriating money for the expenses of the State Board of Charities and Corrections for the years 1917 and 1918.

Resolve, providing for the completion of the book of plans of Waldo County and appropriating money therefor.

Resolve, reimbursing the town of Orneville for expenses incurred in the care and nursing of a State pauper.

Resolve, proposing an amendment to the constitution of the State of Maine empowering the Legislature to authorize towns to divide into voting districts for purposes of holding elections.

This resolve, carrying the emergency clause, required a two-thirds vote of all the members of the House.

A division being had,

One hundred and three having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, the resolve was finally passed.

An Act relating to the registration of information concerning aliens.

The act, carrying the emergency clause, required a two-thirds vote of all the members of the House.

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty having voted in the affirmative, and none having voted in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 130 of the Revised Statutes, relating to offenses against the public health, safety and policy.

This act, carrying the emergency clause, required a two-thirds vote of all the members of the House.

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty-three having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

An Act amending Section 10 of Chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes relating to malicious mischiefs and trespasses.

This bill, carrying the emergency clause, required a two-thirds vote of all the members of the House.

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty-two having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

An Act to prevent injuries to property used for public purposes, and amending Section 4 of Chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes.

This bill, carrying the emergency clause, required a two-thirds vote of all the members of the House.

A division being had,

One hundred and nineteen having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

An Act to require automatic signals and the removal of obstructions at certain grade crossings not protected by gates or flagmen.

This bill, carrying the emergency clause, required a two-thirds vote of all the members of the House.

A division being had,

One hundred and sixteen having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

An Act to establish the Mount Desert Bridge District, for the purpose of acquiring, freeing and reconstructing the Mount Desert toll bridge in the town of Trenton in Hancock county.

This bill, carrying the emergency clause, required a two-thirds vote of all the members of the House.

A division being had,

One hundred and fourteen having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Farrington of Augusta, the House took a recess until 2 o'clock.

#### After Recess

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, bill, An Act to enable the town of Mexico in the county of Oxford to free the Mexico Toll Bridge to public travel, House Document No. 625, tabled by the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Eaton, pending its first reading.

Mr. ALLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, No. 625 is a matter that Mr. Eaton of Rumford is interested in and he went home Saturday sick. I had a telephone from him this morning that he would not be able to be here today and wanted me to have the matter tabled until tomorrow morning; and I move you, Mr. Speaker, that the matter be tabled until that time.

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act relating to the Clark Power Company, Senate Document No. 150, tabled by Mr. Allan of Portland, pending passage to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

Mr. ALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment A.

The SPEAKER: The amendment was adopted March 23 and the question is on the passage to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Allan, the bill as amended by House Amendment A was passed to be engrossed.



The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Senate Document 243, Resolve relating to equestrian statue of Major General Oliver O. Howard, and a standing statue of Brevet Major General Joshua L. Chamberlain at Gettysburg, tabled by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, pending its second reading.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, this resolve, I will say, carries the appropriation of \$50,000, \$10,000 a year for five years. It is a most worthy thing and I am heartily in favor of it; but it does seem to me that in the present condition of affairs, and our desire to keep things down within reason, it would be better to refer this to the next legislature, and I move the motion that this resolve be referred to the next legislature.

Mr. BERRY of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a motion before the House; but I should like to move that it lay on the table until tomorrow. In this time of patriotism that is sweeping over the country perhaps a few words in commendation of this resolve might not be amiss and there is a gentleman in this House who is better able than I and who wishes to address this House along these lines. It is not the purpose of the Committee on Military Affairs to insist on this matter being pushed along to a passage, but I would ask the indulgence of the House and that the matter lie on the table until tomorrow morning for the reason I have stated.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, somehow or other it appeals to my mind in these days that the real patriotism that we should show is willingness to forego some of the things that we would like to have. I know that every man in this House would like to see this thing go through, and I would. I feel, however, in view of the absolute and certain expense that is coming to us on account of the conditions that confront us, it is a mark of real patriotism that we let some of the things we most like and which are dearest to our hearts go by. I have no objec-

tion, if the House desires it, to this matter going over to tomorrow morning; but it seems to me we are not getting ahead very fast. I think I will continue the motion that we refer it to the next legislature.

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: Mr. Speaker, I believe at this time, when the State finds it necessary to curtail expenses for absolute necessities, such as the construction of roads, which we all, or many of us from rural sections, have been obliged to forego any special appropriation for, having many of them cut down and others entirely killed, that it might be well to save to the State of Maine for a time at least this \$50,000. When the time comes that the State of Maine feels that it has \$50,000, after having taken care of the practical needs of the State, then, gentlemen, I would be glad to voice the sentiment to pass any such measure. I heartily favor and second the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. BERRY of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, all I desire to say further is that I have no desire on my part to delay referring this to the next legislature other than a certain member of the House desires to be heard on it after a little preparation and that is why I ask that it be tabled until tomorrow.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Twenty-five voting in the affirmative and forty-four in the negative, the motion of the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Berry, was lost.

The pending question being the reference of the matter to the next legislature.

A viva voce vote being had,

The motion of Mr. Farrington of Augusta prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House House report of the committee on Public Utilities, reporting "ought not to pass" on House Document No. 287, An act to amend the charter of the Peaks Island Corporation, tabled by the gentleman

from Portland, Mr. Rounds, pending the acceptance of the report.

On motion by Mr. Rounds, of Portland, the report was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House House Document 424, Resolve proposing an amendment to Section 5, Article 4 of the Constitution, allowing absent voting, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Brewster, pending its second reading.

On motion by Mr. Meserve of Naples, the resolve was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House House Report of the Committee on Judiciary, reporting "ought not to pass" on House Doc. No. 268, Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Maine providing for the election on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November biennially of governors, senators, representatives and other officers now required to be elected on the second Monday of September biennially, tabled by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, pending the acceptance of the report.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that the report be accepted, and I will say that I do not believe the time has come when there is any demand at all for a change in the time of our elections. They come at a time of year when we usually get good weather and a good turn out at the polls. There appeared before the committee just one man in favor of this resolve, and without taking any more time of the House, I move that the report be accepted.

Mr. HARMAN of Stonington: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: This is a unanimous report coming from the judiciary committee which is made up wholly of members of the dominant party. We did not expect anything different in a report of this kind,—not any fault of the committee, but they have got in such a habit of making similar reports at other sessions of the legislature, they cannot

seem to get out of the habit. There ought not to be, I contend, any politics in this question. This question has come up before the legislature a great many times in the past, and if it is not adopted at this time, it will probably bob up again a great many times in the future. Sooner or later this resolve will be adopted and sent to the people to express their opinion upon.

In 1911, this resolve was introduced into the legislature and there was a unanimous report of "ought not to pass." In 1913 this resolve was introduced into the legislature and a divided report was rendered, two "ought not to pass" and four "ought to pass." In the legislature of 1913 the Senate accepted the majority report and the House the minority report. In 1915, this same resolve came before the legislature and there was a minority and majority report, six "ought not to pass" and four "ought to pass". The Senate accepted the majority and the House the minority report.

I wish to say that Louisiana holds its State election on Tuesday after the third Monday in April. All other states in the Union hold their State elections in November except Maine. Now, gentlemen of the House, is Maine the only one that is right? Does Maine know more than all of the other States combined, or is Maine wrong in holding her election in September?

In 1909 Governor Fernald decided this question was of such magnitude and importance that he made it a part of his inaugural address delivered in this House, from which I will read:

"I suggest to you also the consideration of legislation leading to the change of the date of holding our State election to November, so as to conform with custom in other states of the Union and to bring our election in Presidential years on the same day as that of election of Presidential electors. It is a waste of time and money to hold two elections where one can serve as well."

Now is Governor Fernald's opinion in this matter worth anything? He is a man to whom you gave the highest office in the gift of the people of the State of Maine, and you have now elected him to that august body, the

Senate of the United States at Washington. It seems to me that his opinion in this matter ought to guide this House to a great extent. I believe I speak the opinion of the majority of the inhabitants of the State of Maine when I ask the adoption of this resolution. I believe the people should have a chance to vote on this matter. What is the issue before the House? The issue is plain and simple,—shall we give the people of the State of Maine an opportunity to be heard on this question and decide for themselves whether they shall hold the State election in September or November? That is the issue and the only issue.

During our campaign for the State election very large amounts of money, collected from all the States in the Union, are sent into the State of Maine to corrupt our election for the only reason that they wish to show a great impression upon the other states when they hold their elections in September; and, Mr. Speaker, I do protest against the dumping of all this corrupt fund into the State of Maine to corrupt our voters. You all remember or recall the great Mulhall Fund which was sent into the State of Maine about eight or ten years ago and which changed the election in one of our congressional districts. I believe this is a disgrace to the State of Maine to have this go on.

From a financial standpoint the State of Maine would gain a great deal. It would also be a great gain to all the cities and all the towns in the State. It would be a decided advantage to each individual voter with reference to time lost. September is a very busy time of the year. The fishermen along the coast from Eastport to Kittery are very busy attending to their fishing interests. Nearly all the fairs of the State are held during September. The farmers are at that time of year very busy harvesting their crops.

The opponents of this bill claim that State issues should be separated from national issues, and that for that reason we should hold our State election in September. I claim that we cannot separate national from State issues by the fact that we elect four congressmen, and at the last election we elect-

ed two United States Senators, at our September election. There is quite as much national issue at stake in the September election as in the November election. Members of the now majority party, can you afford to vote against this resolve and deny the people their sacred right to vote on a question of this kind? If you refuse this privilege, as you have refused many other privileges, you will receive a sharp rebuke at the hands of the voters the same as you have received on two different occasions in the past few years. I cannot see how any consistent, fair-minded and just-loving man can refuse to allow the voters to express themselves on a question of this importance. I pray that the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, that the report of the committee be accepted will not prevail.

Mr. BARNES of Houlton: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: Just a word lest any implications be accepted as facts because they are accepted in silence. I can give you two excellent reasons why the gubernatorial election of the State of Maine should not be held in November. Before I get to that I want to suggest with reference to this great fund which comes into Maine. I assume that the gentleman who just preceded me speaks from knowledge. I, myself, have never seen a cent of any great fund coming into Maine to control elections. I assume that the gentleman knows the money has come in and has seen it, and I assume that by the same knowledge he knows it was for corrupt purposes; and, if he knows that the money has come in and has been intended for and used for the purpose of corrupting the voters of the State of Maine, we know now which party is intent upon corrupting the voters of the State of Maine.

Maine stands in a different position from Louisiana, built up in piles on the bayous of the Mississippi river. Maine is geographically differently located. Maine leads in the election for this reason, that the climate and the temperature of Maine are such that a general election is not a practical proposition anywhere, we will say, north of Bangor later than the middle of September.

Now times have changed since the days when this was argued before. This next fall at the State election, you will be presented with half a dozen measures or more to be voted on in addition to the election of officers. It is essential and necessary, if our government of the State continues as a government of people who deliberate over what they vote for, that they have a chance to meet in meetings during the campaign and discuss and go over these matters. I tell you from actual knowledge that a campaign conducted after the middle of October and from that time up to the tenth of November in Aroostook County will be a sad failure so far as getting people together to listen to a discussion of the issues is concerned, because at that time our roads are nothing but ruts of frozen mud and will have been so for a long time. There are times at presidential elections when there is snow in Northern Aroostook and during the two weeks preceding the November election, you cannot call the people out, cannot get them out, and when it is not safe for men to go about delivering speeches. Another point, and this has weight: In all the towns beginning with Bangor north, after the last days of September and through October and November the laboring man is going into the woods and you cannot get him back to vote in November. Now are we men who do not go into the woods and do not work with our hands going to sit here and say that we can vote in November as well as in September and deprive the laboring man of the ballot? The argument of my friend from Stonington dwindles a little when just a moment ago the bill to allow absent voting was permitted to be indefinitely postponed. If he had given us that our men going off into the woods could have voted in that way. Now I insist, and I hope the House will vote with me that the gubernatorial vote in Maine can be got out in that time of year when we can assemble in the town hall, at the crossroads and corners, in the open air if you will, and discuss matters that are going to be voted upon better than later in the fall. It seems to me that there is no politics in it. I see no danger of

corruption to the voters of Maine in it; and I do see a necessity so far as the northern end of this most northerly section of the State of Maine is concerned that the gubernatorial election be not postponed to a date a particle later than that now fixed by statute.

MR. BUSSABARGER of Lubec: Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the resolve introduced by my brother, the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Harman. To me it appeals as on the side of reason and economy; and, while I am not going to make a speech of any length in favor of this resolve, I do wish to say a few words in favor of the measure introduced. I have been to some pains to discover if possible, the basis of the opposition upon which the majority party rests its argument, and I am exceedingly grateful to my brother from Houlton, Mr. Barnes, for the speech he has just made, because that was the very first reason that I had discovered this resolve has not a ghost of a show of getting through this legislature. When the Hon. James G. Blaine, the "plumed knight," occupied the chair of honor in this august assembly, he had a stock phrase which aroused the enthusiasm of the citizens of Augusta. It was "Royal Kennebec"; but, gentlemen of this 78th Assembly, it is no longer "Royal Kennebec," it is "Royal Aroostook." The aristocracy of Kennebec has had to resign its crown. King Spud holds his court and the gentlemen of the old black stock, about which one of our Southern orators has written, is nowhere in the sight of the new aristocracy of Aroostook and the gentlemen who have declared to me that there is no necessity for us to lift up our voice because it was beating the air for Aroostook county was "agin" this measure and it would be certain to fail. I think, friends, that perhaps they have some grounds; but I hardly think, using the argument of a member of the other house, that it is fair to tax all of the rest of the grand old State of Maine's fifteen counties, in order to favor "Royal Aroostook."

There is, however, another reason that was advanced to me why this measure should not pass, and that was

because in preparation for the campaign the majority party were in the habit of appealing to the central authorities, the national campaign committee, for munitions of war for the campaign,—not only those sinews of war but that the leaders from 47 states should concentrate their big guns, their Krupps, their 45 centimeters, and their 35 centimeters and their little pop-gun 25 centimeters, and shell the woods of "Royal Aroostook" from Fort Kent to Kittery. So, friends, you cannot blame the majority party for passing on to future legislators this recommendation of a former governor, who is now in the United States Senate, because possibly the fact that that governor after making that recommendation was defeated at the next election will doubtless make the present and future governors a little bit leary of making a similar recommendation. However, I shall vote in favor of the resolve as introduced by the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Harman.

Mr. BOMAN of Vinalhaven: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to make any extended remarks in regard to this matter; but I wish to state a few facts why I am in favor of this resolution. In the first permit me to read a letter from a gentleman from Rockland, an editor of a leading paper there and the rankest kind of a Republican. This gentleman can never see any good in a Democrat, that is at election, and I want to read what he has said and I will ask the gentlemen to notice. It is as follows: "Mr. Claes Boman, Augusta, Maine.

Dear Mr. Boman:

In response to your telephone message in regard to the bill introduced in the House to change our State election from September to November, I hope you and our other representatives from Knox county will be able to advocate the passage of the measure with all the force you can bring to bear.

As you perhaps know, the Courier-Gazette has for many years favored this change and I have written a good deal in that connection. I don't need to introduce any arguments in this letter for you know them thoroughly. The chief thing in favor of the measure is the

fact that in recent years, with the referendum and primaries, etc., we are called upon to give up too much time to the labor and expense of elections. I can see no good whatever in retaining the September elections in presidential years and we might just as well elect in November during the off years. I sincerely hope the bill may become a law.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) W. O. FULLER,"

Editor of the Republican paper, the Courier-Gazette, who in every campaign has always stumped the State for the Republican party.

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, as you are all aware this is not a new measure. In looking the House and Senate over I find that this measure was introduced the first time I believe in 1881. At that time there were two reports presented and there were 83 against the resolve and 59 in favor of it. At almost every session of the legislature since that time, this same thing has been treated in the same way that the women's suffrage bill has been up to the present time—always turned down. I am very sorry to think that the Judiciary Committee have turned this matter down, and that the attempt has been made not to give an opportunity to speak upon it. There was a time, gentlemen, when September elections favored the Republican party. There were times back in 1870 to 1875 when if a man attempted to vote the Democratic ticket he was discharged the next morning, and, gentlemen, I know what I am talking about; if a man dared to vote that ticket he was told the next morning that he was not wanted any longer. Times have changed, however, and no man would dare do that now. I have even seen men stand behind a voter to see how he was voting. Gentlemen, it does not seem that we have the right to deprive the people of the opportunity of voting on this question at the next September election. I find that there is about sixteen thousand dollars spent in carrying on the State election and that is something worth saving, not only that, but every town and every industry is ham-

pered by an election. We have our presidential election in November and our State election in September when both could be just as well held at the same time. All we ask, gentlemen of the House, is to give the people a chance to vote and to decide for themselves and why should they not have that opportunity? We have no right to say that they shall not and, gentlemen, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, will not prevail.

Mr. MURRAY of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make any speech, but I am going to remind the gentleman, Mr. Barnes, and make it plain to him what perhaps my brother Harman did not make plain, about a corruption fund. If he never heard of one, I will remind him of one. Does he remember the \$2,000 which his party poured into a small town in the northern end of my county to one man and for which in my opinion they did not get value received? If he has further any doubt as to which party uses a corruption fund, I can perhaps be more explicit.

Mr. PATTEE of Harmony: Mr. Speaker, I believe that every gentleman of this House understands this question thoroughly, and I move the previous question.

A sufficient number having arisen, the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: Gentlemen, shall the main question be put? Mr. Harman has five minutes.

Mr. HARMAN: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I wish to state that four years ago the State Grange passed an unanimous resolution asking the legislature to pass a resolution for an amendment to the Constitution to submit this matter to the people to vote on for a change in the election from September to November.

The pending question being on the motion of Mr. Farrington of Augusta that the report of the committee on judiciary "ought not to pass" be accepted.

A viva voce vote being had,

The motion prevailed and the report of committee on judiciary "ought not to pass" was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House majority and minority reports of committee on inland fisheries and game, majority report "ought not to pass" and minority report "ought to pass" on House Doc. 44, An Act to repeal Section 73 of Chapter 33, Revised Statutes, relating to Sunday being a closed season for game or birds, tabled by the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Buzzell, pending the acceptance of either report.

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make plain at this time my position on this bill, to read the bill and to tell the members of this House as I understand it the condition of the law and how the law will remain in the event this bill has a passage; and then I wish to yield the floor to Representative Grant with the understanding that I may say something a little later.

The SPEAKER: May the Chair inquire what motion the gentleman proposes to make?

Mr. BUZZELL: That the minority report "ought to pass" be accepted.

House No. 44 says that Section 73 of Chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes is hereby repealed. In other words, that repeals a law as made two years ago in the legislature of 1915 which reads something like this:

"Sunday is a closed season, on which it is not lawful to hunt, kill or destroy any wild animals or wild birds of any kind. Whoever hunts, kills, or destroys any wild animal or wild bird on Sunday shall pay a fine of not less than ten nor more than fifty dollars and costs for each offense; provided, however, that if protected wild animals or wild birds are hunted, killed, destroyed or had in possession in violation of this section, the penalty shall be the same as is now imposed therefor during other closed season; but the penalties imposed for the violation of the Sunday laws of the statutes of this State are not hereby repealed nor diminished."

My understanding of what this law is to be in the event of its passage is that in case it was a closed time on a particular kind of animal, for instance, on partridge for two months, the repealing of this act as made in 1915 would simply open up the door so that anyone might go gunning or hunting Sundays in the intervening time or during that two months; they would not have a right to go on Sundays during the balance of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. Grant of Hope.

Mr. GRANT of Hope: Mr. Speaker, all of this was thoroughly threshed out before the committee and all that appeared against that bill were only four, and I think somewhere about twenty-five appeared in favor of it. It is only a question of giving the poor man a chance to get out and of getting a little recreation on Sunday. You give him the privilege of doing this and that and everything else, except hunting, and the only objection that I can hear is the noise from the gun. I can't see where there is any difference between taking an automobile and going for a ride and going after partridge or deer.

Mr. Sisson of Island Falls: Mr. Speaker, I hardly know whether I rise in shame or in pride, since I hale from "Royal Arcostook." Some days ago I received an anonymous letter. It was one of those strange missives which, although unsigned, revealed the disguise of the author in every line. It first told me that men of my profession in politics were worse than the devil, and I rather thought it was about time that somebody else had something to say. It then went on to say that I was to understand that in this session I was to be seen and not heard. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot be seen because of natural conditions very well, and I must, if I am known in this session, be heard sometimes.

If this particular law, or desire to repeal a law, were about lobsters, I might remain quiet, but I think that this particular bill comes within my own line.

Mr. Speaker, according to the evidence presented to the committee by

the fish and game commissioners, there are just about three per cent of the citizens of the State of Maine who hunt. Of this number probably half of them would like to hunt on Sunday. Probably many of the petitioners in favor of this bill simply desire to have their acts legalized. But when you think of what a few there are in the State, compared with the greater part of the population, who hunt, and what a few there are who really desire a repeal of the law as it stands, it appears to me that this House can do no other thing than leave the law as it stands.

As to the thousands who come in from outside the State to hunt, we cannot say that these are the ones who leave the twenty-five millions. Neither can we say that in the small, short time that they are here that they are the ones to whom the State of Maine needs so much to cater. They come in numbers, as they do, with the law as it is, and I have never known personally of many complaints from non-residents because there is such a thing as a Sunday law on game and birds.

Of course it is admitted at once that the law is broken, but likewise is the temperance law broken, and I have never seen any evidence that the Sunday law which forbids hunting on Sunday—any evidence to show that it is any more broken or as much broken as the law which places on our books what is known as the open and closed seasons. We admit the law is broken, but that is no reason why it should be repealed any more than that we should repeal all temperance legislation because some people happen to want it. There are thousands who would desire intoxicants to be sold in every store, but the majority of the people of this State do not agree with them, and we enforce as well as we may certain temperance legislation.

But the very worst about this law, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it meddles with the religious convictions of any number of people in this State. Thousands of people would feel it with great indignation, were this law repealed; thousands of people would think it a means of offense, and I submit to you the fact, Mr. Speaker, that

it is this class of people that keeps Sunday as a day of rest for the rest of the people of the State. Sunday is not kept according to law by the manufacturers, it is not kept according to law by pleasure seekers, it is not kept by any body of men and women, but by the church; and, although this law of Sunday is physically necessary for humanity as it has been proven many, many times, there are always movements on foot to so destroy its principles that it should at last become as every other day of the seven. There was a time in French history when all things became as chaos in government; they tried to do away with the church; they tried to do away with Sunday and institute a reign of reason, but all their plans ignominiously failed because one day in seven was found to be physically as well as spiritually necessary for mankind. And I say this bill which is before you now is one of the many that would break down the Sunday which we respect and destroy one of the most precious institutions of our country.

But the main reason why I must differ from my brother from Belfast—the main reason of all—is because of the innumerable parents that I see scattered about this State. They have high ideals; they try to bring their boys and girls up to love their country, to love their church and to grow into noble manhood and womanhood; these parents are trying to the best of their ability to raise up proper citizens of our State, and I claim that if this closed time law were repealed, every parent in the sections where hunting is to be had would have a harder time to restrain their boys and girls and keep them within the institution which means so much to their years of adolescence.

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to speak at length. These few arguments I present and further say that it is well for the State of Maine to show to non-resident hunters that we have a Christian law upon our books.

Mr. LARRABEE of Bath: Mr. Speaker, I think every man here in the House knows well how he proposes to vote; I think he understands the ques-

tion is whether we intend to repeal the laws of our State or to act as men should act in keeping the Sabbath day, and I would call for the question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the previous question be called?

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, saying what I did in opening this question, I reserve the right to say a few words, and if I am in order, I would be pleased to take advantage of the opportunity.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is in order.

Mr. BUZZELL: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House: This bill was introduced in this House by myself. Well did I know the attitude of some members of this House at that time. I knew very well how it would be looked at from different points of view, and if I had the opportunity at this time to talk in behalf of the church and in behalf of the State on the same side with the gentleman from Aroostook (Mr. Sisson), I believe that I could truly make my chin quiver and my cheeks shake so that we would really feel that the grand, old State of Maine was in danger.

But now, gentlemen of this House, what are the facts? What are the facts? Let's not be moved with emotion; let's not be moved with false arguments, but let's come right down to the proposition and say that here is a body of one hundred and fifty people and we are considering a proposition at this time, looking at the thing fairly and squarely, and that we want to deliberate and vote in the interests of all the people. Now, what are the facts in connection with this bill?

I am not particularly interested in it, gentlemen of this House. I cannot tell when I went gunning on Sunday, Monday, Tuesday or any other day in the week. It has been a long time since I went fishing—a long time. So, personally, I am not particularly interested. But the gentleman from Aroostook—and we will leave off the "royal" and "imperial," because they are all good fellows up there—I never



have been with a better bunch of boys in my life than those that come from Aroostook—he says there are about three per cent of the people of the State of Maine that go hunting. I think he is right so far as that is concerned. There are 800,000 population in the State of Maine. Three per cent of that is some twenty-four or twenty-five thousand that want to go hunting. Now you understand that I believe that that twenty-four or five thousand should have just as much right to go hunting as I or somebody else has the right to go automobiling. Now, you may meet the proposition by saying you haven't any right to go automobiling on Sunday, but you have because custom has taken away the force of the law so far as that is concerned, and Mr. Speaker, supposing you and I take our automobiles and go out Sunday and go to ride and ride miles, what are we going to do with the rights of our neighbor who has no auto and who, the laws of the great State of Maine say so far as he is concerned, shall remain in his house? Is that hardly right? Is that hardly fair to that small percentage of men?

On the other hand, take the people that there are in the State of Maine without the opportunity to go hunting during the open season on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday or Saturday. What are you going to do with the fellows who have to work six days in the week—strict application six long days in the week—and whose job to a certain extent depends upon that? Sunday is the only day that they have for this innocent recreation.

The position that the committee of this legislature has taken on this bill is not consistent. There was an act introduced at the same time saying that we should not go fishing on Sunday. That bill they reported "ought not to pass." There is no difference, gentlemen of this House, from a moral standpoint, and I will submit it to my friend from Aroostook who spoke last—whether there is any difference from a moral standpoint in breaking the law with a gun or with an angleworm. There is no difference so far as that is concerned.

As I have said before, some like to go fishing, and they even offer the slight argument that there is not any noise connected with fishing, which is very true, and that there is some connected with gunning on Sunday. Let's go into that a little way and see how much danger there is in Sunday gunning—how much more danger there will be than there is now. Do you suppose that this law makes any great difference in the Sunday gunning which takes place in this State? I do not believe that there will be very much difference. I believe that just as many go Sunday gunning now as would go if this law were repealed. The only difference there would be is, they would have a perfect right to go and go legally. Before the committee the question was asked me what the difference would be and whether or not there would be any great difference from a moral standpoint, and I told them that I thought there would; that I thought if the men of the State of Maine who wanted to go gunning Sunday did so and did it legally, it would be far better than it was for them to go as they were going.

Now there are other things that can be said in connection with this question. I have not bothered to button-hole the members of this House and ask them to say something for this question. I was asked to introduce the bill, and I have done it. I have performed my duty and I believe that there is a sentiment in favor of it all over the State of Maine. There are petitions that have been rolling into this House for weeks. The bill was presented before the committee weeks ago and it has been tossed back and forth in the hands of that committee until they have made a minority report six to four against the passage of this act. Thousands of people all over the State of Maine have signed petitions both ways. My friend from Aroostook (Mr. Sisson) can go out and look at the petitions. He can see whether or not there are more petitions there favoring Sunday gunning than there are against it. That is an expression, and it has had all the time in the world.

Now, gentlemen, so far as I am

concerned, I do not ask a single one in this House to vote for this if he does not want to, and I know very well he won't. Simply vote your own mind on whether or not a few fellows should have the right to go gunning Sunday, that is, have the right one day in the week that the other fellow has for six days. You talk about class legislation; we talk about that the great Republican party wants to do the greatest good for the greatest number—here is your opportunity. Look at the fellows working in the sweatshops! Think of them! Think of them at home! We are taking it here today comfortably; we are having a splendid time—not having to work very hard—but just let's think of those fellows at home who want this opportunity. Shouldn't they have it?

Now, gentlemen, this is not going to ruin any church; this is not going to tear down any precepts, and my brother from Aroostook (Mr. Sisson) knows it as well as anybody. I am not very strong on quoting the Scripture, but, as I understand it, under the Old Dispensation the man was made for the day. I submit to you, gentlemen of this House, that the time has come, under the New Dispensation, when the day is made for the man, and I submit that this is good Scripture.

I ask you, gentlemen, to vote just as you feel on this proposition, but when you do, do not consult your own personal interests. Think of the fellows at home who voted for you, and then say whether or not you can consistently do what you are about to do.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, for a yea and nay vote.

The SPEAKER: Would the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Buzzell, be satisfied with a division of the House?

Mr. BARNES of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, may I be pardoned for just a minute or two. Some of us represent one class of people; some represent another, but all of us represent a class of people that have wandered a little bit away from the path that they set out for themselves to tread as the years have gone by, and we

each of us do things now and then which would bring almost a blush of shame, and at least regret, as we think them over.

Where did we get the feeling of patriotism, that feeling of respect so necessary for the upbringing of a good citizen? We got it from the knee of our mothers years and years ago. What makes that little tug at the heart just now with all of you as you think, well now, perhaps, I might vote for this measure? What is it that holds you back from joining the throng that wish to tear the old New England Sabbath out of our history and with dog and gun and shouts to rush through our little villages to the woods at hours when men should be going to church? It is the teaching of the sainted mother that has gone before.

We have stepped aside from the path we ought to tread, every single one of us, but we stand here and we represent here men who stand for the things the old folks stood for, and I am glad now that it is a yea and nay vote. Before you vote, just think of the teachings that came to your ears. Perhaps the teacher is gone. Perhaps, as you took her hand the last time, not so many years ago, all she could say to you was just what she could say to you when you were a little fellow—just be a good boy. I know that the great majority of the sober thinking people of the State of Maine will regret it from the bottom of their hearts if this House should vote to do away with the New England Sabbath. (Applause.)

Mr. BUZZELL: Mr. Speaker, I ask for the indulgence just a few moments more of this House. I realize that the man who has a chance to say the last word always has the better of the argument. My brother Barnes knows that; he knows it by experience and he knows it by having wound up arguments before a jury. Now it is not my purpose to appeal to you from the mother's standpoint, but it is my purpose to appeal to you as men. If our mothers all had an opportunity to vote upon this question, we know how they would vote. But my brother Barnes, as does every one of you,

knows that there comes a time when the girl and the boy get out from under the strong arm of their mother and walk into the world. Now, as they walk into the world, they face the Sundays; they face the Sundays and every time the State of Maine makes one of those hooping, circumscribing repulsive laws that says what you shall do on Sunday and that you shall do it this way, it simply brings contempt on that law. My brother Barnes knows it. He talks about our forefathers—our Puritan forefathers! Why, the only picture that I can remember of them was one in which our young men and our young women were going to church, and the young man had a gun over his shoulder. (Applause.) Don't you suppose that young man and that young woman could enjoy just as much religion as they could if he didn't have the gun? Is there any question about that? And do you suppose for one minute that if a large deer should happen perchance to cross the path of that Puritan forefather but what he would have taken a crack at him? (Applause.)

Now, members of this House, we will go still farther back than our forefathers. Let's go back a little farther than that. Why are we here? How come we here? We can go farther than the Puritans going to church in Massachusetts; we can go across the water, and it was there that they left their happy homes that they might get away from just such repulsive laws as this.

Now as I said before I am not particularly interested in this question. I do not go fishing Sunday, nor do I go hunting Sunday, but I do know that there are 24,000 people in the State of Maine approximately that want to go, and if they want to, who should say that they shall not. I will withdraw my motion for a yea and nay vote, Mr. Speaker, and we can have a division of the House if it is your pleasure.

Mr. BOMAN of Vinalhaven: Mr. Speaker, all is said, and I hope that no member of this House will vote to encourage the boy to kill game or birds on Sunday.

Mr. ALLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I have sat here in my seat today, and I have heard this matter discussed from the standpoint of the country, you might say. I want to speak for a moment of the city. I do not want to speak in any way upon the moral side of the question, for that has been taken up, I think, very thoroughly by the gentlemen who have preceded me, but I do want to speak from the standpoint of the city and from the standpoint of the police regulations of the city and the country adjoining the cities.

It has been said here today that this law makes no difference as to hunting or shooting, whether we have this law or not. I want to say to you, gentlemen—if you live in the cities, you know it—if you do not, I want to say it does make some difference to us who live in the larger cities. You all know that our cities are made up of a cosmopolitan population of all nationalities. You know that we have one nationality that cooks into a broth or soup nearly anything they can shoot or kill. I want to say to you now that if this law is repealed and these people are allowed to believe that they are justified in going out from our city to shoot and kill in the vicinity of the city of Portland, from Portland to Falmouth and Yarmouth there will not be a song-bird, squirrel or rabbit or anything of that kind left within one season near the city of Portland; they will all be shot and killed. I speak now from the standpoint of a man who loves the birds and who wants to see them live.

I want to go further than that too. I will admit that the Sunday law is broken. I admit we go out on automobile trips. I admit we take walks in the country. I care nothing for the noise, but I know from personal experience and from parties who go out from the city of Portland to walk out through the country that this promiscuous shooting and use of guns in the hands of young men and untrained men constitute a danger to every person, man, woman or child, that goes out to walk. For this reason, if for nothing else, I am going to ask you gentlemen today to vote to sustain the

Sunday law and to keep it upon the statutes of our State. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Buzzell, that the minority report "ought to pass" be accepted.

A division being had,

Thirty-one having voted in the affirmative and eighty-four having voted in the negative the motion was lost.

Mr. SISSON of Island Falls: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the majority report of the committee "ought not to pass".

A viva voce vote being taken,  
The motion prevailed.

Mr. SISSON: I move that the bill receive its three several readings at this time. (Laughter and applause.)

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House House Report of the committee on mercantile affairs and insurance reporting "ought not to pass" on House Doc. No. 464, An Act to amend Section 6, Paragraph 4, Chapter 50, Revised Statutes, relating to compensation for personal injuries for employees, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Baxter, pending the acceptance of the report.

Mr. GURNEY of Portland: Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitation that I rise to move the substitution of the bill for the report unanimous from this committee. I say hesitation, because I am aware that the committees of this House have faithfully and with painstaking effort considered every bill that has been submitted to them. Here we are facing a situation in which a bill comes back apparently bearing the unanimous report of a committee, and in its place I move to substitute the bill. I say with hesitation, because I do not believe that the day has come when we shall shut up our consciences and our reason upon the report of an committee, however wisely that committee may act.

I believe further that if the facts are presented to this House, its justice and its merit will so appeal to you that you will feel that the report of the committee ought to be laid aside and the bill

itself adopted. And I want to say at this time that if any member of the committee will rise when I shall have finished and will present to the House any argument so quoted as to command the respect of thinking men, I shall be glad to change my own position and to vote with that committee, for I believe that the situation here presented is a peculiar one worthy the consideration of every man.

The bill itself is a proposition to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. I have before me the Statutes of the State, a copy of which I assume is not in the hands of every member, so I am going to present the facts found in that revision of the statute which is now sought to be amended.

Under the laws of this particular act a city and a town is an employer. A fireman is an employee. The provision of Paragraph 4 of Section 6 which is now sought to be amended, provides that in the event that a city or any employer shall have in vogue any system by which he provides for his own injured employees, as if for instance instead of paying each employee that may be injured a portion that is required and set out in the schedule of recoveries under the Workmen's Compensation Act—I say that if any employer has a system of his own which is equivalent to the benefits under the statute, then he may submit that to the commission and they may allow him to adopt that in place of the provision of this particular statute. That must, however, have been in vogue the first day of January, 1915.

Now the provision of this amendment, which is House Bill, No 464, is this:

"Any town or city may, in lieu of the compensation and insurance provided by this act, continue any member of the fire department in said town, who may have been injured in the course of his duties, on the payroll at full pay, if such full pay exceeds the maximum compensation provided for employees under this act."

It is obvious that the provision here is entirely permissive. It authorizes cities and towns to do what any individual employer may do of his own free will and accord. If a fireman shall have been in-

jured in the course of his duties, the city, if it wants to, may pay to him his full pay that he has been earning prior to his disability. Now, why is that act necessary?

If a man be employed by another and be injured, the employer may easily pay him his full pay; he may pay him the amount required under the Compensation Act, and then he may supplement, if he wants to, the deficit—the difference between what the man was earning and what he is obliged by law to pay. But cities and towns are not allowed that liberality in spending the people's money; they may only use money for certain purposes established rigidly by law, so that strictly a city is not allowed to dip its hand into the treasury and say to an injured fireman: "You have been faithful in your duties; you have for many years responded to every call of fire; you have never once defaulted, and now, as you lie upon your back, we have not the heart to say that you shall receive a mere pittance each week, but we will reward your honest effort and we will compensate your fidelity and pay you dollar for dollar what you would have been paid if you had not been obliged to lie sick in bed, mangled from injuries received in the discharge of your duties."

With this in mind, that the statute is merely permissive, if in any given case where a fireman has been injured in the course of his duties the city may be allowed to continue on its payroll any man who has been injured, it seems to me only just that that permission should be given. Each city is not obliged to use it in every case. It is left entirely to the discretion of the board of mayor and aldermen and city council or the selectmen of every town. It simply gives them permission to do this if they want to.

Not long ago in Portland one Sunday morning a fireman was seated at his breakfast table with his wife and two children, and there came a timid knock at his back door, and when he responded, five little children, the oldest 14 years of age, came into the house. He hardly knew who they were, but they were children of a sister in Massachusetts who had been taken off the week before by

typhoid fever—she and her husband. And those little orphans, suffering and knowing that down in Maine was an uncle and aunt, had come under the leadership of that little 14 year old girl to Portland and there presented themselves Sunday morning without a single place to go except the poor farm, and that fireman took them in and cared for them; and he consulted a lawyer, and he went to the probate court, and he adopted every one of those children. He did not attempt even to divide them up; he never said for a moment I cannot support but one of these because I have two children of my own, but he said that as long as he was able to struggle for an existence, those children should never be separated but they should be his children from that day forth. That man is still, I judge, in the city of Portland. He has never, nor has any other fireman, to my knowledge, ever failed in duty. They have dared danger in every conceivable manner, and I ask you if a fireman stands in the door of a burning building, knowing that in the inside is a baby looking for him, and behind may be his wife and children, whether he shall stop and say "If I am injured here, I shall receive two or three dollars a week," or whether he may go into that certain place of danger with the confidence that behind him stands the city with its magnanimity, whose people will reward him by saying, "You shall be continued upon the payrolls because of the injuries received in the course of duty while in our employ."

I move, Mr. Speaker, that the bill itself, House Bill No. 464, be adopted in place of the report of the committee.

(Mr. Farrington of Augusta assumes the Chair.)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gurney, moves that the bill be substituted for the report.

Mr. DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this bill simply asks—I will read the bill.

"Any town or city may, in lieu of the compensation and insurance provided by this act, continue any member of the fire department in said town, who may have

been injured in the course of his duties, on the payroll at full pay, if such full pay exceeds the maximum compensation provided for employees under this act."

As I understand, Mr. Speaker, it simply allows the cities and towns to have the right to pay the firemen their full pay, if they so desire. If I understand the law rightly, at the present time under compensation you can't get over \$11 a week, no matter if you are injured \$50 a week—all you can get is \$10 a week. It seems to me that \$10 a week is not enough for men who are working seven days a week, although they would get no more than \$10 a week under the Compensation Act. I hope the House will vote in favor of the bill and I second the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gurney.

Mr. MURRAY of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Portland through the Chair what effect this would have on firemen who were working yearly, and not under civil service? If they received their pay a short time, where would that leave their rights under the Workmen's Compensation?

Mr. GURNEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say through the Chair that I could not answer the question of the gentleman from Bangor without some consideration of that particular fact, but I should assume any municipality would not take any action that would in any way injure the fireman. I do not understand the firemen are obliged to accept it.

Mr. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, the effect of my question is this: If a man were working only for a year, appointed we will say for a year, how would that affect him if they should pay his salary for that year and then he should be dropped or something of that kind should happen?

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Gurney, wish to answer that question?

Mr. GURNEY: I shall have to say, Mr. Speaker, through the Chair, to the gentleman from Bangor that I have not considered that phase of it, but it does not occur to me that it can in any way

jeopardize the rights of any employee. If any gentleman has any section in mind where it would work to a disadvantage, I would be glad to consider that.

Mr. ALLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, doesn't this bill, in the position in which it is left, leave the matter in this way, namely, it allows the cities and towns, if they wish, to make a contract with the men in their employ, and nothing else? It looks that way to me, and it seems to me very, very advisable for such a bill to be passed by this legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tem: It appears to leave it entirely at the option of the city or town entirely so. The motion before the House is the motion of Mr. Gurney, which has been seconded, that the bill be substituted for the report.

A viva voce vote being taken,  
The motion prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Gurney of Portland, the bill was given its two several readings.

On motion by Mr. Anderson of Portland, the bill was tabled pending its third reading.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House at this time House Amendment A to Senate Doc. 159, entitled "An Act to authorize Blaine S. Viles and Guy P. Gannett to erect dams and develop water storage basins on Bog Brook in Dead River Plantation for the storage of water for driving logs and manufacturing" tabled by Mr. Baxter of Portland, pending the adoption of House Amendment A.

Mr. BAXTER of Portland: I move the adoption of House Amendment A.

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: I ask that House Amendment A be read.

The SPEAKER: House Amendment A reads as follows:

"House amendment A to Senate document No. 159, entitled 'An Act to authorize the erection of dams and water storage basins on Bog Brook and tributaries in Dead River Plantation in Somerset County.'

Amend Senate document 159, by

striking out all of Section 1 of said act and substituting therefor the following:

'Section 1. Blaine S. Viles and Guy P. Gannett, both of Augusta, their heirs and assigns, are hereby authorized to erect dams on Bog Brook and its tributaries in Dead River Plantation in Somerset county, for the purpose of the storage of water to facilitate the driving of logs and pulp wood, and for said purpose they may widen, deepen, and remove obstructions from said stream, and may erect dams, side dams, sluiceways, booms, side booms, piers and other facilities. They may use the water power developed on said stream for any and all manufacturing purposes. They shall have the right to flow any and all lands on said streams, provided, however, that they shall pay to the State of Maine such damages for use or flowage of any public lots as the Governor and Council may determine, and also such damages to parties injured for flowage of any other lands as may be determined by the county commissioners. The State of Maine reserves the right to take over by proper legislation the property, rights and franchises hereby granted to the said Viles and Gannett, their heirs and assigns, upon the payment of just compensation to the owners therefor, but such compensation shall not include the value of the franchise hereby granted. No power generated at any dam or dams to be erected under the provisions of this act shall be transmitted by electric current for sale or use beyond the limits of this State without express authority of the Legislature.'

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendment be indefinitely postponed and in support of that motion I ask the legislature to bear with me a few moments.

In the year 1916, Bog Brook became famous when Blaine Viles and Guy Gannett imported a German wild boar and took it to Bog Brook in Somerset county. Due notice was taken thereof in all the newspapers of the State of Maine that such an importation had

been made, and they built a small wire enclosure to take care of this animal at Bog Brook, and, as the season advanced, the water dried up in Bog Brook and the animal became infuriated and escaped through the wire netting into the forest of Northern Somerset. Due notice was taken of that fact in all the newspapers of the State. Later, since this legislature has been in session, that animal was shot on Somerset just before it had crossed the line into Canada, and the State of Maine needs to be congratulated here that none of the mire from Bog Brook was transmitted into Canada.

Messrs. Viles and Gannett began to inquire how more water might be stored in Bog Brook and made some investigation, and they find that by erecting dams and making reservoirs they may be able, aided by the spring freshets and the melting snows of the spring, to retain sufficient water in the tributaries and in Bog Brook to permit the driving of four-foot pulp wood, and they have come here to this legislature and asked for this privilege.

Gentlemen, I hold in my hand a post-card which has a birdseye view of Bog Brook, and I wish that every member of this legislature might see what the proposition is. If you were to take a lead pencil and draw it along the line which indicates Bog Brook on this post card, one scratch of the pencil, gentlemen, would entirely eliminate and efface from that post card the picture of Bog Brook.

And now we come to the proposition, gentlemen, of this amendment to their charter, asking that there shall be nothing given for the franchise should the State of Maine ever decide to take this water power away from them. I submit to you that there is nothing at Bog Brook of any value today; there is nothing there but a mere meadow, and if Messrs. Viles and Gannett spend their good money in Northern Somerset and create something there, is there any reason why the State of Maine, should they ever decide to take it away from them, should not reasonably compensate

them for everything which they may create there?

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, goes still further. It provides that they shall transmit no electricity out of the State of Maine. In the early spring they may retain sufficient water to facilitate the driving of short pulp wood, but as an electric light proposition, gentlemen, if you were to install a dynamo at Bog Brook and bring your transmission lines to this State House, you could not light one of those sixteen candle power lights there. I say it is absurd, preposterous and ridiculous for this legislature to spend its time tacking on an amendment on to a charter when it is a physical impossibility to transmit any electricity out of the State of Maine, and I move you, Mr. Speaker, that we indefinitely postpone the amendment.

The SPEAKER: pro tem The gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton, is informed by the Chair that the motion to adopt the amendment takes precedence. Mr. Baxter of Portland moves that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BAXTER of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I want to explain to the House just the position of this bill. Two of my very best friends have come to the legislature and ask it that they be given certain franchises up in the Dead River region. I want them to get all those franchises, be they great or small. I do not want to stand in the way for one minute. But this legislature, up to the present time, has been consistent in attaching certain amendments to bills of this sort. I admit at the start that this is not a large proposition, but, nevertheless, there must be more in it than the gentleman from Bingham, would have us believe.

If you will look at the bill, it gives Messrs. Viles and Gannett the right to erect dams, widen, deepen and remove obstructions from said stream, erect side dams, sluice ways, booms, side booms, piers and other facilities. It also gives them the right to use

stream for any and all manufacturing purposes.

Now, I do not think that a bill would have been drawn as carefully as this for so trivial a matter as the gentleman from Bingham suggests, and on my part I hope that there is a large business water power development there and that my friends may have the benefit of it, but I think it is rather belittling the subject to treat it as the gentleman from Bingham has.

Now the amendment which I have suggested is very mild in form. In the first place it says that if the State of Maine ever wants to take over the franchise in that locality, the State of Maine may do so by paying for everything but the bare franchise. You cannot get away from that proposition, gentlemen, and I am sure that those gentlemen coming here and asking for that privilege must agree that this is perfectly fair and reasonable, even though it may be a small matter in comparison with some of the other matters we have treated. The Great Northern Paper Company accepted this same amendment in a very large matter. I do not want to get up here and advocate trifling amendments, but there is something in being consistent in these matters.

Now the State of Maine owns certain lands in that locality, because the bill provides that these gentlemen may flow these lands which belong to the State of Maine. I cannot tell whether these lands are valuable or whether there is any possibility of a power development on them, but that is left in safe hands. It says that the Governor and Council may decide what compensation should be paid for these lands. But notwithstanding that, we give outright to these gentlemen the privilege of flowing those lands, and the Governor and Council is to fix the compensation.

Now, if there were any injustice contemplated by these amendments, I should be the last member of this House to offer them, but I do not like to have the matter treated in quite so trivial a manner, and I move you, Mr. Speaker, that Amendment A be adopted.



Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: Mr. Speaker, while this is a trivial matter, I am perfectly willing to be as serious about the proposition as the gentleman from Portland. He says it has become the settled policy to attach these amendments to the charters which have been granted here at this session of the legislature. It is not the settled policy of the State of Maine and never has been the settled policy of the State of Maine, and it is not the settled policy of this legislature. They have been forced on to their charters in this division of the legislature because he had the votes and he plans well. Across the hall they have as promptly taken them off. It has never been the settled policy, not even in this present session.

When we come to the proposition of transmitting electricity out of the State of Maine, gentlemen, this was never a people's measure. You gentlemen all remember that it originated way back in 1909 and 1911 with the corporations outside of the State of Maine fighting among themselves, and it came in to this House and passed without even voices or discussion in the matter. From that time and at that time was created an opposition to the development of water powers in the State of Maine which from that day to this has prevented any development of the water powers of Maine. We have stood absolutely still on that proposition for a period since 1909. Early in this session of the legislature I presented a proposition here which provided for the State of Maine to develop her water powers. That was referred to the judiciary committee, and I am willing to abide by the wisdom of that committee in reporting that that measure ought not to pass.

Now the situation in the State of Maine today is simply this. The State of Maine does not care to develop her own water powers, and the position taken by the legislature in antagonizing the development of all water powers means that we can have no development. In Northern Somerset County we have sufficient undeveloped water power to nearly heat and light the State of Maine. Propositions have come to this legislature and have been as promptly turned down. I believe,

gentlemen, it is time for the State of Maine to have a sane and radical policy in regard to her water powers. We people in Northern Somerset have been digging the sand out of our eyes which has been thrown in by crafty politicians seeking to advance their own welfare rather than the benefit of the people of the State of Maine. Now we come here asking you to establish a safe and sane policy which will allow that development, for so long as we maintain our present attitude toward the development of water powers, there can be no development.

As to the proposition that the State of Maine owns some valuable land on Bog Brook, I want to say for the members of this legislature that I have a photograph of the valuable land which the State of Maine owns on Bog Brook, and you people who are familiar with what meadow grass is, know the value of that land. If this were valuable timber land, we might hesitate before draining it for the purpose of flowing, but it is purely meadow land and nothing grows there but swale hay.

We question the wisdom of the transmission of our surplus electricity outside the State of Maine. Again I wish to refer you to the great county of Aroostook. It is one of the underlying principles of the State of Maine that we may sell our surplus from whatever source outside the State. Aroostook county produces a surplus of potatoes and, because of the privilege which they enjoy of shipping potatoes outside the State of Maine, you have established in Aroostook county a great potato field. Is there anyone finding any fault with that fact? No! With the great potato fields in Aroostook has sprung up a great surplus and great grain fields and great development along all agricultural lines. Nowhere in New England nor in the United States can you find a more productive and prosperous country.

I want again to cite to you, gentlemen, the proposition of transporting outside the State of Maine our quarters themselves. I wish to point to the Poland Spring proposition. The Rickers have sold Poland Spring water in all parts of the civilized world, and has Maine suffered any by it? The surplus

which they have sold outside Maine has come back to Maine in dollars and cents and built up one of the greatest summer hotel systems which there is in Maine today. Is there anyone in Maine finding any fault with that sort of a proposition?

I submit to you that the same principle underlies every business proposition in the State of Maine in which our surplus may be sold outside the State. To me it seems, gentlemen, that it is mighty good religion to do it, and it is mighty poor politics for us to advocate not doing it.

The gentleman from Portland is the first to stand on the floor of this House and pledge to the defence of this nation the blood of our sons and fathers, and I want to ask this House how long since the water of Maine has been more sacred than the blood of Maine. I do not wish to detract in any way from the patriotism of the gentleman from Portland; I second all of his sentiments in that respect, but I submit to you that it is causing a depression in the business of the development of all the water powers of the State—this perpetual antagonism to that development—and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland will not prevail.

Mr. BUSSABARGER of Lubec: Mr. Speaker, I wish to heartily support the position of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Baxter, in offering these amendments to all of these water power bills for the conservation of the water powers of Maine; and in order that we may settle this question, which has been more or less dragging through this session, I take this occasion on this little Bog Brook stream, to give and to cite a precedent similar to this, and I believe of much higher authority than even the grand old State of Maine.

Some ten years ago I appealed to the great President of the United States for certain letters patent, or charters, if you choose to call them that, to certain agricultural lands in the Cascade mountains on the Stillagwamish river in the state of Washington. I did not want to go into the electrical business.

I did not want to build a dam and drive logs or shingle butts. Neither did I have dreams of becoming the Count of Monte Cristo and becoming rich prospecting for the copper in those mountains. Neither did I have dreams of becoming a capitalist and establishing a great pulp mill such as those they have in that same country worth half a million dollars. But I simply asked the President of the United States to grant me this charter after I had lived up to certain regulations and had paid down the coin. He granted that charter, and I have copied from this precious document that I hold in my strong box in my desk the concluding provisions of that long document.

“United States Land Office Patent for 160 acres. Certificate No. 21,000.” I do not read this, friends, because it has got my name in it. I have seen my name in a great many positions in the newspaper during this legislature. I just read it as a precedent to support the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Baxter). “Know ye, that the United States of America, in consideration of the premises and in conformity with the several acts of Congress in such cases made and provided, have given and granted, and by these presents do give and grant, unto the said Robert L. Bussabarger, and to his heirs, said tract above described, to have and to hold the same, together with all the rights, privileges, immunities and appurtenances, of whatsoever nature, thereto belonging, unto the said Robert L. Bussabarger and his heirs and assigns forever”—now here is the meat in the coconut that applies to this very question that we have been debating for nearly three months—“subject to any vested and accrued water rights”—and the people of Washington know what water rights are just as well as the people of Maine—“as may be recognized and acknowledged for mining, agricultural, manufacturing or other purposes, and rights to ditches and reservoirs”—just like the Bog Brook reservoir, for the little brook on my place I could jump across, as it was no larger than this aisle—“used in connection with such water rights and as may be recognized and acknowledged by legal

customs, laws and decisions of the courts, and also subject to the right of the owner of a vein or lode to extract or remove his ore therefrom should the same be found to penetrate or intersect the premises hereby granted as provided by law; and there is reserved from the land hereby granted a right of excavating thereon for ditches or canals constructed by the authority of the United States." Signed, "Theodore Roosevelt."

Friends, if the great power vested in the White Father at Washington should take those infinite pains to affix all of these provisions to a title or letters patent for a preacher who wanted to go into the agricultural business on the rippling stream of Stillagwamish in the far-off State of Washington, certainly I believe I stand on solid ground in concluding that the people of Maine, representing this great old State, have got a right to attach Amendment A to this charter desired by our good friends from Augusta for building their Bog Brook or Dead River reservoir. I therefore heartily second the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Baxter.

Mr. COLE of Eliot: Mr. Speaker, I hope that no member of this House will in any way rely upon what the gentleman from Lubec has said as to the amendment which is offered by the gentleman from Portland. It has about the same connection with that as the phases of the moon have to the state of lunacy, which is an old woman's whim probably. If any of you will go home and look at the warranty deeds which you have in your strongboxes, you will find, if anybody had an old path across your farm or a woods road or anything else when you bought it, that you bought it subject to the vested rights of any man who had any rights in that property before you got it; and that is all there is in his remarks, that he took that land grant or that patent subject to all the vested rights that there were in there. And you will all understand, gentlemen, that the rights in the West are altogether different than the rights in Maine. There may be as many owners in the West as there are stratas in the soil. One man

may own the surface of the earth and another man may own everything which is under the earth, and that is what is preserved there subject to the rights to any strata under the surface, because he only got the surface subject also to the rights of any reservoir which might exist there or any water, because in the West, according to the law I think of most of those states water may be appropriated by any man who may catch and use it, exclusively if you please, while in the State of Maine water runs through your farm and goes on to the next farm and you haven't any right to appropriate it whatever. You can use it as it flows past you, but as a riparian owner you have only the right of user as it flows past you and not the right of appropriation for domestic uses.

I am not saying anything against the amendment of the gentleman from Portland, (Mr. Baxter), but whatever has been said by the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Bussabarger, as coming from the great head at Washington has absolutely no connection at all, and so I hope everyone will pass it out of their minds and remember that he gave us a very pleasant and interesting talk. I always enjoy the gentleman from Lubec; I am always glad when there is occasion for him to get up and say something, and although it does not hit the point, as it did not in this case, it is very entertaining.

So far as the amendment of the gentleman from Portland is concerned, and talking about State policies, you will hear something and you have heard something about the so-called Cole Bill regarding the transmission of electricity out of the State. That bill has not been reported out of the committee yet and I am not going to discuss it this afternoon, but I want to say here that the policy of the State, if a policy is fixed, will be fixed here by you when you sit here. If you let things go by, when you go home over Sunday and some neighbor asked you what goes on through the week, unless a discussion has been had on it, you cannot tell him, and yet you have been making the policy of the week when the Speaker has been running these things off and you have been sitting

here and asking your friend who sat beside you, while you were busy with something else, what was going on. That is the way the policy of the State can be usually fixed, and it can be unfixed just as quickly as it can be fixed. There is no policy of the State except when people speak. When a legislature comes here and makes laws and the next legislature comes and amends those laws, they are the policy of the State until the wisdom of a succeeding legislature takes them off the statute book. The only policy there is in the State that is inviolate is the Constitution of the State and the laws in the Constitution of the United States which you and I here have no right to change, but there is nothing in the statute books that the majority of us here have not the right to change.

Gentlemen, in almost all matters that come before us it is the committee that fixes the policy of the State, and it is very seldom, except on a divided report or unless there seems to have been some misunderstanding or some lack of comprehension on the part of the committee as to the scope of the bill, that there is ever any discussion on a bill. The report of the committee is accepted and you and I don't know often what is in the bill. It is House Document 472 or Senate 468, or something like that; we look at the title in order to see what is in it and before we can look at it, it has gone and another is on its way. That is the policy of the State and the wisdom of the legislature.

We must trust our committees because there is no one man here big enough to know it all. There never has been, there never will be a policy created in this State by any one man, and no one man will ever change the policy in this State. It may be that members will submit to various things being done and to various injustices. You and I may sit here and let laws go by which we in our own minds do not believe should be enacted, but we do not stand on our feet to oppose them because they do not seem to be of public interest or to affect us personally.

Take into your minds a few things and think them over. Two-thirds of the legislation that goes through under the guise of public law is private legis-

lation which somebody puts in here for private gain and private benefit. You have had people in your own locality, your own constituents, ask you to put a bill in the box for something. That bill was usually from an insurance agent or an undertaker or an osteopath or something else, and he wanted something fixed whereby his personal condition would be improved in some way. He wasn't thinking of the whole broad State at large; he wanted a law enacted which would have something in it for himself. That is private legislation put on the statute books. Gentlemen, nine-tenths of the legislation, if we could get under the surface and find out where it originates, is originated by somebody who has an axe to grind, and the only legislation that is not personal and which has not some personal element in it is found in the Constitution of the State of Maine. So far as we are concerned as a State, that is inviolate until the people speak, but there is nothing inviolate and there is no State policy in statutory matters.

Now, so far as these amendments are concerned which are offered by the gentleman from Portland, I haven't any quarrel with the gentleman from Portland and neither have you. We are all citizens of the State of Maine; we were born here, the most of us, and we expect to die here, and if we didn't, we would get out of the State. There is nothing that binds us here, and the State would not miss us if we were out. We are satisfied with our conditions in the State. We want to see the State improve and there is not a man who would come here and lift his finger to do a thing that he thought was against the improvement of the State or against the betterment of the conditions of the people in the State; we want good roads; we want good schools, and we want work for 313 working days in the year for every man, woman and child. We want to see our farms develop, and we are passing laws which will help the farm. We want business because business means labor; labor means prosperity, and prosperity means better chances for our children than we had ourselves. It means bringing things to us in the every day walks

of life which we could not have if we were not prosperous as a whole. No one man can be prosperous; no five men in the community can be prosperous, but to make it a prosperous community it is everybody who must be prosperous. If we get an interchange of work and an exchange of money that comes from that work, and we all get some in the great exchange day in and day out, everybody then is happy, everybody has got work and everybody has got something to spend and wants to buy something with it. That is what makes business.

Why do you come here and talk about State policy when we have already got a Constitution of the State which says you can't take water—any man's water—except for public uses. Mind you that word is "public." You cannot take any man's property except for public uses. When you take his property for public uses you must pay him for it under the Constitution of the State of Maine, and the way is fully and clearly blazed by our supreme court in which that taking must be had for every single thing and the way of arriving at the compensation. It does not tell you how much you shall pay, but it says you shall pay what it is worth. It tells you how you shall get at it to find how much it is worth. If you do not get what it is worth, it is because of lack of human judgment by any men put on to assess its value.

Attaching all these amendments to these charters, I submit to you, gentlemen, adds not one iota to your rights or mine; it simply hangs on to them something useless and something that does not mean anything because everything is already covered by the law so far as the transmission of electricity out of the State by any corporation within the State is concerned. We have got a general law in the State today that covers it and absolutely forbids any corporation from transmitting electricity out of the State except a few exceptions, and thereby hangs a tale, gentlemen, which we will tell later.

There are exceptions. Then why load them up? Business is done by an aggregation of capital. You and I are not corporations. You and I are not part and parcel of them, but corporations are in

our midst. They are doing business. They can only do business within the limits of their charters. There are general laws governing them and there are special laws limiting them. Now if you have given a corporation a right to do business but you have limited it within certain rights or limitations, if you please to repeat the words, why then tie on to it something that covers every single general corporation; why attach to them a tail when there is a whole broad law that covers it? It seems to me utterly useless and childish for this legislature to stand by and see every act which is honest in purpose—and I am not saying that every corporation does not have some sincere motives behind it. I do not know about the motives of any of these but I take it for granted that most of them are intending to do an honest business and they come here to enlarge their powers so that they may do a greater business. If this is what they are after, why not treat them honestly and give them the right to do business on the scale they want to do it and not hang onto them something we do not care anything about because they are already under the general law which has been enacted and not repealed, and until that general law has been repealed, then the general law is enough without any special law.

So they go a step farther, my friends, and say that the general law might be unconstitutional; and, if it should happen to be unconstitutional, then we want to tag them again. Why, my friends, if it is right for any one of you individuals to do a certain thing under the Constitution of the State of Maine, are you willing to have this legislature circumscribe by a special law affecting you alone? That is what is attempted to be done by these particular amendments which are added to the individual corporations,—that if the general law under the Constitution is not correct you can tag them one at a time as they come up by limiting them where the Constitution did not intend to limit them and does not otherwise limit them, and where the people as a whole have not spoken. I protest, Mr. Speaker, against useless legislation. If it is the policy of the State to do these things

which we have heard so much about, then let's make a test of it and send one thing to the people—and I will vote to send any of these things to the people if we want to try out the policy of the State, because I am not here to vote against the wishes of the people or do anything that is against the building up of the State of Maine or the benefit of the people at large; but I do protest against any one man assuming that he stands for the rights of all the people, and that the rest of us stand here for the rights of none of the people. As I have said, if this thing wants to be tested out to find out what is behind the matter, and whether or not it is the policy of the people, let's attach one of those things to something and send it to the people next September and if not let's put them aside and live under a general law as long as we believe that law is right; and when we do not believe the law is right, then let's amend it and make it right or altogether repeal it.

Mr. CLARKE of Standolpn: Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Cole, and I would like to add about four words. It seems to me that the people at home are looking to us—the people of the State of Maine are looking to us to preserve their rights. I am going to join with the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Baxter, in trying to save the rights of the people of the State of Maine. (Applause.)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Baxter, that House Amendment A, which was read to the House, be adopted. Is the House ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being had,  
House Amendment A was adopted.

On further motion by Mr. Baxter of Portland, the bill as amended by House Amendment A was passed to be engrossed, in concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House majority and minority reports of committee on inland fisheries and game, majority re-

porting "ought to pass", and minority reporting "ought not to pass," on Senate Document No. 210, "An Act to create the office of Commissioner of Inland fisheries and Game and to abolish the office of Commissioners of Inland Fisheries and Game."

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Berry, was called away suddenly, and has asked that this be laid on the table until tomorrow.

On motion by Mr. Allan of Portland, the reports were retabled until tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House An Act additional to Chapter 433 of the Private and Special Laws of 1907, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Portland water district," tabled by Mr. Rounds of Portland pending its third reading,—being House Document No. 568.

On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House An Act to provide for the payment of a bounty on bears killed in the State, being House Document No. 549, tabled by Mr. Clifford of Reed Plantation.

On motion by Mr. Clifford of Reed Plantation, the House voted to non-concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the bill.

On further motion by the same gentleman the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed on March 20th.

The same gentleman then offered House Amendment A to House Document 549, as follows:

"Amend said House Document 549 by adding thereto the following sections:

"Sect. 5: The bounty so paid by the state treasurer shall be taken from the fees received from the licenses of dogs in the State of Maine.

Sect. 6. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed."

The amendment was adopted.

On further motion by Mr. Clifford the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House Senate Document 340, An Act to amend Section 76 of Chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to any town raising money to secure free use of library in adjoining town, tabled on motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Allan.

Mr. ALLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, that matter has got my name attached to it, I do not know for what reason. I have no interest in it.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that this bill was passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee, according to the endorsement on the bill.

Under a suspension of the rules the bill then had its three several readings and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House House Document 544, An Act to authorize the town of Yarmouth to supply gas and electricity, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Wilson, pending the adoption of Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Wilson of Portland, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House An Act to amend Paragraph 15, Section 45, Chapter 117, Revised Statutes, relative to clerk hire in the office of register of deeds in Waldo county, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Wilson, pending acceptance of majority report in concurrence with the Senate.

Mr. WILSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I tabled that on Saturday in the absence of the gentleman from

Belfast, Mr. Buzzell, who is interested in it. I yield to him.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Buzzell.

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, I move you that the majority report be accepted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that this matter comes before you on the report of the committee, "ought not to pass," on bill, "An Act to amend Paragraph 15, Section 45, Chapter 117, Revised Statutes, relative to clerk hire in the office of register of deeds in Waldo county. On March 20, on motion by Mr. Buzzell of Belfast, the bill was substituted for the report; and in the Senate on March 21, the report "ought not to pass" was accepted.

Mr. BUZZELL: We had a committee of conference, Mr. Speaker, appointed, and it went back to the Senate and they voted to adhere; so I move you that the report be accepted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will inform the gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Buzzell, that the report of the committee of conference does not appear to be with the papers.

Mr. BUZZELL: That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I move you that it lie on the table until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair is informed by the Clerk that the conference papers are not with the other papers; but the motion of the gentleman from Belfast (Mr. Buzzell) is in order that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the report "ought not to pass."

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House the minority and majority reports from the committee on salaries and fees, majority reporting "ought not to pass" and minority reporting "ought to pass," on "An Act to amend Chapter 337, Public Laws of 1915, relating to clerk hire in the registry of deeds of York county," tabled by

the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Stanley.

Mr. PATTEE of Harmony: Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Dixfield, Mr. Stanley, I move that these reports be taken from the table, and the majority report accepted.

Mr. COLE of Elliot: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which affects York county entirely, and relates to the services of three young ladies in the registry of deeds' office. One of those young ladies has been there nearly twenty-five years—and I say "young" advisedly. Another, a sister of the former, has been there about twenty years, and still another has been there some five or six years. Those of us who know the registry of deeds in York county realize that it is an office in which the clerical service is efficient. They are almost perfect penmen—all of them; and, as you are aware, deeds have to be recorded by hand-written out in longhand. They are thoroughly competent to run the office. One of them acts as deputy, and it has been many and many a long year since they have had a raise, although the high cost of living has struck them as much as anyone else. I think the elder of the two sisters is today getting some eleven dollars a week; the other is getting nine something; and one of them around eight something. The register of deeds two years ago when the matter of readjustment came up was just elected, and before that time our register of deeds had died in office, and the clerk of courts was filling out his term, so that he knew nothing of the work. The work at that time for a long period was carried on by these three ladies pending the regular election of a register of deeds and his taking office the following January. As I say, when the readjustment of salaries came up, they were not properly represented. The register of deeds knew nothing about them and knew nothing of the salaries they were receiving; and it is at his request, and in behalf of the entire delegation of York county, that I ask you gentlemen to allow the county of York to increase these three girls'

salaries to the amount of \$250, to be divided among the three according to the idea of the register of deeds as to their merit and worth. This is only what would be done in any private concern to a clerical force which had been in office as long as they have and which was as efficient as they are.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, this was heard before the committee on salaries and fees, and, as I understand it, the solid delegation from York was represented there by the gentleman from Elliot, Mr. Cole, and others. It was suggested that they should have a raise. These girls only ask for a little mite; but I tabled a bill, No. 689, this morning, in which a judge of the supreme court who, on retiring has been allowed half pay, now asks for two-thirds pay, making an increase of \$833. Yet we cannot give these young ladies, although it is not the State of Maine that has got to pay it, this little increase. For the reason stated, I support the minority report at the present time.

Mr. ALLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, while I am not personally interested in a York county matter, I want to say that I know something of the work of these young ladies over there at Alfred. I know what work they have done for years. I know how well they have done it and what they have to contend with. I also know that their salaries are small. I only hope—and I think many of the Portland lawyers will agree with me—that the minority report may be accepted. I think they ought to have the increase, rather than to hold them where they are.

The pending question being the motion that the majority report, "ought not to pass," be accepted.

And a viva voce vote being had,

The majority report was rejected.

Mr. ALLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the minority report.

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, the act just before this provides for an increase relative to clerk hire in the office of the Waldo county



registry of deeds. One of those girls is fifty odd years old and is only getting six dollars a week. I have fought that proposition from the House to the Senate, and from the Senate back to the House, to the last ditch, and finally I moved that the report be taken care of here. However, the watch dogs of the treasury were too much for me, although our county treasury paid the bills. Now to show that my heart is in the right place, notwithstanding that bill has fallen by the wayside, I want to second the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Allan. (Applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: It is moved and seconded that the minority report "ought to pass" be accepted.

The motion prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Buzzell of Belfast, the bill then received its three several readings under suspension of the rules, and was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: This brings the House to the consideration, if it chooses, of those matters which are tabled and unassigned.

Mr. ALLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, at this time I would call up House Document 101, which is a Portland matter, to straighten out the difficulties between this and another bill, and I have an amendment to offer.

On motion of Mr. Allan of Portland, House Document 101, An Act to repeal Chapter 134 of the Special Laws of 1831, entitled "An Act establishing a fire department in the town of Portland"; Sections 1, 3 and 4 of Chapter 167 of the Special Laws of 1853, entitled "An Act relating to the City of Portland"; Chapter 285 of the Special Laws of 1854, entitled "An Act respecting the erection of wooden buildings in the City of Portland," was taken from the table.

The same gentleman presented House Amendment A, as follows, and moved its adoption:

"Amend by striking out the last three lines of said act."

The amendment was adopted.

On further motion by the same gen-

tleman, the bill then had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A."

On motion by Mr. Allan of Portland, House report of the committee on public utilities, reporting "ought not to pass," on House Document 286, "An Act to amend the charter of the Portland Water District," was taken from the table, and on further motion by the same gentleman the report was accepted.

(Speaker Bonney in the Chair)

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Houlton, House Document No. 615, An Act to amend Section 9, Chapter 29, Revised Statutes, entitled "Soldiers and sailors not to be considered paupers," was taken from the table; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. FARRINGTON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that we take from the table Senate Document 328, Resolve in favor of the General Knox Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution of Thomaston, Maine, and the Knox Academy of Arts and Sciences, the pending question being the passage to be engrossed in concurrence. I move that that be referred to the next legislature as one of those resolves which carries an appropriation of \$25,000. I feel that it would be the sense of the House that it ought to go over to the next legislature in non-concurrence.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FARRINGTON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that we take from the table House Document 596, An Act relating to State stipend for support of public library. I have an amendment which I wish to offer. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is designed simply to correct some clerical errors in the bill which the committee on bills in the third reading could not take care of.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington, moves that we take from the table House Document 596,

and offers House Amendment A, which the Chair will not read unless asked to do so, if the House is satisfied with the explanation of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farrington.

On further motion by Mr. Farrington, House Amendment "A" was adopted; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A."

Mr. FARRINGTON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that we take from the table House Document 672, An Act to amend Section 36, of Chapter 58 of the Revised Statutes, relating to discontinuance of street railroad service, tabled by me March 24 pending second reading, and I yield to the gentleman from York, Mr. Ellis, for whom I tabled it.

Mr. ELLIS of York: Mr. Speaker, I move that it be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KNIGHT of Kennebunk: Mr. Speaker, I second the motion that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WILSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I will say that I hope that the motion of the gentleman from York (Mr. Ellis) will not prevail. The gentleman from York has insisted, ever since this bill was introduced in the House, that there was some sinister purpose in it. They have spent a great deal of printer's ink in circulating documents insisting that this bill was intended for the sole purpose of discontinuing their railroad. This bill was never designed to apply especially to their railroad, and has no more connection with it than with the railroad out here in front of the State Capitol. The amendment was made at the suggestion of the public utilities committee. The bill was held over in the committee for one or two weeks, and was finally amended in the matter of appeal, so that after a hearing before the municipal officers, either the corporation affected or 10 voters of the town affected, might then appeal to the commission for a further hearing. There is nothing in the bill that is intended to injure anyone, and it has been represented by the Utilities Com-

mission that the bill should pass. The main object of this would be to allow street railroads on proper procedure to take up a portion of unused track, sleepers, and so forth. We had a case in Portland where a track went out to the old Rigby Park—some two or three miles of track that was not used and never could be used. It was all gone, and the railroad company, desired to remove that track, but they had to do so at their own peril. There was no legal authority by which they could do it. With this act in effect they would have been allowed to have applied to the municipal officers of South Portland, and, if necessary, to appeal to the commission for authority to take up those old rails and sleepers. Now this act primarily simply amends the present law. The present law says that, on petition to the municipal officers, any street railroad corporation may be allowed to suspend service during the winter months. This bill took out the words "during the winter months," and says "during such time and upon such terms and conditions" as may be contemplated by municipal officers or on appeal to the commission. It does not affect the gentleman from York (Mr. Ellis); it does not effect anyone directly so far as I know. It simply broadens out the statute and gives the Utilities Commission a little more freedom, and will not injure anyone. I hope the motion will not prevail.

Mr. ELLIS of York: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that that is just what we are asking. We think the Public Utilities Commission has got law enough, and we do not like for them to have the right to do this at any time they see fit. I have been following this along for a long time, and I do know that the railroad interests are back of this somewhere. I hope the gentlemen here will vote to have this indefinitely postponed.

The pending question being the motion of the gentleman from York, Mr. Ellis, that the bill be indefinitely postponed,

And a viva voce vote being taken,

The motion of the gentleman from York, Mr. Ellis, prevailed, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Dutton of Bingham, bill, An Act amendatory of and additional to Chapter 44, Private and Special Laws of 1887, relating to the Skowhegan Water District, was taken from the table.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is concurrent action with the Senate. In the Senate, under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its two readings and passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Dutton, the bill was given its three several readings under suspension of the rules, and the bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, Senate report of committee on salaries and fees, reporting "ought not to pass" on "An Act relating to clerk hire in the office of the clerk of courts for York County," was taken from the table.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the acceptance of the report in concurrence.

Mr. COLE of Eliot: Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be substituted for the report. I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to inflict myself upon these members here any more than possible; but I am more than glad to stand up here for any young lady who earns her living and advocate that she should get as much as any other young lady would get for her ability and service. We have in the clerk of court's office in York county a young lady who has been there for some twelve years, as efficient as any one can be, and there is allotted for clerk hire in that office \$750. There are portions of the year when the clerk of courts is obliged to hire assistance outside. This young lady does not feel like cutting her salary, and he pays that clerk hire out of his own pocket, which you and I will agree is not a square deal. I come again with the backing of the entire delegation of York county for an appropriation to take care of that extra clerk hire, and give this present young lady a raise in salary such as they are all getting all over the land at the present time. I hope the bill will be substituted for the report.

The pending question being the motion of the gentleman from York, Mr. Cole, that the bill be substituted for the report.

The motion prevailed.

On further motion by Mr. Cole of Eliot, the rules were suspended, and the bill had its three several readings and was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Wilson of Portland, House Document 624, bill An Act relating to insurance, was taken from the table.

Mr. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Harman.

Mr. HARMAN of Stonington: Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of House amendment "A" to House Document 624.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Harman, moves the adoption of House amendment "A", which the Chair will read. Amend House Document No. 624, entitled "An Act relating to insurance," by striking out of said act after the words, "use of said companies" in the ninth line thereof, so that the said act when amended shall read as follows:

"The insurance commissioner may require the filing of specific rates for Workmen's Compensation insurance including classifications of risks, experience or any other rating information from insurance companies authorized to transact such insurance in Maine, and may make or cause to be made such investigations as may be deemed necessary to satisfy himself that such rates are correct and proper before giving his approval and permitting such rates to be promulgated for the use of said companies."

The amendment was adopted.

On further motion by Mr. Harman of Stonington, the bill as amended by House amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Farrington of Augusta, the majority and minority reports of the committee on salaries and

fees, majority reporting "ought not to pass", and minority reporting "ought to pass," on "An Act to amend Section 43, Chapter 117, Revised Statutes, relating to the salary of the register of deeds for Kennebec county," was taken from the table.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the minority report, "ought to pass"; and I will state that the register of deeds for Kennebec county was not in at the readjustment of salaries several years ago. For some reason or other he was not present, and he has felt that the salary he is receiving is not equivalent to what is being received by the registers of other counties. I move that we accept the minority report "ought to pass."

Mr. BOMAN of Vinalhaven: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that this is an increase in salary for the register of deeds of Kennebec County?

The SPEAKER: The Chair so understands it.

Mr. BOMAN: I wish to ask what the increase is.

Mr. FARRINGTON: I will answer the gentleman through the Chair that it is from \$1500 to \$2000, unanimously voted by the Kennebec delegation and was recommended in the committee. These bills, of course, are to be paid by the county, and it does not mean any expense to the state whatsoever. This Register of Deeds was not before the readjustment committee of several years ago, and this matter was not considered at all. I think that is well known to the committee.

The minority report was accepted.

On further motion by Mr. Farrington, the rules were suspended, and the bill had its three several readings and was passed to be engrossed.

---

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Houlton, Adjourned until 9.30 tomorrow morning.