

# 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

Eighty-Fourth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1929

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Wednesday, March 27, 1929.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Moyle of Hallowell.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

**Senate Bills in First Reading**

(S. P. 723) (S. D. 374) An act to amend Public Laws, 1923, Chapter 87, relating to lobster licenses.

(S. P. 721) (S. D. 372) An act relating to lobster licenses.

(S. P. 718) (S. D. 370) An act to provide for the inspection of gasoline.

(S. P. 720) (S. D. 371) An act to amend Sections 41, 44, 45, 53 and 54 of Chapter 18 of the Revised Statutes, relating to optometry.

(S. P. 440) (S. D. 180) An act relating to licenses of small loan agencies by the Bank Commissioner.

From the Senate: Resolve in favor of the State Reformatory for Women for the erection of a house for mothers and babies, H. P. 185, H. D. 663, which was passed to be engrossed in the House, March 19th.

Comes from the Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in non-concurrence.

In the House, Senate Amendment A read.

Thereupon the House voted to reconsider its action whereby this resolve was passed to be engrossed; Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the resolve as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Legal Affairs reporting ought to pass on bill an act in relation to the rights of creditors and beneficiaries under policies of life and accident insurance and under annuity contracts, S. P. 556, S. D. 223,

Comes from the Senate report read and accepted, Senate Amendment A offered and withdrawn, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment B.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence, and the bill had its two readings. Thereupon the Clerk read Senate Amendment B, which was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended was assigned for tomorrow for its third reading.

**Reports of Committees**

Mr. Webster for the Committees on Public Utilities, Judiciary and Interior Waters jointly on bill an act to provide for the use of surplus power (H. P. 1390) (H. D. 461) reported that legislation thereon is inexpedient.

(Tabled by Mr. Peacock of Readfield pending acceptance of report)

Mr. Holman from the Committee on Revision of Statutes reported same on bill an act relative to absent voting (H. P. 1283) (H. D. 440)

Mr. Melcher from the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation reported same on resolve for the maintenance of the State Park at Mere Point (H. P. 1391)

Mr. Jones from the Committee on Ways and Bridges reported same on resolve in favor of the towns of Standish and Limington (H. P. 571) as it is covered by another bill.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on resolve in favor of the town of Newry (H. P. 934) as it is covered by another bill.

Mr. Farris from the Committee on Judiciary reported ought not to pass on bill an act relative to the terms of the Supreme Judicial Court of York County (H. P. 414) (H. D. 125)

Mr. McCart from same Committee reported same on bill an act to amend Section 25 of Chapter 87 of the Revised Statutes, relating to change of venue in the Supreme Judicial Court and Superior Court (H. P. 1545) (H. D. 563)

Mr. Farris from same Committee reported same on bill an act relative to terms of Hancock Supreme Judicial Court (H. P. 57) (H. D. 26)

Mr. Williamson from same Committee reported same on bill an act relating to the terms of Superior Court for the county of Kennebec (H. P. 1607) (H. D. 605)

Mr. Peacock from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on bill an act to create a Board of Registration of Master Plumbers

(H. P. 607) (H. D. 178) together with remonstrances.

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Rounds from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of H. E. Houdlette, Administrator of the Estate of Benjamin Owen Emmons, late of Richmond, county of Sagadahoc, deceased (H. P. 636) (H. D. 188) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1696) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Same gentleman from same Committee on Communication from State Auditor transmitting statement of deficiencies reported a resolve under title of resolve to pay certain deficiencies (H. P. 1695) and that it ought to pass.

Mr. MacKinnon from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on resolve in favor of screening Piper Pond or Sylvan Lake, so called. (H. P. 1538) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1690) under title of a resolve in favor of screening Whetstone Pond, or Sylvan Lake, so called, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Farris from the Committee on Judiciary on bill an act relating to the consolidation of corporations. (H. P. 409) (H. D. 120) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1693) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Wing from same Committee on bill an act relating to the time and place of holding the Commissioners' Court in York County. (H. P. 601) (H. D. 173) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1692) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Same gentleman from same Committee on bill an act relating to the regular sessions of County Commissioners of Hancock County. (H. P. 1548) (H. D. 565) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1691) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. McCart from same Committee on resolve in relation to the completion of the seventh revision of the General and Public Laws and appointing a commissioner therefor and a commission. (H. P. 1649) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1697) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Hammond from the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation on resolve to modify the

conditions of the gift from B. C. Jordan to the State of Maine for the purpose of encouraging cultivation of forests. (H. P. 734) (H. D. 384) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1694) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Reports read and accepted and the new drafts ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. Kitchen from the Committee on Ways and Bridges reported ought to pass on bill an act relating to the removal of snow from highways and town ways. (H. P. 1223) (H. D. 408.)

Report read and accepted and the bill having already been printed was read twice under suspension of the rules and tomorrow assigned.

Majority report of the Committee on Judiciary on bill an act to modify the practice on pleas in abatement. (H. P. 1409) (H. D. 471) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1688) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. OAKES of Cumberland  
MARTIN of Kennebec  
—Of the Senate  
WILLIAMSON of Augusta  
ALDRICH of Topsham  
Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland  
—Of the House

Minority report of same committee reporting ought not to pass on same bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. WEEKS of Somerset  
—Of the Senate  
Messrs. FARRIS of Augusta  
HOLMAN of Farmington  
McCART of Eastport  
—Of the House

On motion by Mr. McCart of Eastport both reports tabled, pending acceptance of either, and 500 copies of the new draft ordered printed.

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act to regulate the manufacture of bedding and upholstery (H. P. 1219) (H. D. 410) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1689) under title of an act to regulate the manufacture of bedding and that it ought to pass.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DWINAL of Knox  
 CROSBY of Penobscot  
     —Of the Senate  
 PEACOCK of Readfield  
 SARGENT of Brewer  
 BELLEAU of Lewiston  
 BLAISDELL of Franklin  
 TAYLOR of Belfast  
 JACK of Lisbon Falls  
     —Of the House

Minority Report of same committee reporting ought not to pass on same bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MURCHIE of Washington  
     —Of the Senate  
 BURKETT of Portland  
     —Of the House

On motion by Mr. Carleton of Portland, both reports tabled, pending acceptance of either, and 500 copies of the new draft ordered printed.

Majority report of the committee on Public Utilities, Judiciary and Interior Waters jointly reporting ought not to pass on joint order relative to water power investigation. (H. D. 11)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. WEATHERBEE of Penobscot  
 GREENLEAF of Androscoggin  
 DOUGLAS of Hancock  
 MINOTT of Cumberland  
 CARLTON of Sagadahoc  
 WEEKS of Somerset  
 OAKES of Cumberland  
 MARTIN of Kennebec

Mrs. PINKHAM of Aroostook  
     —Of the Senate

Messrs. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth  
 HATHAWAY of Milo  
 HUGHES of Mapleton  
 BISHOP of Boothbay Harbor  
 TUCKER of Sanford  
 COMINS of Eddington  
 FARRIS of Augusta  
 HOLMAN of Farmington  
 POWERS of Caribou  
 WEBSTER of Auburn  
 HUBBARD of Plymouth  
 ADAMS of Linneus  
 MILLIKEN of Old Orchard  
 QUINT of Limerick  
 WILLIAMSON of Augusta  
 McCART of Eastport  
 BOSTON of Gardiner  
 ROBIE of Westbrook

WING of Kingfield  
 Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland  
     —Of the House  
 Minority Report of same Committee reporting ought to pass on same joint order.  
 Report was signed by the following member:  
 Mr. ALDRICH of Topsham  
     —Of the House

On motion by Mr. Aldrich of Topsham both reports tabled, pending acceptance of either.

**Communication From the State Highway Commission**

STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION  
 State of Maine  
 Augusta

To the House of Representatives,  
 Maine Legislature:

In compliance with the order of March 20, 1929, as then passed in your House, we respectfully transmit to you all information in possession of our Department connected with and concerning demand of J. N. Norris as mentioned in said order.

Respectfully submitted  
 (Signed) CLYDE H. SMITH  
 CHARLES MURRAY  
 EDWIN CLIFFORD

Members of the Maine State Highway Commission

On motion by Mr. Leonard of Hampden, the communication was ordered placed on file, and on motion by Mr. St. Clair of Rockland 500 copies of the communication and accompanying papers ordered printed.

**First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves**

(H. P. 618) (H. D. 742) An act relating to the salary of the Judge of Probate in Aroostook County.

(H. P. 695) (H. D. 743) An act relating to the salary of the Municipal Court Recorder of Sanford.

(H. P. 1441) (H. D. 744) An act increasing the salary of the County Attorney of Waldo County.

(H. P. 1683) (H. D. 745) An act making it unlawful for depositing sawdust in the limits of the highway.

(H. P. 1684) (H. D. 746) An act relating to the salary of the Sheriff of Oxford County.

(H. P. 1685) (H. D. 747) An act relating to the salary of the County Commissioners in Oxford County.

(H. P. 1686) (H. D. 748) An act relating to the salary and clerk hire of the Register of Probate in Aroostook County.

(H. P. 1687) (H. D. 749) An act relating to the Western Washington Municipal Court.

#### Passed to be Engrossed

(S. P. 145) (S. D. 66) An act relating to optometry.

(S. P. 371) (S. D. 158) An act relating to mothers with dependent children.

(S. P. 690) (S. D. 366) An act to acquire the property of the Arrow-  
sic Bridge.

(S. P. 694) (S. D. 369) An act relating to the protection of silver, silver black and black foxes, and providing a penalty.

(H. P. 1682) (H. D. 741) An act to provide for the building of a highway bridge across the Kennebec River between the towns of Richmond and Dresden.

(S. P. 692) (S. D. 368) Resolve appropriating money for the study and control of the birch saw-fly leaf miner and birch case bearer.

(H. P. 657) (H. D. 198) Resolve to reimburse the town of Benton for expenses of a person in quarantine.

#### Passed to be Enacted

(S. P. 34) (S. D. 312) An act to incorporate the New England Finance Corporation.

(S. P. 65) (S. D. 36) An act relating to fees of sheriffs and their deputies.

(S. P. 593) (S. D. 260) An act relative to enforcement of motor vehicle laws.

(S. P. 601) (S. D. 269) An act relative to notice on application by municipal officers for appointment of guardians.

#### Finally Passed

(S. P. 47) (S. D. 27) Resolve in favor of the Bangor State Hospital for additional equipment and renovations.

(S. P. 685) (S. D. 361) Resolve in favor of Emmerson J. Hills and Alice S. Hills of Belmont for damages.

(S. P. 687) (S. D. 358) Resolve in favor of the Northern Maine Sanatorium for the construction and equipment of a Nurses' Home.

(H. P. 1654) (H. D. 685) Resolve in favor of Caratunk Plantation.

#### Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents to the House the first matter today assigned bill an act to amend the charter of the city of Westbrook in reference to reducing the number of its aldermen, and increasing the time of their office as well as that of the mayor and the board of assessors, H. P. 1660, H. D. 695, tabled on March 21 by the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Robie, the pending question being second reading; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Robie the bill received its second reading and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the second matter today assigned, report of the committee on Towns on bill an act to re-establish the town line between the towns of Hancock and Lamoine, which comes from the Senate the report read and accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A, the bill being tabled on March 21 by the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. McCart, the pending question being the acceptance of the report in concurrence; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. McCart.

Mr. McCART: Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield to the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. McLean.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. McCart, yields to the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. McLean.

On motion by Mr. McLean the report of the committee on Towns ought to pass was accepted in concurrence.

Mr. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment A for the following reasons:

The committee on Towns had a hearing on this matter and they took into consideration the people who were for a division of the lines and those who were against such division. At that hearing there was presented a good many more facts than I am able to present before this body. The report of the committee was accepted in the Senate and the bill had its several readings and was amended by an amendment which would completely change the

report. I believe that the reason that amendment was accepted was because, maybe, they did not have the facts, and I will read, with your permission, a portion of the Legislative Record of March 18. This is Senator Douglas' arguing for the amendment, "I make this assertion that those people actually want to come to Lamoine, that a good part of the town of Hancock want them to come, that Lamoine wants them to come. I believe it is right that they should and I am asking you to allow them to come by striking off from the original bill the referendum."

It seems that those people living there should have something to say about this matter themselves. If you were to believe that, you would think they did not need a referendum.

First I wish to say to you that the town of Hancock, which I represent, desires very much the privilege of the referendum, and I will read the following letter addressed to me here at the Capitol from the selectmen of that town: "In appreciation of the vote of this town instructing its selectmen to take action to prevent the passage of an act in the Legislature to separate the Marlboro district from the town of Hancock and realizing the nearly unanimous sentiments of its citizens including the district affected against its passage, the municipal officers of this town urgently request you to prevent passage of any amendment in the House that will deprive the voters of the town the privilege of voting upon it." This was signed by the three selectmen.

Next I wish to show to you that the town of Lamoine which would, if this amendment were adopted, become the parent town of this village—I have a telegram here from the Selectmen of the town of Lamoine addressed to me, as follows: "Sentiment here neutral on Lamoine-Hancock line bill as reported from committee. Strenuously opposed to bill as passed by Senate without referendum feature. Such action contrary to best interests of either town are likely to cause serious and unfortunate hard feeling for a long time." Signed by "Selectmen of Lamoine, C.

Dewey Smith and Harry M. Woods."

There is a little village affected by this that they would change from one town to another; and I received from them at 2 P. M. on the afternoon of March 20 the following telegram: "Please do all you can for us on Senate Bill 103, annexation of Marlboro to Lamoine to obtain a referendum for us."

As I said before, I am representing the town of Hancock. The village of Marlboro is a part of the town of Hancock, and I am representing that village also. I got that appeal after the Senate had adopted this amendment striking out the referendum. I got in touch with some of the residents of the little village of Marlboro over the telephone. That was not satisfactory; so the last week-end I drove 260 miles to get in closer contact with the situation. I found several things that I did not know about the community and I found that the sentiment in that town was almost unanimously in favor of a referendum and against the amendment. On Monday I received the following letter addressed to me at the Capitol: "Dear Mr. McLean: Am sending you a list of Marlboro all-the-year residents that wish to retain the referendum vote, and we will appreciate very much your assistance in helping us to retain it. We all feel by letting it go to a vote of the two towns that everyone concerned would be given a square deal, and that is all we ask. Then if we are by vote of the two towns annexed to Lamoine we would accept the decision as we should.

There are a few facts I would like you to know. Mr. L. L. Brown does not live here during the winter and spring and at present writing is living in Ellsworth." Mr. Brown is the chief proponent of this bill as was said. "Also I want to give you separate lists of our non-residents and our residents. As I have been told that Mr. Brown has them all under one list. On the petition he presented I also understand he has the name H. K. Burgess, Thomas Powell and Roy Galla on that petition. Now H. K. Burgess is only a week-end visitor at his wife's mother's, Mrs. Ella Flye, who owns the cottage.

"Thomas Powell has not spent even a week-end here in the last 10 years.

"And Roy Galla is a name that is not at all familiar to me, in fact I never heard the name, and as a rule I know or hear all the new names each summer, as I am postmaster here.

"Another family that moves away in winter is Mr. and Mrs. Otto Johnson and Sylvia Johnson.

"We hope this will help and we thank you for your interest in this matter and hope to have an opportunity to help you at some time in the near future. I remain, Yours very truly, (Signed) Shirley B. Hodgkins, Postmaster."

I also have from this little village that is so affected by the decision of the Legislature the following petition sent to me: "To the Honorable Legislature of Maine assembled, Greeting: We, the undersigned citizens of Marlboro, in the town of Hancock, respectfully petition that the Referendum Clause be retained in Senate Bill 103."

This petition is signed by fourteen of the citizens representing seven out of the nine families living there.

Now it seems that those of us who live near enough to this section should know what is wanted by them. It seems only fair that the town of Hancock, which would lose this portion of their town, should have something to say in regard to the matter. It seems, on the other hand, also logical that the town of Lamoine, which would become the parent town, should have something to say in regard to the matter; and, last but not least, it seems to me that these people in this little village should have something to say about it themselves. As their Representative in this Legislature I ask you to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment A (Applause)

Mr. SARGENT of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, in order that the members of the House may more correctly understand the geographical situation of this town of Lamoine, I will ask the Messenger to turn the map so that the members may see it.

On motion by Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth, the rules were suspended and the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Sargent, was accorded permission by the House to come to the front of the House and point out

to the members certain matters on the map to which he wished to call attention.

Mr. SARGENT continuing: In order that the members of the House may more correctly understand the geographical location of the land under discussion I will point out the town lines as they now exist. The town of Hancock is on the right of the map and the portion of Marlboro in controversy is on the left of what is known as Skillings River which runs up around here (indicating). Skillings River would probably be designated by the members of the House more properly as an inlet or bay. Salt water makes up in here (indicating), the tide rushing on as Sherm said "ebbing and flowing twice a day." It has a long ways to go so it only gets there twice a day. However at this point it is narrow and the tide rushes up there at the rate of about nine or ten miles an hour and rushes back. The town line of Hancock runs down through this portion (indicating), so that this little point of land here (indicating) is in the town of Hancock and this portion out through here (indicating) is Marlboro; and this (indicating) is the part they desire to be set off into the town of Lamoine.

Now, if the members will look at the map they will see that, geographically, there is no question but that this part of the town of Hancock (indicating) should be a part of the town of Lamoine. This (indicating) is the one road in the town of Marlboro which runs down through here, up here and out through here (indicating), going along in a northerly direction over to the city of Ellsworth so that the travel from the hamlet of Marlboro must necessarily be through—except a mile or half a mile—through the town of Lamoine. The town of Lamoine, therefore, has to keep up the road over which these people get out. Now if they want to get them into their own town, they must go way up around the head of this bay (indicating), which is the nearest way, about twelve miles. If they want to go over a good road they have probably got to go eighteen miles up around or cross the river by boat.

I think I have explained the relative position of the two little



pieces of land that would be set off into the town of Lamoine, and the rest of my argument, I will make from my seat.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Sargent, has not yielded the floor:

Mr. SARGENT continuing from his seat: In regard to the setting off of this town, I wish to call the attention of the members that this land which the gentleman from Bar Harbor (Mr. McLean) speaks of is a part of that beautiful land of Acadia which the genial and hospitable Sherm explained the other day it was to these shores that Patrick Gookin, now called Googins, as he said, came in the year 1762, and it was on these shores that he raised a family whose descendants have gone out into the world and married and who hold distinguished positions,—lawyers, judges and doctors.

In regard to the referendum, I wish to say that in the year 1658, when Massachusetts assumed and asserted her right over the State of Maine, there was one county which was called Yorkshire county, and in 1760, there were set off from Yorkshire county two counties, Cumberland and Lincoln. In 1799 there were set off from those counties Hancock and Kennebec, and so on, down to 1864 when the county of Sagadahoc was set off. In 1789 the towns of Sullivan and Trenton were incorporated and in 1828 the town of Hancock was incorporated, part from the town of Sullivan and part from the town of Trenton, and in 1870 Lamoine was set off from the town of Trenton. Now was there referendum on those bills? When the town of Lamoine was set off from the town of Trenton in 1870 was there a referendum on that bill? I think not. Since then there have been numerous bills passed in this Legislature setting off one part of a town from another. In the year 1915 I think the town of South Bristol was set off from the town of Bristol, and only four years ago the town of Beals was set off from the town of Jonesport, but I do not think there was any referendum. As a matter of fact, the referendum is simply a matter of "passing the buck," a good many times, or "letting George do it" as the old expression is. I would like to ask the members of this House,

with the hamlet of Marlboro having about 44 inhabitants, 44 to 50, and the town of Hancock having about 500—500 voters I believe—how fair would it be to submit the setting off of the hamlet of Marlboro to the inhabitants of the town of Hancock? You and I know that if ever submitted to the people, without doubt propaganda would be circulated in the town of Hancock showing that Henry Ford or Insull was about to establish some kind of an industry in the town of Marlboro.

The hamlet of Marlboro has existed, as has been stated, about one hundred years. I happen to have in my office a map of the town of Hancock and I referred to it on my recent visit home and I found that in the year 1860 there were nine families in the hamlet of Marlboro, and I think the gentleman from Bar Harbor (Mr. McLean) has stated that there are nine families there today and that a representative from that town has sent a petition or a letter to him. Now that is not conclusive. As I understand it was stated before the committee that practically three-quarters of the inhabitants of the hamlet of Marlboro sent a petition saying that they desired to be set off and become a part of the town of Lamoine. Now I am not able to state because I am not very much interested in a way. I have had no telegrams sent to me and no letters, and I am not able to refute the statement of the gentleman from Bar Harbor (Mr. McLean) whether the inhabitants, or a majority of them, desire this or not: but it seems to me that it is a question for this Legislature to decide for themselves whether it would be justice to the people of Marlboro to be set off into the town of Lamoine or whether they should remain as a part of the town of Hancock.

The gentleman has said that the people who are interested in this bill, two of them at least, did not spend the winter in the town of Marlboro. There is good reason why they did not spend the winter there because the town of Hancock does not plough out the roads, as I understand, in the hamlet of Marlboro and they have to get out in the fall. The town of Lamoine would keep the roads open and

that is one of the reasons they want to go in as a part of the town of Lamoine. If one does not get out of there in the winter he has to stay until spring or else get out in a boat.

Conditions are a good deal different in the year 1929 than they were back in the year 1870. In 1870, I submit to you members of the House, practically all the travel was to the coast and from the coast. There were small steamers plying between different ports and it was easier for a man to leave Marlboro at that time than it was to leave from the town of Lamoine; but today, with the advent of the automobile, traffic instead of going east, as it went at that time, goes west. The trunk line over the Bar Harbor road has reached practically to the northern part of Lamoine and there have been good roads built down into Lamoine, so that it is easier today for those people to travel from the town of Lamoine to get to the city of Ellsworth. About 1885 the railroad was put down through there, the shore line railroad, to the town of Hancock and travel was easy by this railroad.

It was easier for those people to cross that river and reach the station at Mt. Desert Ferry. It was the easiest way of getting out of the hamlet of Marlboro; but today, as I say, the natural way is to leave the place by automobile.

Now there are some people, even in the town of Hancock, who believe that this ought to be set off and be made a part of the town of Hancock. I have here in my hand a letter that was given to me by Mr. Douglas which states: "I have always been and am still in favor of the community called Marlboro becoming a part of Lamoine as it geographically belongs there. I should not favor a referendum for the reason that it might cause some feeling which I dislike in any town or community." This was signed by Albert B. Crabtree, who I understand is the President of the Liberty National Bank of Ellsworth and treasurer of the town of Hancock for the past forty years, and as I understand, the most prominent citizen and one who owns the most property in the town of Hancock. I have another paper here which reads: "As

one of the petitioners heading a remonstrance against the adopting of the town line between Hancock and Lamoine, I beg to advise all concerned that I signed the petition because of insufficient information, and I am now convinced that to offer this to a referendum to the respective towns would be a serious matter. It would surely arouse a bitter feeling that would best be avoided by the referendum's absence." That letter is signed by William M. Gallison, a former selectman and now Chairman of the School Board of the town of Hancock. So it seems that even the prominent citizens of the town of Hancock realize that there is justice in the desire of the hamlet of Marlboro to be set off and to become a part of the town of Lamoine.

I have here in my hand a copy of a bill that was introduced at the last session of the Legislature, the Eighty-third Legislature. This bill was presented by the Honorable gentleman, Mr. McLean, and it reads: "An act to set off from the town of Gouldsboro and add to the town of Bar Harbor certain islands.

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

That the two islands in Frenchmen's bay, known as Bar or Rodick's Island and the island known as Burnt or Sheep Porcupine, together with the inhabitants thereof, are hereby set off said town of Gouldsboro and annexed to said town of Bar Harbor and said inhabitants shall enjoy the same rights and be subject to the same requisitions as the town of Bar Harbor."

I do not see any referendum on that bill. I do not see where the gentleman from Bar Harbor in the year 1927 thought that it was necessary to put a referendum on that. I could not find in the Record where the gentleman from Bar Harbor offered an amendment, even suggesting that there should be a referendum; but now he comes here, after claiming two years ago that it was perfectly right and proper to set off the islands to the town of Bar Harbor in which he lives without a referendum,—now he comes here and says that it is not fair to set off in this case without a referendum. The argument is that we gentlemen from Penobscot,

Aroostook and other parts of the State should not have the right to settle the affairs down there. He did not believe that way in 1927. If he had, he would have offered an amendment at that time. This bill, I understand, received an unanimous committee report of ought not to pass and was not discussed in the House, but the gentleman perhaps could have got the thing through if he had offered an amendment.

Now I am going to leave this, appealing to the fairness of the members of this Legislature that it is only fair, that it is only proper, that this matter should be decided practically by the wishes of the hamlet of Marlboro, and it is only fair that we who are sent here from the different towns should take this matter fairly and squarely and decide it the way it ought to be decided and not pass the buck and say let's refer it to the people. Let's refer it to the inhabitants of the town of Hancock or the town of Lamoine. If that were done, they would have no more chance of being separated from the town of Hancock than would have slaves been freed by submitting the slavery question to the people of the South. I say that it is not a fair proposition and I believe it is up to the members of this Legislature to settle it, and I hope the gentleman's motion will not prevail.

Mr. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary to go back to my record of two years ago in this Legislature, and I would have the present Legislature understand the conditions that existed at that time. They have been misrepresented. It is a fact that I introduced the bill two years ago to annex a part of the town of Gouldsboro to Bar Harbor. It was not my bill, it was given to me by some of my constituents. The bill was introduced, had its hearing before the committee on Towns and that committee reported ought not to pass. I accepted that report, and I took my licking, so-called, like a man. It went along in its regular course in the House, and the Representative from Hancock county who was in opposition to me will bear me out in this statement.

I am well aware that the gentleman from Brewer is entirely out

of order in taking up the geographical location of this village. That is not the question before us. The question before us is that of non-concurrence with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment A. The question before us is shall we let those people down there have something to say regarding their own matters.

The gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Sargent, is one perhaps of all the members of this House who has a map hanging up in his office of that particular section. The most of us, I am pretty sure, do not know anything about it. He cites the case of the towns down in that particular section. He did not bring out that in every case that those towns were made into new towns, not divided, giving one town another piece of that town.

There is only one fair way for the House to decide this question and that is by referendum. It has been shown that everybody down there are not of one mind as you have been led to believe; and, members of the House, if you can see your way clear to vote with me and give these people down there in that little village that you have heard so much about an opportunity to vote, it will give me great pleasure as their representative to go to the telephone after this vote is taken and tell them that their appeal to this Legislature has been heard and that their request has been granted.

Mr. RUMILL of Tremont: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I will confine myself not to the reasons why these people ask the passage of the bill for the reasons have been well brought out; and as a matter of fact it occurs to me that our desire should be to know what the majority of those people want rather than why they want it.

The town of Lamoine, the home town of the Senator who presented the bill, is also a town of my representative class, and I am sure that Senator Douglas had in mind his own home town and the adjoining town which is also a part of his constituency as Senator, that he would be acting within the desires of the majority of his constituency, and I as a representative from Lamoine and con-

scientifically in favor of the large majority as I see it.

As a result of a thorough canvass of the proponents and the opponents of this bill I hold in my hand here a petition which reads "We the undersigned citizens of the town of Tremont protest any action of the Legislature of the State of Maine changing the town line of this or any other town without giving the towns concerned a voice in the matter." That is a petition signed by two of the selectmen of Lamoine and 27 others. That is one side. In my other hand I hold a petition which reads: "We citizens and real estate owners of Lamoine are in favor of the annexation of Marlboro to Lamoine and do not favor a referendum to the respective towns." That is signed by one of the selectmen of Lamoine and 142 others. In addition to the 142 on the petition, I hold in my hand telegrams from thirteen others in favor of the passage of the bill as it passed the Senate without referendum that makes 155 in favor of the bill as it passed the Senate and 29 opposed. Now so much for Lamoine.

I have here communications from parties in Marlboro and in the town of Hancock, on the other side of the river, emphatically in favor of the annexation of Marlboro to Lamoine without the referendum—striking out the referendum they say at the bottom of their communications. Now these are prominent in Marlboro and the mother town of Hancock. In this section of Hancock which is under discussion, Marlboro, there are sixty land owners, not all residents, some of them summer residents,—I presume non-residents. Anyway there are sixty land owners and forty-seven of that sixty are in favor of annexation. This is Marlboro and out of sixty real estate owners, forty-seven of them are in favor of the bill as it passed the Senate without referendum.

I also have communications from leading men in Marlboro, Hancock. One says, "While we would regret to lose our neighbor of Marlboro, yet we can see the feasibility of their position as requiring annexation to Lamoine. We think it is about evenly divided, perhaps

50-50, in the mother town of Hancock on this referendum. Of course Hancock hates to lose any part of those real estate assessments, while at the same time they do recognize that this piece of their town is separated from the mother town by the Skillings River and it does labor under disadvantages and the feeling is not strong against them if they want to join Lamoine.

It has been stated here, and by the way I have here the name of every person living in Marlboro, amounting in all to twenty-eight. The gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. McLean, says that fourteen of these are opposed to its going without a referendum; but I say that forty-seven of these sixty land owners are in favor of the bill without the referendum.

At the hearing,—well, I won't mention that, because the question now is not on the passage of the bill, it is on the referendum. Now I feel that this referendum business is just to try and befuddle and perhaps defeat the bill in the end. My home town is a divided town and there was no referendum on it. Anyway, be that as it may, a very large majority, right around ninety per cent. of Lamoine has come in without a referendum. Seventy-five per cent of Marlboro, as to the land owners, has come in without the referendum and we have assurances, as my friend Mr. Sargent has said, from two of the leading town officers and I think leading citizens, saying that there is at least a 50-50 sentiment in Hancock, and probably a referendum would be simply the inauguration of a district row. There would be hard feelings and it would be a hard row for this Legislature to settle. I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Bar Harbor (Mr. McLean) does not prevail, and that the bill will finally pass as it came to us from the Senate.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question was called for.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will call attention to the situation. The new draft contains the final section: "This act shall not be operative until it is ratified by the voters of each of the towns of Hancock and Lamoine at a regular

town meeting of the legal voters of each town, held by virtue of a warrant containing an appropriate article therefor and when so severally ratified, shall take effect on the first day of March next following," and the effect of Senate Amendment A is to strike out the section just read providing for a referendum. The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bar Harbor, Mr. McLean, that Senate Amendment A be indefinitely postponed, so that Section seven, the referendum section, would remain in the bill. As many as are in favor of the gentleman's motion for indefinite postponement will say aye; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion for indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment A prevailed.

On motion by Mr. McLean, the rules were suspended and the bill received its two readings and tomorrow assigned.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair now presents to the House the third matter today assigned, bill an act granting the right of eminent domain to electric power companies doing a public utilities business, House Paper 1644, House Document 673, tabled on March 22 by the gentleman from Garland, Mr. Clifford, the pending question being third reading; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

**MR. GARLAND:** Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A to House Paper 1644 and move its adoption.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment A to H. P. 1644, H. D. 673, an act granting the right of eminent domain to electric power companies doing a public utility business.

Amend House Paper 1644 by adding thereto the following:

"This act shall be submitted for approval or rejection to the duly qualified voters of the State of Maine at an election to be held on the second Monday in September in the year A. D. nineteen hundred and twenty-nine. The Aldermen of cities, the Selectmen of towns and the Assessors of the several plantations in this State, are hereby empowered and directed to notify

the inhabitant of their respective cities, towns and plantations to meet in the manner prescribed by law for calling and holding biennial meetings of said inhabitants for the election of Senators and Representatives to give their votes upon this act and the question shall be 'Shall an act granting the right of eminent domain to electric power companies doing a Public Utility business, be accepted?' And the inhabitants of said cities, towns and plantations shall vote by ballot on said question, those in favor of the same expressing it by making a cross within the square opposite the word 'yes' upon their ballots and those opposed to the question by making a cross within the square opposite the word 'no' upon their ballots, and the ballots shall be received, sorted, counted and declared in open ward, town and plantation meetings, and returns made to the office of the secretary of State in the same manner as votes for governor and members of the Legislature, and the governor and council shall count the same and if it shall appear that a majority of the inhabitants voting on the question are in favor of the act, the governor shall make known the fact by his proclamation, and thereupon the act shall become law. The secretary of State shall prepare and furnish to the several cities, towns and plantations ballots and blank returns in conformity with the foregoing, accompanied by a copy thereof."

**MR. CLIFFORD of Garland:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is necessary to take the time of the Legislature with oratory on this subject. The legislative power of the State of Maine is vested in the Legislature, but it is further provided that questions can be referred to the people for their consideration. The right of eminent domain is something that is of interest to the people of the State of Maine, and it may effect the property owners of the State of Maine at any time and should not be given except when public necessity is recognized. This is something that is easily understood by the citizens and does not require extended study. Therefore, I think that if this were passed it should be referred to the people for their con-

sideration, and I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. McCART of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, I occupy rather an anomalous position, just voting for one referendum and now opposing another; but I believe that the power of referring any measure to the people of this State was given us to be used in cases where we are in doubt as to what we should do. I do not intend to go into the subject of eminent domain. It has been covered and re-covered but I do want to cover this matter of referendum. In the first place I want to say that I have not the slightest doubt that this referendum would be passed by the people and I believe that is also the opinion of the proponents of this amendment. I want to tell you that it is my belief that this amendment was never offered in the hope that it would go through. The proponents of this amendment are now sparring on it on the subject of eminent domain as granted to public utilities companies doing an electrical business. It is my belief that it is hoped to get this amendment through the House and then the whole bill will go back to the Senate and they hope and pray that the Senate will refuse to accept it and then they are going to sit tight and throw the eminent domain bill out of the window.

I believe that last Wednesday when this bill was considered I was among those absent. I was accused of side-stepping a little on this question, when as a matter of fact it was impossible for me to be here. Right now I am going to stand up on my hind legs and say that I am in favor of eminent domain for these electrical companies, and I am not in favor of passing the buck along to the people. I have no question but what it will be accepted, but I am not going to sit still and have someone spar me off my feet and have the whole measure thrown out of the window.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. CLIFFORD of Garland: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. McCart, has told you what he considered to be the hopes of the proponents of this measure, but he does not tell you that the interests of the property owners of the State of Maine are not at stake

on this measure. He does not tell you that that should not enter into the consideration of it. Therefore I still urge the passage of this bill, and I move that when the vote is taken it be by a ye and nay vote.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Garland, Mr. Clifford, that the House adopt House Amendment A, which has been read, and which provides for a referendum to the voters of the State. The gentleman from Garland, Mr. Clifford, has moved that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of calling the yeas and nays will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have returned the count.

A sufficient number arose and the yeas and nays were called for.

The SPEAKER: A vote of yes on the roll call is a vote for the adoption of the amendment and for the referendum, a vote of "no" is against the referendum.

Mr. Varnum of Westbrook was excused from voting, being paired with Mr. Pike of Lubec.

Mr. Sterling of Kittery was excused from voting being paired with Mr. Eaton of Calais.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the question is entirely clear to all of the members as to what a vote "yes" or "no" means.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will endeavor to explain the matter. A vote of "yes" is a vote in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Garland, Mr. Clifford, and in favor of a referendum to the electors of the State on the eminent domain bill. A vote of "no" is a vote for the bill as it stands in its present form, and as heretofore read twice in the House. Is the question clear? If not, the Chair will be glad to explain it further. The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Aldrich, Anderson, New Sweden; Anderson, South Portland; Angell, Ashby, Bachelder, Bailey, Belleau, Bisbee, Briggs, Burr, Buzzell, Campbell, Carleton, Winterport; Clifford, Crawford, Daigle, Dudley, Fogg, Gagne, Hamel, Rodolphe, Harrington, Hatch, Hawkes, Richmond;

Hawkes, Standish; Hughes, Hunt, Hurd, Ingraham, Jack, Jacobs, Auburn; Jones, Corinna; Jones, Windsor; Kitchen, Lenfest, Leonard, Lewis, Littlefield, Farmingdale; Littlefield, Monroe; Lombard, Lowell, MacKinnon, McKnight, Morin, Morse, Oakland; Patterson, Peacock, Perkins, Picher, Potter, Powers, Pratt, Rea, Richardson, Roach, Robie, Rogers, Yarmouth; Rounds, Roy, Saucier, Stanley, Stetson, Stone, Stuart, Sturgis, Ward, Webster, Buxton; White, Wight—69.

NAY—Adams, Allen, Camden; Allen, Sanford; Bishop, Bissett, Blaisdell, Blanchard, Blodgett, Boston, Bove, Burkett, Portland; Burkett, Union; Butler, Carleton, Portland; Chase, Clark, Comins, Day, Farris, Folsom, Ford, Foster, Friend, Gay, Gillespie, Hamel, George, Hammond, Hathaway, Heath, Hill, Holbrook, Holman, Hubbard, Jackson, Portland; Jacobs, Wells; Jones, Waterville; Jones, Winthrop; Kane, King, Laughlin, Libby, Locke, Mansfield, McCart, McLean, Melcher, Merrill, Milliken, Morse, Rumford; O'Connell, Palmer, Perham, Quint, Rackliff, Rogers, Greenville; Rumill, St. Clair, Sargent, Seavey, Small, Freedom; Small, East Machias; Sterling, Caratunk Plantation; Sturtevant, Taylor, Thatcher, Towne, Tucker, Webster, Auburn; Williamson, Wing, Wright—71.

ABSENT—Boynnton, Burns, Cou-  
ture, Jackson, Bath; Vose—5.

PAIRED—Eaton, Pike, Sterling,  
Kittery; Varnum—4.

Sixty-nine having voted yes and 71 having voted no, the motion for the adoption of the amendment failed of passage.

On motion by Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth, the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

#### Order out of Order

On motion by Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle, it was

Ordered, that when the House rises this morning, it be to recess to 4 P. M. this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the fourth matter today assigned, Senate report ought to pass, committee on Ways and Bridges, on bill an act to provide for building a bridge across the Penobscot River, at or near Bucksport, S. P. 541, S. D. 364, tabled on March 22nd by the gentleman from Naples, Mr. Bove, the pending question being acceptance of the ought not to pass report in concurrence with the Senate and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. BOVE: Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. McCart.

Mr. MCCART: Mr. Speaker, this bill is accompanied by a resolve providing for money with which to pay for it. That resolve is now in the Senate, and I would move that the bill be retabled and unassigned, in order that the House may act on both matters.

Thereupon, the bill was retabled and unassigned, pending acceptance of report in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the fifth matter today assigned, House order relative to requesting information from the Governor concerning State Highway Work, H. D. 738, tabled on March 22nd by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, the pending question being passage.

(At this point Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle, assumed the Chair, amid the applause of the House, the members rising.)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds.

Mr. ROUNDS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am a little mite hoarse today, you see, but I guess I will try and get through what I have to say on this order.

This order was presented by me on the 22nd day of March, and I have been told that we shall have a report from that committee soon; but I want to say now, while I am on my feet, that I think it is right, and if they had just gone ahead with that order, it would have simplified matters quickly, and we would find out where the cement went to or whether there was cement enough in that road or whether there was not. I think, too, that every member of this Legislature, and the other citizens of the State of Maine would be satisfied with the report. I know it has been tried by certain newspapers of this State, and the verdict has been given, but the Legislature of Maine has not done it yet; and I hope that when that comes, it will be justworthy.

I have a number of clippings here from newspapers. I will just read a short piece from a Portland paper: "The integrity of the State Highway Department personnel which discharges any duties in connection with the construction of Federal Aid projects

thus becomes a matter of serious concern to the Federal Government. If such personnel should be corrupt, dishonored, or inefficient, the interests of the Federal Government are certain to suffer."

I am not going to make any extended remarks here, because I think it is time that we should act, and I have been told that they would act, but I will say this, and I will read what I have to say:

This order was tabled last week so that the members of this House could examine and consider its provisions, and also the matters which are interlinked with and related to the Highway Commission and its conduct of the affairs of that department. These matters are the charges which have been made against the three honored citizens who compose that commission.

The order attempts to amend the present law by requiring the Chairman of the Commission to devote his entire time to the duties of his office, and the associate members to devote such time as may be required by the Chairman. Viewed in the light which has been shed by the newspapers of the State, the purpose of this order is to abolish the present commission and establish another commission which shall have all the powers which this commission now exercise. And this is done to satisfy the demand made by the representative of the Federal Government. The Legislature has the power to abolish the present commission and create another commission to carry out the work. The commission was not created by the Constitution of Maine. Whether the Legislature may use the proposed bill as a means of removal of the members of the present commission, is a matter which may be determined by the Supreme Court. But that question is not raised and will not be discussed. The matter which it seems that this House should consider is whether it will exercise its right to abolish the present board to the great injury of the honored men who compose that commission, without giving these gentlemen the right to be heard in their own defense.

Secretary Jardine in his letter says: "The integrity of the state highway department personnel which discharges any duties in con-

nection with the construction of federal aid projects thus becomes a matter of serious concern to the federal government. If such personnel should be corrupt, dishonored, or inefficient, the interests of the federal government are certain to suffer." The secretary states that "several thousand barrels of cement which, under the specifications should have come into their construction, were omitted therefrom with apparent intent to defraud the state and federal government." Here is a clearly defined charge against the members of this commission. The intent of the pending bill is to deny these honored men the right to be heard in their own defense.

Now I want to say here that I am in favor of giving every man a chance to be heard, and I hope, when we get through, that we will not adjourn until they have been heard, and we have rendered a verdict. I do not want to recess and come back here, but I am in favor of giving them all the chance there is to be heard, and I hope that every member of this House is in the same position.

I want to read a poem that was written by a man you all know:

#### "The Under Dog in the Fight"

I know that the world—that the great big world—  
From the peasant up to the king,  
Has a different tale from the tale I tell,  
And a different song to sing.  
But for me, and I care not a single fig  
If they say I am wrong or am right,  
I shall always go in for the weaker dog,  
For the under dog in the fight.  
I know that the world—that the great big world—  
Will never a moment stop  
To see which dog may be in the fault,  
But will shout for the dog on top.  
But for me—I never shall pause to ask  
Which dog may be in the right—  
For my heart will beat, while it beats at all,  
For the under dog in the fight.  
Perchance what I've said, I had better not said,  
Or, 'twere better I had said it in cog.  
But with heart and with glass filled  
chock to the brim,  
Here is luck to the bottom dog."



Now I want to say here that I have been told by members of that committee that next week we shall hear a report, and if that is so, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the order.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, asks unanimous consent to withdraw his order. Is there any objection? The Chair hears no objection and the order is withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House what appears to be on the calendar the first tabled and specially assigned matter. It should be really the sixth today assigned matter, an act to consolidate the general superintendence, management and control of the State Prison, the Reformatory for Men and Reformatory for Women under one board of trustees, and to provide for the temporary transfer of inmates, (H. P. 1675) (H. D. 729) tabled on March 25th by the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich, the pending question being second reading, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. ALDRICH: Mr. Speaker, I feel at this time, inasmuch as I signed the minority report in this matter, that possibly it is only fair to the members of the House that they should understand my reason for having done so.

This is a bill, you will notice, for consolidating the State Prison, the Women's Reformatory, and the Men's Reformatory under one board. At the hearing which was held upon this matter, it is my recollection no reason was assigned for this consolidation. There did, however, appear at that hearing several members from the Trustees of the Women's Reformatory, who, while speaking rather guardedly, certainly gave me the impression that they were decidedly opposed to this bill upon the ground that the problems of the Women's Reformatory were of such a different character from the problems of either the Men's Reformatory or the State Prison—that they could not receive proper attention from a single board, which would be very little larger than the number of trustees which now act in connection with this reformatory, and that if we at-

tempted by such a board to handle the affairs of all three institutions, I think I am fair in saying it was the impression of those people, in their judgment, based upon years of experience, a mistake would be made.

Now in addition to that, I remember very well that one of the members, one of the trustees of the Reformatory, a Reverend Father of the Catholic Church, has had no hesitation whatever in expressing the opinion that neither from the standpoint of efficiency nor from the standpoint of economy would anything be gained by the adoption of this measure and the creation of a single board to handle these three institutions. I may say that my recollection is that this Reverend Father was speaking from an experience of several years, and my impression from hearing those who were opposed to the measure was so strong that it induced me to submit for your consideration a minority report on this measure, and in order that the matter may be definitely brought before the House, I will move the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich, moves the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I also signed the minority report, namely against the passage of this bill, I feel it incumbent on me to briefly state my reasons.

The only possible reasons for it would be two—increased efficiency and a better handling in a monetary way, and a better handling of the affairs of the institutions.

We received no evidence, and I have not been able to find any evidence whatsoever, that there would be any increased efficiency either in the economic management or in any other way.

Now comes a third matter: It seems to me that penal institutions are in a different category from other institutions because the primary object is the rehabilitation of the inmates, making them into good citizens, and the more personal interest and personal touch there is, the more hope there is for rehabilitating them. I do not believe that one board controlling three institutions can give the same

personal interest and touch that can be given by the three boards of the different institutions. As the gentleman from Topsham (Mr. Aldrich), has said, the problems that concern the Women's Reformatory are very different from those that concern the Men's Reformatory and the State Prison. All the questions that come up there are entirely different. For instance, we pass a resolve here for homes for mothers and babies, and I believe they have about thirty-five babies in that institution, and it seems to me that the problems that come up there are quite different from those which come up in the State Prison or in the Men's Reformatory.

At the present time the majority of the board on the Women's Reformatory is composed of women who are specially interested in the inmates of that reformatory and specially in touch with other matters which would concern their well-being and their rehabilitation, therefore I am opposed to the proposition to see this board, the majority of which is women, wiped out and made into a general board and the Women's Reformatory put under their control.

Mr. PERHAM of West Paris: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, as a member of the committee on State School for Boys, State School for Girls and State Reformatories, that I would like to stand with Miss Laughlin and Mr. Aldrich on this matter against the consolidation. I would like to have you listen while I read the heading of this bill: "An act to consolidate the general superintendence, management and control of the State Prison, the Reformatory for Men and Reformatory for Women under one board of trustees, and to provide for the temporary transfer of inmates."

Now, I object to that last clause more than anything else. I have had the opportunity of meeting the different women in charge of the Women's Reformatory. I also have had the good fortune to meet the man who is the "big push" in regard to the State Reformatory for Men, and I would like to say at this time that I think there is no necessity whatever for this general consolidation in one board of the

State Prison, the Reformatory for Men and Reformatory for Women, and I would like to take my stand at this time with Miss Laughlin and also with Mr. Aldrich.

Mr. BISSETT of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I also want to go on record as standing with Miss Laughlin and Mr. Aldrich on this bill. In the transfer of prisoners, especially at the Men's Reformatory in South Windham,—those men are out working around the grounds, and doing everything possible to help the State. If you should transfer prisoners from Thomaston there, you would have to have more guards, more expense, and everything of that sort. I certainly hope the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. STURGIS of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the State Prison Committee. To my mind they are doing efficient work at the present time and doing everything to make the men interested in their work. In going through that prison, in our inspection, the men seemed to be as enthusiastic as they would be in a factory outside.

I wish to specially speak of the Reformatory for Men, I have been in close touch with some of these men—Mr. Merrill, of Portland, and Mr. Howes who is Lecturer of the State Grange, and David Moulton, a prominent attorney at Portland, and Mr. Cannon, connected with the Agricultural Department.

They take great interest in that department there. They have a large clay bank there, which will last for years. The men are looking after that, and that keeps the men interested. They make about 400,000 bricks a year there. Two years ago they sold 300,000 that went to the hospital in Bangor. Last year they sold 300,000 in the Portland District, and they are making good there.

Now they are trying to introduce other reforms there, manufacturing, hoping to bring about a mechanical department there, to tear down automobiles and the men will be given instructions in putting them together, so that when the men come out from there, they will be self-supporting. I was told by a member of this committee that they tell these men, when they go

out from there, "Don't go back stealing. If you can't find a job, come back here."

Another thing, these men get \$5 a day for their services, and they are enthusiastic. They meet about once a month. Now you put this on one commission,—and these men, as has been stated many times, are men of large calibre,—and they would not give their time for \$5 a day, nor their enthusiasm, in attending to these institutions—it would take three times that amount. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Topsham (Mr. Aldrich) will prevail.

Mr. FARRIS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I speak on this measure as one who signed the majority report. I have no personal interest in the matter. It is simply, as I understand it, an administrative measure seeking to economize by consolidating several state boards.

This matter was thrashed out in the committee room, eight members of our committee signing the majority report. As the gentleman from Topsham (Mr. Aldrich), has said, several appeared against it from the Women's Reformatory.

There was some evidence that it would be very beneficial to have one board control all three institutions, because there would be closer co-operation. Many times they have prisoners at Thomaston that they like to transfer to the Women's Reformatory, and under the act they can do so by going to the presiding justice, who signs the papers, and they make the transfer without any more confusion. I believe one of the Prison Commissioners also appeared.

This simply takes five members from the reformatory board and three from the prison commission, and consolidates these two boards into one board, having charge of the State Prison and Reformatory for Men and Reformatory for Women.

Now I do not believe it makes very much difference whether this goes through or not. It is merely an experimental measure, and if the House does not see fit to vote for this bill, I do not think there will be any complaint from anyone.

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I signed the majority report with the other members of

the Judiciary Committee. Under the present system of management of these institutions, the experiences gained by one board, for example the Prison Board, are not available for the board managing the State Reformatory for Men or the Reformatory for Women. I think the great benefit to be derived from this bill is that one board will utilize the knowledge gained from one institution in the management of the other institutions. There will be some saving of money through having one board, it is true, but the real reason is to consolidate the management and have them run more efficiently. That was my reason for signing the majority report of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BOVE of Naples: Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the committee on State School for Boys, State School for Girls and State Reformatories. I wish to say that I was very pleased to see the conditions of these institutions. These institutions at the present time are working well, they function well, they are directed under a splendid Board of Trustees, and therefore, at this particular time, I personally object to any change. The consolidation that they propose, I think, would be a disaster. In my opinion, it is too much of a proposition for one board to assume,—there is too much money involved. Therefore, I wish to support the motion of Mr. Aldrich.

Mr. STURGIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The previous question is moved. As many as are in favor of the Chair entertaining the previous question will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will return the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is shall the main question be now put? As many as are in favor of this motion will say aye; as many as are opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion that the main question be now put prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich, for indefinite postponement of the bill—

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, asks for a division of the House. All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of the bill will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will return the count.

A division was had, Eighty-two having voted in the affirmative and 15 in the negative, the motion for indefinite postponement prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House the first unassigned matter of the day, communication from the Governor transmitting letter from United States Commissioner of Agriculture, tabled on March 18th by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, the pending question being the motion of Mr. Kitchen to place the communication of file in concurrence, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Rounds, the communication was placed on file in concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair places before the House the second unassigned matter, bill an act relating to equal school privileges for all pupils, H. P. 1333, H. D. 463, tabled on March 18th by the gentleman from Poland, Mr. McKnight, the pending question being third reading, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. McKNIGHT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Eighty-fourth Legislature:

Owing to the lateness of the hour, I am going to ask the indulgence of the House to retable this bill.

This bill, House Document 463, an act relating to equal school privileges for all pupils, is a bill that interests the rural inhabitants of the State of Maine, and I do not feel at this time that we have the time to go into a full discussion of this bill, and I am going to ask the indulgence of the House to have the bill retabled. This bill has been on the table for some time, but when the opportunity came that I could take it off the table, I left it on, out of courtesy to one of my opponents.

Thereupon, a viva vice vote being had, the bill was retabled pending third reading.

On motion by Mr. Bissett of Port-

land, the House recessed until 4 P. M.

#### After Recess 4 P. M.

Papers from the Senate were taken up out of order, under suspension of the rules, and disposed of in concurrence.

#### Senate Bills in First Reading

S. P. 719, S. D. 377: An act relating to deposits in the names of two or more persons, in banks, institutions for savings, trust companies or shares in building and loan associations.

S. P. 724, S. D. 378: An act to make uniform the method of computing interest on savings accounts in trust companies, savings banks and national banks.

S. P. 726, S. D. 379: An act relating to the protection of children.

S. P. 691, S. D. 367: Resolve providing for the purchase of "Music and Musicians of Maine"

S. P. 622, S. D. 291: An act concerning financial responsibility for damages caused by the operation of motor vehicles.

S. P. 629, S. D. 376: Resolve providing for a State pension for Charles Brown of Liberty.

S. P. 374, S. D. 157: An act relating to damage suits brought against towns and counties on State and State aid highways.

From the Senate: Bill an act to amend the fees for registration of motor vehicles H. P. 341, H. D. 102, which was passed to be engrossed in the House, March 19.

Comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Bachelder of St. George, it was voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the bill.

#### Reports of Committees

Mr. Burkett from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported ought to pass on bill an act relating to Penobscot Council Incorporated. Boy Scouts of America, Bangor and Brewer, Maine, (H. P. 865)

Report read and accepted and the bill ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. Peacock from same Committee reported same on bill an act defining the crime of burglary with

explosives and providing the punishment therefor (H. P. 1433) (H. D. 494)

Mr. Burkett from same Committee reported same on bill an act to authorize the city of Lewiston to issue its bonds to the amount of \$51,000 to refund its bonds now outstanding and maturing in the year 1930 (H. P. 1474) (H. D. 516)

Mr. Merrill from the Committee on Public Health reported same on bill an act with reference to tuberculous prisoners (H. P. 1572) (H. D. 579)

Miss Laughlin from the Committee on Revision of Statutes reported same on bill an act relative to interest and mortgages on loans on personal property (H. P. 1489) (H. D. 524)

Mr. Stone from same Committee reported same on bill an act relative to attachment of property mortgaged or pledged (H. P. 1488) (H. D. 523)

Reports read and accepted and the bills having already been printed were read twice under suspension of the rules and tomorrow assigned.

Mr. Littlefield from the Committee on Claims on resolve in favor of Frank E. Downes (H. P. 771) (H. D. 238) reported in a new draft (H. P. 1701) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Stone from same Committee on resolve appropriating money for payment of the expenses of Tancerde Morin, an employee of the State Highway Commission (H. P. 507) (H. D. 146) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1700) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Rounds from same Committee on resolve in favor of Edward J. Carroll and Alice Janet Carroll (H. P. 775) (H. D. 242) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1698) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Blodgett from same committee on resolve in favor of H. H. Havey and estate of Eradbury Smith in reimbursement for loss on State Highway contract (H. P. 338) (H. D. 113) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1702) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Allen from the Committee on Education on bill an act in relation to the Maine School for the Deaf (H. P. 1384) (H. D. 464) re-

ported same in a new draft (H. P. 1703) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mrs. Gay from same Committee on bill an act in relation to the State Military and Naval Children's Home (H. P. 1529) (H. D. 551) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1704) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Wing from the Committee on Judiciary on bill an act relating to licensing operators of motor vehicles after their conviction of operating the same while under the influence of intoxicating liquor (H. P. 1468) (H. D. 511) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1699) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Blaisdell from the Committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act to simplify procedure in municipal or police courts (H. P. 1566) (H. D. 574) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1705) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Reports read and accepted and the new drafts ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

The following bill on its passage to be enacted, and resolves on their final passage were taken up out of order under suspension of the rules:

#### Passed to be Enacted

(H. P. 578) (H. D. 160) An act relating to the apportionment of State Aid to Agricultural Societies.

#### Finally Passed

(H. P. 479) (H. D. 677) Resolve in favor of the town of Kingman.

(H. P. 709) (H. D. 680) Resolve in favor of the town of Dover-Foxcroft.

(H. P. 915) (H. D. 681) Resolve in favor of the town of Medway.

(H. P. 1651) (H. D. 683) Resolve providing for a State pension for Anna L. Gagan of Lewiston.

(H. P. 1652) (H. D. 684) Resolve to provide for a State pension for Mary W. Chamberlain of Portland.

(H. P. 1653) (H. D. 675) Resolve in favor of the Penobscot Tribe of Indians for the general care, maintenance, and education thereof.

The SPEAKER: The House will now revert to the unfinished business of the morning. The Chair presents the third unassigned matter, H. P. 1657, H. D. 688, bill an act relative to close time on moose, tabled on March 20th by the gentle-

man from Patten, Mr. Harrington, the pending question being second reading, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. HARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. McCart.

On motion by Mr. McCart, the bill was recommitted to the committee on Revision of Statutes.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the fourth unassigned matter, S. P. 121, S. D. 56, resolve in favor of the State School for Boys, tabled on March 20th by the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, the pending question being final passage; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmingdale, Mr. Littlefield.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield the bill was retabled, owing to the engagement of the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, on the special committee, and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Farmingdale it was voted to take from the table the fifth unassigned matter, resolve in favor of the Western Maine Sanatorium for the maintenance, personal services, repairs and equipment, S. P. 163, S. D. 73, tabled on March 20 by the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, pending final passage, and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was retabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Farmingdale, it was voted to take from the table the sixth unassigned matter, resolve in favor of the State Reformatory for Men, S. P. 328, S. D. 120, tabled on March 20 by the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, pending final passage; and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was retabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Farmingdale, it was voted to take from the table the seventh unassigned matter, resolve in favor of the State School for Girls, S. P. 414, S. D. 166, tabled on March 20 by the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, pending final passage; and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was retabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Farmingdale it was voted to take from the table the eighth unassigned matter, resolve in favor of the Reformatory for Women for maintenance and other purposes, H. P. 84, H. D. 530, tabled on March 20 by the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, pending final passage; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was retabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents to the House the ninth unassigned matter, House report ought to pass on new draft from the committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on bill, the new draft being entitled, an act for the better protection of lobsters and crabs in the Georges River, H. P. 1670, H. D. 736, tabled on March 22 by the gentleman from Cushing, Mr. Vose, the pending question being the acceptance of the report.

On motion by Mr. Bachelder of St. George the matter was retabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 2, by reason of the fact that Mr. Vose of Cushing is at home ill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the tenth unassigned matter bill an act to amend Chapter 162 of the Public Laws of 1927 as applied to the War Bond Sinking Fund, H. P. 1523, H. D. 546, tabled on March 22 by the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, pending third reading.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Farmingdale, the bill was retabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the eleventh unassigned matter, House report A ought not to pass and House report B ought to pass in new draft, committee on Judiciary, on bill an act to regulate the occupation of Hairdressers and Cosmetologists, to register and license persons engaged in such occupation, and to create a Board of Hairdressers and Cosmetologists, H. P. 1020, H. D. 327, tabled on March 22nd by the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, the pending question being acceptance of either report, and the Chair recognizes the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of Report B, ought to pass in new draft. Now the new draft of this bill is before the members—it does not appear on the calendar—as House Document 740, and has quite material changes from the original bill.

The reasons for this bill, you might say, are two-fold, one in the interests of health and the other in getting a higher standard of equipment for those who are engaged in the occupations referred to.

Along the line of it being in the interests of health, some changes have been made which also appear in the new draft, and the special change is that the Chairman of the Board is to be the Commissioner of Health. Now I think that all doctors and scientists agree that is one of the easiest ways to pass off infectious diseases, through the treatment of the hair—in the barber shop or in the hair dresser shop. This is a fruitful source, and there should be something done to regulate this in the interests of the general health of the public, because those who may go into these shops in perfect ignorance of any danger may there have extended to them some contagious disease. So it is in this interest, that it is an object of health, that it should come under the Department of Health.

Section 4 of the new draft, on page three, provides, as I said, that the Chairman of the Board shall be the Commissioner of Health. It further provides—this was in the original bill—in the interests of health: That every school where persons go to study hair-dressing or cosmetology shall have attached to its staff a regular licensed physician who will instruct them in matters of health, that they may be able to determine any evidence of diseases that come before them, and also that they themselves, the operators, may not be so afflicted.

On page 6, section 10, still in the interests of health, it is provided that any operator in these occupations must have a certificate of health from any regularly licensed physician, whom they themselves, of course, may select, so they may not pass along any diseases.

On page 12, section 19, you will observe again that this Board, with the approval of the State Board of Health, shall prescribe such sanitary rules as it may deem necessary.

So it is provided that these kitchen-shop hairdressers, cosmetologists, so-called, come under the regulation of the State Board of Health, and specifically under the Board, the Chairman of which is the Commissioner of Health. Then, on the other hand, I think that it is in the interests of creating a higher standard for the equipment of those engaged in these occupations.

There is no regulation at all in this State—anyone can come here and engage in the occupations prescribed in this bill. I am informed that in thirty other states there are bills similar to this in effect, so the result will be that if we do not take steps in the State of Maine, we will be the dumping ground for every other State for persons that cannot pass the examination or conform to the rules in these other thirty states.

Now this occupation—there are people engaged in it, going along, practicing it. I understand there are about eighty in the city of Portland alone, but we are not stopping that. The only question is whether we are going to bring them under the supervision of the Department of Health, the Commissioner of Health, and we are going to require of those engaging in this business that they have proper equipment for it. It not only carries the danger of spreading disease, but other dangers are connected with it.

I remember, in the city of San Francisco, of somebody going into one of these shops and had some sort of a treatment that resulted in death. It may come to that.

Since this bill came before the Legislature the only person who came to me to show me anything about it—it happened to be a man—and he came and showed me where, in one of the smaller shops, this man had been burned because they were not properly equipped. He also told me of a small boy who wanted to get rid of freckles. That does not seem to be limited to any one sex in the matter of objection to freckles. He thought that if a

little was good, more would be better and he got into very serious trouble because of what he did, so there are these dangers, the danger of spreading disease, danger to people who patronize shops of this kind. As I have said, other states have taken means to protect their citizens against it and unless we take similar means, we are going to be the dumping ground, as I have already said.

Some opposition has been raised as to shampooing, that they should not require a license under this bill, therefore we include a provision in this new draft which was not in the original section, which you will find on page 13 of the new draft, in which it provides that this shall not apply to any municipality, plantation or unorganized sub-division of the State wherein there is no person practicing the occupation of hairdresser or cosmetologist as the sole or chief means of getting a living. So that will get rid of the question in the small towns where they would not be running shops as they would in cities. That takes care of that matter.

Then another matter came up: There are quite a number of women who simply give shampoos, and they occasionally give them in their residences, and the way this bill was originally drawn it cut them out. We have changed that in the new draft so it simply provides that these occupations shall not be carried on in rooms where persons sleep or rooms that they use for eating purposes, so this will in no way interfere with those who simply, as a side line, are giving shampoos.

There is one other matter. People say this is creating a new Commission. True, but it will be supported entirely by the fees paid, and if there is any apprehension that the fees paid will not be sufficient to continue this Commission and pay what expenses are necessary, that is taken care of in the last section where, in the new draft, we have provided that whenever the fees provided for in this act shall be insufficient to defray expenses provided for herein, no further action entailing expense shall be had pursuant to the terms hereof. So that, as we have it now, people in these country towns

are entirely protected from any red tape. We have it provided so any woman who wishes simply to wash hair in her own home can do that provided she does not do it in a dining room or sleeping room.

This act provides that the State shall not incur any expense, because no action will be taken unless the fees support it. So we come back to the fact that it is in the interests of health and the protection of the people of the State that we shall adopt these provisions which will require better preparation for those who engage in these occupations, a better supervision of the shops where these occupations are carried on, and a supervision which is distinctly along the lines of health because it is under rules approved by the Board of Health, and under the Board of Health, whose Chairman is the Commissioner of Health.

Mr. FARRIS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill on the ground that there is no necessity for creating a commission to regulate hairdressing. It seems to me that we have our statute books cluttered up with enough commissions now, and as far as the health part of it may go, it seems to me we have plenty of laws on our statute books to take care of the health conditions in beauty parlors as well as in other places.

Another reason why I object to this bill is because it monopolizes the business. Now you will note that two of these members will be hairdressers, members of the profession, and the other member of the commission will be a member of the Board of Health. That is, it gives the hairdressers, two members, control of this Board, and they can bar out ladies who come in here and want to do a legitimate business, if they see fit, under the stringent regulations they put in here.

I do not believe that this legislation is necessary, therefore I move the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, moves the indefinite postponement of the bill, the new draft being House Document 740.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just one word more because we hear in this Leg-



islature so much about monopoly. It seems a word to conjure with.

If it is monopoly to have a board which will examine people in these occupations, then the board of Dental Examiners, the Board of Optometrists, the Undertakers, the Lawyers are equally monopolies. Of course that is not the object of this bill. The object is to present a standard up to which those who engage in these occupations shall come. That is not monopoly. That is to say, if you have the equipment for these occupations, you shall be permitted to engage in them, and if you have not the equipment, you shall not be so permitted. That is not monopoly. That is simply protection of the public who hire these people.

Mr. PATTERSON of Freeport: Mr. Speaker, I am against this bill for the simple reason that in every small town in the State of Maine there are a lot of girls whose folks are poor and who cannot afford to pay seventy-five cents or a dollar a week on six or seven girls. The result is, if this bill goes through that in an unorganized township, in the small places, the minute this bill is passed they will be up against it. In the town of Freeport there are a lot of girls, as I say, who have to go looking ragged because they cannot pay these high prices. The minute you pass this bill you have got to pay the price that they ask. There isn't any father who is getting \$18 or \$20 a week who can afford to pay for these girls to have their hair fixed in the way they wish, and the result is that they are going around looking shabby. At the present time a girl can get her hair fixed in our town for 25 or 35 cents. The other way they would have to pay 75 cents to a dollar and a quarter. It is a good deal the same as to this matter as it is when they graduate. Somebody will work six months and put a dress on their girl as good as somebody else, and the result is that these girls have got to go looking not one-quarter as good as they would like; and I second the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, for the indefinite postponement of this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I am not disturbed about the beauty of Maine girls. I thing they will all be beautiful

whether this bill passes or not. (Laughter) I think that we should protect not only their pocket books but also their health. This bill appeals to me as a proper health measure. If any husband has been in a hairdressing parlor, he knows the many and powerful machines that they there use. I think those machines should be handled by well trained operators. This bill would give a standard for all parts of the State which standard would not be found and is not now found under the laws on our books; so I urge that the motion of the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, that the report be accepted have passage.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question was called for.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, may we have a division?

The SPEAKER: A division is requested. As many as favor the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, that the bill be indefinitely postponed will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have returned the count.

A division of the House being had, Sixty-nine voting in the affirmative and 32 in the negative, the bill was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Peacock of Readfield the House voted to reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it voted to accept the ought not to pass report of the Legal Affairs committee on H. P. 1471, H. D. 513, an act relative to finger prints and photographs of criminals; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was recommitted to the committee on Legal Affairs.

On motion by Mr. Wing of Kingfield, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it voted to accept the ought to pass report in new draft from the committee on Judiciary on H. P. 1468, H. D. 511, an act relating to licensing operators of motor vehicles after their conviction of operating the same while under the influence of intoxicating liquor; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was tabled pending acceptance of report.

On motion by Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle, it was voted to take from the table the fourteenth unassigned matter, an act relative to the hours of employment of women, H. P. 1568, H. D. 603, tabled on March 26 by that gentleman, the pending question being passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mrs. Gay of Gorham, it was voted to take from the table the thirteenth unassigned matter, an act relative to the extermination of mosquitoes, H. P. 1638, H. D. 662, tabled by that member March 26, pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same member the House voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed; and the same member offered House Amendment A and moved its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to H. P. 1638, bill an act relative to the extermination of mosquitoes.

Amend said bill by striking out in the first and second lines the words "The insect known as the mosquito is hereby declared in all its stages a cause of sickness and a public nuisance, and;" and further amend said bill by striking out in the fourth and fifth lines the words "its control, suppression and abatement" and insert in place thereof the words "The extermination of mosquitoes and prevention of their breeding."

Thereupon House Amendment A was adopted; and on motion by the same member the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it passed to be engrossed House Paper 533, resolve in favor of the towns of Gardiner and Randolph.

Mr. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment A to said resolve and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read House Amendment A.

House Amendment A to H. P. 533, resolve in favor of the towns of Gardiner and Randolph.

Amend said resolve by adding at the end thereof the following: "The fund for this purpose to be taken from the Bridge Maintenance Fund."

House Amendment A was

adopted, and on motion by Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle, the resolve as amended by House Amendment A was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby House Paper 192, resolve in favor of the Trustees of bridge at East Machias and Machiasport was passed to be engrossed.

The same gentleman offered House Amendment A to said resolve and moved its adoption, as follows:

House Amendment A to House Paper 192, resolve in favor of the Trustees of the bridge between East Machias and Machiasport.

Amend said resolve by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1930, the funds for this purpose to be taken from the Bridge Maintenance Fund."

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

On motion by Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle the House voted to reconsider its action whereby House Paper 481, resolve in favor of the town of Fort Fairfield, was passed to be engrossed.

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

House Amendment A to House Paper No. 481, entitled a resolve in favor of the town of Fort Fairfield.

Amend said resolve by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1930, the funds for this purpose to be taken from the Bridge Maintenance Fund."

House Amendment A was adopted, and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve as so amended was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The House has in its possession H. P. 321, H. D. No. 96, an act to establish a Park Commission of the city of South Portland, which was recalled from the files pursuant to a Joint Order.

On motion by Mr. Richardson of South Portland, the rules were suspended and the House voted to

reconsider its action whereby it accepted the ought not to pass report on H. P. 321, H. D. 96, an act to establish a Park Commission of the city of South Portland; and on further motion by the same gentleman, a viva voce vote being taken, the House voted to substitute the bill for the ought not to pass report.

On further motion by the same gentleman the rules were suspended, the bill had its two readings and tomorrow assigned.

---

Reports of committees, out of order.

Mr. Farris from the committee on Judiciary on bill an act relating to the establishment of resi-

dence for certain purposes, H. P. 1547, H. D. 564, reported, the same in a new drafts under same title, H. P. 1706, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Aldrich from the committee on Revision of Statutes on bill an act relating to the appointment of public administrators, H. P. 1581, H. D. 584, reported same in a new draft under same title and that it ought to pass.

Reports read and accepted and the new drafts ordered printed under joint rules.

---

On motion by Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle,

Adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning.