

# 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

Friday, April 5, 1929.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Jennings of Gardiner.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

### Senate Bill in First Reading

S. P. 707, H. D. 715: An act relative to the Department of Education.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Judiciary on bill an act to create the Port of Portland Authority S. P. 307, S. D. 138, reporting same in new draft, under same title, S. P. 751, S. D. 406 and that it ought to pass.

Comes from the Senate the report read and accepted and the new draft passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A.

In the House:

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, this bill has been in the Legislature for some time. It has been amended in the committee and, as I understand it, all of the eminent domain has been taken out. It has been here trying to do something for the city of Portland and the State of Maine. Portland pier, or the State pier, in Portland, has outgrown itself. The Grand Trunk has abandoned Portland as a terminal for its European trade. I have in my possession some writings of what the Canadian government is trying to do against the citizens of Portland, and I would like to read you something that it is trying to do and is doing. The Grand Trunk officials would like to have this road run to Portland, but if you are working for a man you have got to do as he says. Therefore the management of the Grand Trunk railroad has got to do what the Canadian government says. I will read you one man's speech.

"The elimination of Portland, Me., as a terminal would not necessarily mean that the road would have to sell its 1600 miles of lines in the United States, Sir Henry Thornton, new head of the Canadian National Railways, today told a joint meeting of city councilmen and Board of Trade members.

"Sir Henry's remarks concern statement made Saturday night at Moncton by Lieutenant-Governor William R. Pugsley, who declared that the new railway head could not successfully administer the Grand Trunk Lines unless he divorced the lines in the United States from the Canadian.

"The possession of the Grand Trunk Lines over the border is not fundamentally connected with your problem with regard to Portland," Sir Henry added.

"The Grand Trunk Lines in the United States are valuable feeders of the Canadian National Railroad system and we must do considerable business with our neighbors in the South whether we like it or not," said Sir Henry.

"The United States is the principal reservoir of unattached capital in this country," he continued "if we amputate these lines somebody will get them. It would be better to have them on friendly terms with the Canadian National Railways than to let them fall into hostile hands."

"Sir Henry promised that the whole question would be thoroughly examined.

"On September 25th 1925 there appeared in the Portland Press Herald with the headlines below reproduced another dispatch from St. John, New Brunswick, as follows:

**"LOCAL TERMINAL NEEDED FOR TRADE OF DOMINION, ASSERTS ARTHUR MEIGHAN"**

"Unwise to 'dry up' Portland End of Canadian National until Canada Provides Better Facilities"

"St. John, N. B. Sept. 24.—Until sufficient facilities can be provided elsewhere, in justice to the whole trade of the Dominion it would be unwise to 'dry up' the Canadian National Railways terminals at Portland, Maine.

"This was the warning sounded to a big audience in the Imperial Theater, St. John, by Arthur Meighan, Conservative, in reply to the charge made by Premier Mackenzie King that the opposition party was responsible for taking away the trade of the Port of St. John because of its inclusion in the National Railways system of the Portland terminal and the premier's

subsequent suggestion that these should be sold.

"Moreover, Mr. Meighan asserted, the remedy in any case was not to sell the terminals, as Mr. King had urged, but divert traffic from them. It was possible to go much further in this connection than had yet been done, the Speaker argued, but at the same time he told the crowd of 3,000 that the maritime provinces must meet the Portland competition with better shipping facilities of their own before Portland lost all the business.

"Were the Portland terminals to be sold to an American company, declared Mr. Meighan, that company would use every effort to attract traffic to them, but if they remained under control of the National System, it could gradually divert its traffic to Canadian ports.

"He said that if he were sure it would not injure the prosperity of Canada he would 'dry up' the whole Portland terminals and close that port, so far as Canadian traffic was concerned, but there seemed to be a great doubt of the effect of such a procedure upon Canadian trade at the present time.

"Mr. Meighan during his address referred to the keen competition between Portland and St. John in the old days of the Grand Trunk system, and he closed with the statement that if the Maine terminals were to be placed in the hands of private interests, as the premier had suggested there would be a bitter struggle for the business offering, intimating that the private company might be able to make it very interesting for the Canadian Port."

Now members of this Legislature the Canadian government has said "dry up" Portland and get all the freights you can from the western states to go to St. John and Halifax. St. John and Halifax have spent millions of dollars to "dry up" Portland and "dry up" the State of Maine, it might be said.

Now we have come here in this matter and we have eliminated what we thought were the objectionable features in the bill first presented to this House. We ask you in all fairness, for your own sakes, whether you are going to let Canada rule the State of Maine, or whether the State of Maine is going

to rule itself. I stand here, I want to say, for the good old State of Maine.

I will say that Canadian parties now have a lease of the elevator, but 300 feet they cannot go under this bill. The Canadian Pacific, through the Boston and Maine and Maine Central, can come into Portland, and, as I understand, they agree to run a line of steamers to Europe every week in the year if they can get terminal facilities there.

I want to say that I am interested in this matter. My home is in Portland and I have lived there some sixty odd years. My father was born here and my forefathers were born here and I am right here at home. I want to see this bill have its first and second readings and, as it has been engrossed in the Senate, under suspension of the rules, I want to see it given all its readings here so that we can go home and say that this bill has been carried along as far as we can today.

Mr. FARRIS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation, due to the fact that this bill creates a body corporate having the same rights, privileges and powers as a corporation organized under the general law. Now this property, the State pier, so-called, the State has pledged it bond in the sum of \$1,564,000 and I am working on a proposition at this time and I would like to have the matter tabled until I can confer with a Portland attorney. Therefore I move that the bill be tabled.

A viva voce vote being doubted, a division of the House was had,

Thirty eight having voted in favor of the motion to table and 49 voting in opposition, the motion to table failed of passage.

Mr. ROUNDS: Mr. Speaker, I move that it have its several readings.

Thereupon the report of the committee, ought to pass in new draft, was accepted, and the bill had its two several readings.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment A.

Mr. ROUNDS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and amendment lie on the table for printing. Has it been engrossed in the Senate?

The SPEAKER: The bill has been passed to be engrossed in the Senate as amended by Senate Amendment A.

Mr. ROUNDS: Mr. Speaker, I would like then to have it go right along.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Senate Amendment A in concurrence?

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, has the motion to table been withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman withdrew his motion.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the paper on which we are acting, and I think possibly the amendment should be looked over to see if it corresponds with the Senate paper.

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, the purport of Senate Amendment A is that the parts stricken out in the bill taking away the right to mortgage property. In one section of the bill the word "mortgaging" was left in the new draft and the purpose of this amendment is to strike out the word "mortgaging" to conform to another section of the bill. The word "new" contained in it simply means that there was a restriction on their spending money for construction and there was put in there the word "new". The other amendment where it says "tracks", they simply put in to make it clear what tracks referred to—the tracks leading to the pier and elevators. So these amendments in no way affect the meaning but simply are for the purpose of making it conform by striking out the word "mortgaging," putting "new" before "construction", and by designating the tracks so there can be no mistake as to what they are. Therefore I can see no reason for delay on account of these amendments because they in no way affect the bill in the draft that is before us.

Thereupon Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: What time will the House assign for the third reading of this bill.

Mr. ROUNDS: The present time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, moves that the rules be suspended and that the bill receive its third read-

ing at this time. Before putting that motion, the Chair feels it fair to state that the reading of the bill for the third time this morning will eliminate the functions of the committee on bills in the third reading and will render much more probable a mistake in the engrossed bill, which will necessitate re-engrossing, and will probably cause delay rather than expedition.

Mr. ROUNDS: Then I will withdraw my motion, Mr. Speaker. Thereupon the bill was assigned for its third reading Monday, April 8.

#### Orders

On motion by Mr. Boston of Gardiner, it was

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that the Governor be requested to return to the House, House Paper 776, resolve in favor of Lloyd W. Hickey to reimburse him for injury and expense incurred while in the employ of the State of Maine.

#### Reports of Committees

Mr. Hawkes from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on resolve to provide for the completion of the raised road between Deer Isle and Little Deer Isle (H. P. 500) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1746) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Same gentleman from same Committee on resolve in favor of the Townships of T. 1. R. 9, T. 2. R. 9 and T. 3. R. 9 (H. P. 564) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1747) under same title and that it ought to pass.

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

#### First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

(H. P. 1743) (H. D. 815) An act relating to finger prints and photographs of criminals.

(H. P. 1744) (H. D. 816) An act relating to taxes upon mortgaged real estate.

#### Passed to be Engrossed

(S. P. 81) (S. D. 44): An act to provide for the exportation of surplus power.

(S. P. 541) (S. D. 364) An act to provide for building a bridge

across the Penobscot river, at or near Bucksport.

Mr. HOLMAN of Farmington: Mr. Speaker, I move that (S. P. 541) (S. D. 364) be indefinitely postponed, and that, when the vote is taken, we have a division of the House.

In making this motion I feel that this proposition is too much for the State as a State to take on at this time, considering the demand for a bridge to be built there by the State. In this Legislature we have passed a bill which touches all sections of the State to clean up the small bridges all over this State where the people of the whole State will get a benefit; and it seems to me that at this time, taking into consideration the credit of the State that has got to be extended because of other things which have come before this Legislature, that this is not the proper time for the State to take on this project; and I believe the bill should be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CARLETON of Winterport: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I feel differently than the last speaker. I feel that there is demand for a bridge by a certain number of people. I feel that if a bridge is to be built, it should be a State bridge, and I am going to say that I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Farmington (Mr. Holman) will not prevail.

Mr. JACKSON of Bath: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I believe that today the State of Maine has the best opportunity in its history of bridging some of its rivers, especially on the trunk lines of roads, to get good bridges at small cost to the State of Maine.

We have what I consider to be a very reliable estimate from engineers that this bridge—proposed State-owned bridge at Bucksport—can be built for \$1,200,000. I contend that this is a reliable estimate from the fact that it was made for Waddell & Hardesty, the same people who gave us the \$3,000,000 estimate on the bridge at Bath despite the fact that that estimate was disputed at the time by men high in authority in this State who contended that the bridge would cost from ten to

fifteen million dollars. That bridge has been built, the approaches to it built, and put in operation on the engineer's estimate; so I believe it is fair to assume that the Waddell & Hardesty estimate on this proposed Bucksport bridge is reliable.

Now assuming that this figure is to be taken at its face value. I want to read just a paragraph from the pen of Mr. MacDonald, Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads. Mr. MacDonald says: "Originally the law prohibited use of Federal funds for roads which serve as immediate approaches to toll bridges. Congress recognized that this might at times be desirable, and authorized Federal appropriations in payment of half the cost of public bridges, the State's portion of which is to be met by bonds repayable from toll collections. This, says Mr. MacDonald, has proved a feasible solution, and such toll bonds command an active market and more favorable terms than those placed by private interests. Public building also assures open competition in construction bidding." He further says: "In consideration of these and other facts the bureau generally opposes the construction of private toll bridges and favors construction under public auspices whether or not it is necessary to resort to tolls as a measure of finance."

I am informed by the Highway Commission that it would be simply a matter of form to have this approximately five miles of road off of the trunk line No. 1 designated as a Federal highway. That would bring it within the terms of this provision of the Federal Department.

Now a \$1,200,000 bridge, with the Federal Government paying one-half the cost, \$600,000 leaves \$600,000 for the State of Maine.

Again, statistics of toll collections across the Carlton bridge at Bath show that twenty-five per cent of the toll collections are from out of the State cars. In other words out of the State people are paying 25 per cent of that bridge, and I believe it is only reasonable to assume that the same proportions would hold true across the Bucksport bridge. Do not misunderstand me! I am not

stating that the gross toll collections across the Bucksport bridge would be as great as across the Carlton Bridge, because much of that traffic is diverted to Boothbay Harbor and Bristol, and so on, before getting to the Bucksport bridge; but I do believe that the same percentage would hold good.

Now, then, twenty-five per cent of \$600,000 is \$150,000. Deduct that from \$600,000 and you have \$450,000 left. Now where can the State of Maine invest its money to better advantage than buying a \$1,200,000 article for \$450,000?

The Highway Department informed me that there will be available June 1st in Federal funds for road and bridge building in Maine approximately \$1,400,000. They further say that under the present road and bridge program it will be quite impossible to absorb in a year more than \$750,000 of it. I fear, Mr. Speaker and members, that unless we do absorb more of this and use it while it is available, it may be diverted by the Federal government into other channels and we will lose it. That has happened in other cases and I think it fair to say that it might happen in this case. I have not any reliable information as to the toll collections across the Bucksport Ferry except that at the peak of summer travel they carry 450 cars per day. That is the only figure I have and I thought I would just state that in passing.

Now the statistics in the Highway Department show that over improved highways traffic doubles the first year. This would certainly be an improved highway. Across the Carlton bridge at Bath, the first year it was opened, I want to give you a comparison with the traffic across the ferry, and I see no reason why the same proportions should not hold good in comparison with the Bucksport ferry and the Bucksport bridge. The season following the opening of the bridge at Bath, from May 1st to the following April 1st, 11 months,—and I take the eleven months because for the month of April the roads are in such condition as to practically eliminate automobile travel,—but in spite of that the traffic for the eleven months over the Carlton bridge for the first year it

was opened increased eighty per cent over the same period across the ferry the year previous. I can see no reason with my limited vision why the State of Maine should not enter into this enterprise and I certainly hope that the gentleman's motion for indefinite postponement will not prevail.

Mr. TAYLOR of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, this matter is one of interest to the easterly section of the State of Maine. Not only that, it is of great interest to the whole State of Maine for the reason that as one part of our State is benefited, so benefits the whole. Now the lower section of our State of Maine, because of its two great rivers which flow into the sea, divide the State into three great sections. The westerly section is bounded on the east by the Kennebec. The middle section lies between the Kennebec and the Penobscot, and the easterly section, which we will consider more as we go on, is that great section including Hancock and Washington counties, that lies easterly on the Penobscot. The progress of the State of Maine was enhanced in the first instance because of those two great rivers which connected the resources of the interior of our State with that great highway of the world, the ocean. The first barrier, the Kennebec, has been spanned by the Carlton bridge which is a credit to the State of Maine, not only as a connecting link to the main highway along the coastal sections of our State, which was its primary purpose, but also because it has been a financial success as quoted to you this morning, practically beyond the dreams of those who promoted it.

The necessity and the feasibility of building this bridge across the Penobscot has been called to our attention several times this winter, especially because of the three bills that have been introduced by private concerns asking for this franchise, and also by the bill introduced which would give the State of Maine the privilege of building and owning this bridge.

There seems to be a tendency on the part of the Legislature here to hold in abeyance the project of the private ownership. There has been intimated from some source that if this bill were passed that

it should be built by the State under the issuance of bonds that it would be defeated because of the interest of some one who owns and has control of one of our newspapers. Now that is only introduced for the sake of delay, and though they claim that the building of this bridge would be done more quickly by private interests than by the State and we would have the use of it sooner, I feel that it would be well for the State to build it rather than give it over into the hands of private ownership. If that should be feasible, why not build all of our bridges and all of our roads at the place where it pays the most money? If it is a safe investment for a private corporation to come here and build a bridge across the most vital spots of the State of Maine, why not let the State have a chance to do this?

In highway construction the chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and this small ferry which plies its regular course across the waters of the Penobscot between Hancock and Waldo counties—and that is where our weakest link is in this connection,—and therefore, make it more easy for transportation to be carried on between those two counties and the other sections of the State. I have confidence in the people of this State that they will not be frightened by any particular one individual, and that no one not even the power of the press can turn the people of the State from their honest opinions in regard to the prosperity of this State. I will not go to the extent of quoting from the letter which has been issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, and which has been already referred to this morning by the last speaker, because you all know the tendency of the Federal government to encouraging the building of our bridges by the people rather than by private corporations; but I will quote from Senator Nickerson's speech, Page 543 of the Legislative Record, who says "Now, I have some estimates in regard to the business that would go over this bridge, and I think it is a very conservative estimate. Even the opponents of this measure can see that it is conservative. They have an estimate,

No. 1, which estimates that the total receipts and total revenue from this bridge would be \$62,500. I have another estimate which is a little larger, \$74,230, and I have estimated the interest on bonds and the upkeep of the bridge including the toll keeper at \$29,000, and this would provide a sinking fund in one case of something over \$30,000 and in the other of something over \$40,000."

Now as a business proposition, Senator Nickerson, who introduced this bill and who has made a careful study of the same, points out to you that it is good business for the State of Maine to build this bridge. This does not interfere with our road program or our bridge program, as was brought out to you by the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Holman, because this is introduced not as a burden on the people themselves, but introduced to you as an investment, and the primary object is to connect that weak link between the far east and the other section of our State, and, like the Carlton bridge, instead of being a burden to the people of this State, it will be a help to them not only as to prosperity but as a financial success.

There are other good reasons why this bridge should be built at this time:

1. Because private concerns have brought it to our attention demanding that they should have the privilege of franchise that they may make a good sum of money out of the same and therefore it must be a good business proposition. If a good business proposition for a private concern why not for the State of Maine?

2. Lofty banks on either side of this great river offer a location where it may be spanned without interfering with the traffic up and down its waters.

3. It may be built as I said before, without interfering with the road and bridge program of our State, whether it is by bond issue or otherwise, because the bonds can be issued, and this bridge, because of the tolls will be self-sustaining.

4. It can be built very cheaply at this time because of the provisions made by the Federal gov-



ernment for the building of State toll bridges as brought out by the last speaker.

5. It can be built as a safe business venture, as also shown to you by the last speaker.

6. It is bound to come at some future time, so why not have it now? Why all the fears of delay which never amount to anything? The fear of doing what we ought to do never brings success to anyone.

I hope that the motion of the first speaker for the indefinite postponement of this bill will not prevail.

Mr. ALDRICH of Topsham: Mr. Speaker, one hundred to hundred and fifty years ago it used to be the policy all over the United States to allow private capital to build roads, to build toll bridges and impose tolls upon the people of our country, but a more enlightened and business-like attitude has since prevailed until today I think the fact is that in the State of Maine there is not a single privately-owned toll bridge left. The last one which we had here has been taken over by the State of Maine at this session of the Legislature, namely the bridge at Arrowsic. So that we have adopted and pursued here in Maine the policy which has been pursued elsewhere, of owing, controlling and operating our highways in all respects.

Now let us see whether this is a good policy. In the first place, as a business proposition and as business men, we would assume that any proposal which is of value to private capital ought to be of at least equal value to the State of Maine if the proposal is in connection with something which it is proper that the State of Maine should operate, and no one will question that a bridge is within the category of the things which should be so operated. The privately-owned concern will pay \$1,200,000, if I am correctly informed, for this bridge, and I assume that they will pay interest at the rate, probably, of at least six per cent. Assuming that they can make a successful venture of that business proposition, of that investment, what will it cost the State of Maine for the same thing?

As has been shown by the gentle-

man from Bath (Mr. Jackson), by designating a very short strip of road on either side of this bridge as a Federal highway, the State of Maine will place itself in a position to receive Federal aid in the building of this bridge, with the result that the cost to the State of Maine, instead of being \$1,200,000, will be \$600,000. Now what will the State of Maine pay for the money on the investment which it makes? We all know that the State of Maine can borrow money unquestionably at four per cent or a very little over, so that you start out with a proposition on one side that the privately-owned bridge will cost \$1,200,000 with interest charges of six or seven per cent, as offset by the State's investment of \$600,000 with interest at four per cent.

Now, how does that affect us? I do not imagine there is a man in this House who would expect to support the privately-owned proposition unless he contemplated that some day the State of Maine is going to take over that bridge. I cannot conceive that anyone here would for a moment tolerate the suggestion that for time indefinite we would permit that bridge to remain as a private enterprise. Therefore we are preparing, at some future date, to take over a bridge which we could ourselves get for \$600,000 at a figure of over \$1,200,000, thereby losing, my friends, \$600,000 plus the difference in interest. But what more? Let us assume that we take over that bridge in twenty years. For the next twenty years while it is a privately-owned affair, you will pay tolls on that bridge, and then when the State of Maine takes it over for a million, two hundred thousand dollars or more, how many more years will you pay tolls on that bridge? You will pay them at least another twenty or thirty years, so that if you adopt the privately-owned bridge proposition, you start out absolutely with the understanding that for at least the next forty or fifty years, the State of Maine will pay tolls or the people of the State of Maine will pay tolls on that bridge.

Now what will happen if, instead of accepting that proposition, we build the bridge ourselves for \$600,000 instead of \$1,200,000? We will

pay tolls for the length of time which will be necessary to pay for the bridge, and I am assuming that if the State of Maine was prepared at the end of twenty years to take this over, if it is a privately-owned affair, we should expect that probably at the end of twenty years, if it is a State-owned affair it will have paid for itself and in that way you are going to save tolls to the people of the State of Maine for at least twenty or thirty years by having the State of Maine make its own investment. Now why should not we make our own investments? I understand the gentleman who spoke first stated we were not ready. Why aren't we ready for it? Is there any reason, if it is a good business proposition, why the people of the State of Maine are not ready to build a bridge? Are we unable to do so? I cannot conceive that this House would go on record as making the statement that the great State of Maine is unable to build a bridge and therefore by force of necessity expect private enterprise to do for it what it could do itself. I do not believe it is so—but if it is so, then for Heaven's sake let's wait until we can do it.

So I say to you, from every standpoint—I have no interest in this matter other than that of a citizen of the State of Maine—but from every standpoint that I can see, we should not revert to the old abandoned policy which under the days of the common law in England was established of permitting privately-owned toll companies to operate on our highways. He have got beyond that. Do not let us reestablish a precedent which has been abandoned.

Mr. INGRAHAM of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I think it well at this time possibly to correct an erroneous impression as to Bangor's attitude in this bridge matter. Originally when this bridge bill was introduced, Bangor's merchants were one hundred per cent against it. After they were educated more or less there has been a considerable change. They figured that all her Canadian traffic,—New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—would be diverted by way of Bucksport, and all the traffic coming from Massachusetts would detour around Bangor. Since then there has been a

traffic association formed to get the expression of the Bangor merchants. Now I am going to say to you that they are very much divided on this proposition, probably fifty-fifty. They figure in time that we will get a bridge there and that, though it is a little premature, all right they are willing to accept it. In a referendum, if one comes, it will be shown that in Bangor at least fifty per cent, to my mind, will support a State-owned bridge. It is true that Mr. Towle, who owns the Bangor News, is interested. He came to me and admitted that it was a selfish interest. He tried to create a one hundred per cent feeling among the citizens of Bangor and he has failed to do it. Now Mr. Towle has fought me at every election and I have won out. The Republican machine has fought me and I have won out. I do not think that Mr. Towle has as much influence with his paper as a lot of you people think he has. As a matter of fact, I told him in the last senatorial campaign that I never had any doubt as to my man winning until he came into the field backing him. So we have not got any particular power in the paper. When it comes to a proposition affecting the whole State of Maine, we should bury any prejudices that we have. We will get a certain amount of business from the county of Hancock and the county of Washington that might go elsewhere should we oppose them in the matter of the bridge.

I think I am voicing the majority of the citizens of Bangor when I say that they are agreeable to a bridge and that they will support a bridge and a referendum.

Mr. McCART of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, it may sound rather strange for a person coming from one of the counties most directly affected by having a bridge across the river at Bucksport, when I say that I am opposed to a State-owned bridge at this time. I suppose the most of the members of this House have listened to salesmen selling oil stock and perhaps some of you have bought some. I think we have just heard some sales stock by men who might be quite capable of selling oil stocks, because they have almost convinced me that a State-owned bridge

would be profitable at Bucksport.

I think that bridges and highways divide themselves into two parts. There are bridges of necessity and bridges of convenience, and I believe that the Bucksport bridge falls into the latter class. There has been a great deal of comparison here between the Carlton bridge and this proposed bridge at Bucksport. The traffic across the Kennebec river at Bath demanded a bridge. The ferry there was becoming incapable of carrying the traffic. That is not true at Bucksport. I have travelled by car down into that county a number of times from Portland and I have never used the Bucksport ferry, but have always gone by the way of Bangor.

It has also been said that we might get \$600,000 of Federal money for this bridge. Well, we might not. The resolve which accompanies this bill calls, I believe, for a bond issue of \$1,200,000. Those who are proposing the bridge cannot be sure of getting \$600,000. If we can get \$600,000, I would like to see just a little bit of it spent on some of the roads we have to ride over in Washington county. If you have ever traveled from Bangor to Calais, you know that you strike the worst pieces of road down in Washington county.

There are certain gentlemen who proposed to build a private bridge down there at Bucksport. Those men are business men and are willing to speculate. Perhaps they would make some money and perhaps they would not, but I do not think we want the State to speculate. I am sure I do not. Rather than to see a State-owned bridge down there, and I believe five miles of road built, which of course is not included in this \$1,200,000, so that I presume that would be at least another \$150,000, I would rather see no bridge at all and five miles of road built down in Washington county. There is no genuine necessity for this bridge but it would be a great convenience.

It has been said that the Carlton bridge has made money for the State. That is very true; but how much more traffic is there through Sagadahoc county than there is down into Hancock and Washington counties? I believe if you are satisfied that this bridge is called for by

the people—demanded—that you are perfectly right in voting for the bridge, and incidentally later along voting for a resolve calling for a bond issue of \$1,200,000. I think you feel that perhaps \$600,000 of Federal money might be better spent in other parts of the State, you should let this bill ride to defeat, and perhaps we would be willing to take a chance on a privately-owned bridge.

Mr. HAWKES of Richmond: Mr. Speaker, I will not take very much time. I attended the hearing before the committee on Ways and Bridges and the fact was then brought out that a charter for a privately-owned bridge would be worth one million dollars to the company receiving the franchise. If that is the case, it certainly is a good proposition for this State to take that over and build the bridge. If you will pardon a little personal experience. Several years ago I was in business with a gentleman in Massachusetts. He came to my place, crossed the old ferry at Richmond, and went down through Waldo county and across the ferry at this place mentioned, and he said they were two of the worst places for an automobile to cross that he ever encountered and that it was a disgrace to the State of Maine to have such conditions exist. I thank you.

Mr. JACK of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record as being in favor of a State-owned bridge. The gentleman from Eastport (Mr. McCart) has spoken about oil stock selling as a matter of argument, which is also another definition for hokus-pokus. The late war developed what was called a smoke screen for the purpose of covering up something that they wanted to put across, but he unconsciously pulled back the scenery and enabled me to see, and I presume some of your other gentleman, when he said that this proposition is being advocated, the privately-constructed bridge proposition, by business men; and when he made that statement he proved to me conclusively that this is a business proposition and that is all it is. If it is a good business proposition for what he terms to be business men, certainly it is a good business proposition for the State of Maine.

As to the argument that you might spend this \$600,000 somewhere else that is a little vague and is intended to take your attention away from the issue. Personally I am generous enough to spend this \$600,000 down in the section where it should be spent if we truly represent the best interests of the State of Maine.

Mr. JACKSON: Mr. Speaker, first to clear up a couple of points mentioned by other speakers. An antagonistic press was mentioned as a reason why a bond issue would probably not go over in a referendum. We have down in Bath an antagonistic press. A very insidious and bitter one. In spite of that the bond issue for the Carlton bridge went over seven to one. I say that first to clear that matter up as you have nothing to fear from an antagonistic local press.

Mention was made of the fact that the private interests could build a bridge more quickly and the bridge be put in operation at an earlier date than a State owned bridge. Now here is our experience! The bond issue went to a referendum in September. It passed, as I say, seven to one. The engineers got busy in September, October and early November and made their preliminary surveys, borings, soundings and measurements and got all the data necessary to go ahead during the cold winter months when there was a lot of ice in the river, and got out their detailed plans and specifications and advertised for bids, so that the next July the contracts had been let and operations were under way. Now if somebody conversant with this matter will tell me how much sooner a privately-owned bridge should be built, I would like to be shown.

The gentleman from Eastport (Mr. McCart) early in this session said on the floor of this House one day when a measure was under discussion that he would like to see that matter referred back to the committee where it would get some sensible action. I have always resented that. I do not feel that way about it. I believe a matter would get sensible action in a committee, and I also believe that in this body of intelligent, fair-minded men, a matter is going to get sensible action on the floor of this House, and I am willing to abide by the vote of my constituents in this matter.

Mr. COMINS of Eddington: Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I would feel just a bit guilty if I should return home without recording my views in regard to this bridge. I do not care to present any smoke screen as has been mentioned; but I want to say that I am opposed to a State-owned bridge and I am opposed to a privately-owned bridge, and I shall so vote.

It has been mentioned that this will necessitate the building of five miles of Federal aid road to get any funds from the Federal government; but I state to you that I believe it will call for the building of a State or Federal road from Prospect to the city of Ellsworth, which is certainly more than five miles. That, I believe, is what the intentions are and I believe what the outcome will be, and that constitutes quite an expense. This bridge in all probability will be built on Verona Island. There is a bridge at the present time from Verona Island to Bucksport, twelve to fourteen hundred feet long. It is a wooden bridge built on piling. I understand quite a sum of money has been expended on this bridge recently; but do you think that kind of a bridge would stand a great while on a State or Federal highway through our State? It is my opinion that the State of Maine will have to build a new bridge there very shortly.

I represent a class of eight towns just out of the city of Bangor, and through that class there are three State highways and a State-aid highway which goes from Bangor to Calais known as the Air Line, and none of those highways in the towns that I represent are macadam roads; they are just gravel roads with a tarred surface.

It seems to me that before the State takes such an obligation as this on its hands, it should improve the roads that we already have, and I know I am voicing the sentiment of the people I represent in opposing this bridge.

Mr. EATON of Calais: Mr. Speaker, having heard Calais mentioned several times on the floor, I think I had better say something about this matter. To take care of the through travel from Calais to Bangor, this bill is not a necessity. I have been traveling over this road for the last fifteen years and I have never been across this ferry

but once and that was on a foggy night when I got lost and got on the wrong road. I am against this bridge.

Mr. INGRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I sold Jewish hardware for a great many years, a term in my line for clothing, and as a salesman I was fairly good; but as an orator I am not much of a success. I cannot, however, see why we should pay \$1,200,000 for a bridge when there is a possibility of getting a bridge for six or seven hundred thousand dollars. Now that is just a sound, simple business proposition, as plain as two and two, and we should adopt a measure of saving to the State of Maine. In time we are going to have a bridge there, but I do not believe there is any immediate necessity for it nor any rush for it. A referendum in two years will bring it nearer to the time when we need this bridge and when we want it, and I am frank to admit that if I had an option on this bridge with the State of Maine's name tagged on it, I could take it to Wall Street and sell it to several I know for a handsome profit; and, if the promoters of this bridge will give me an option on it, I will pay something for it.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Monroe: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I am not going to say but a few words on this subject. The bridge is in my county and I think it will help my county and I think it will help the whole State of Maine. If it is a good proposition for a privately-owned concern, I think it is a good proposition for the State of Maine. Therefore I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Farmington (Mr. Holman) will not prevail, and I ask for a yea and nay vote on it.

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 Farmington, Mr. Holman, that S. P. 541, S. D. 364, an act to provide for building a bridge across the Penobscot river, at or near Bucksport, be indefinitely postponed. The gentleman from Monroe, Mr. Littlefield, has moved that when the vote is taken, it be taken by the yeas and nays. As many as support the motion of the gentleman from Monroe will rise and stand in their places until counted

and the monitors have returned the count.

A sufficient number obviously arose.

The SPEAKER: A sufficient number having obviously arisen the yeas and nays will be called for. A vote of yes on the roll call will be a vote in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Holman, and consequently a vote against the bill. A vote of no will be a vote against the motion and for the bill. Is the House ready for the question.

Mr. HARRINGTON of Patten: I ask to be excused from voting as I have agreed to pair with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Thatcher. He would vote for indefinite postponement and I against it.

Mr. Harrington was excused from voting.

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

YE—Allen, Sanford; Bishop, Blaisdell, Blanchard, Blodgett, Boston, Bove, Boynton, Burkett, Portland; Campbell, Carleton, Portland; Chase, Clark, Comins, Day, Eaton, Farris, Ford, Foster, Friend, Gillespie, Hamel, George; Hammond, Holbrook, Holman; Jackson, Portland; Jacobs, Wells; Kane, King, Lewis, Locke, McCart, McLean, Melcher, Morse, Rumford; O'Connell, Perham, Perkins, Pratt, Quint, Rackliff, Robie, Rogers, Greenville; Rounds, Rumill, Seavey, Small, East Machias; Sterling, Caratunk Plantation; Stuart, Tucker, Webster, Auburn; White, Dyer Brook; Wight, Newry; Williamson, Wing, Wright—56.

NA—Adams, Aldrich, Allen, Camden; Anderson, New Sweden; Anderson, South Portland; Ashby, Bachelder, Bailey, Belleau, Bisbee, Bissett, Briggs, Burkett, Union; Burns, Burr, Butler, Buzzell, Carleton, Winterport; Clifford, Crawford, Daigle, Dudley, Fogg, Folsom, Gagne, Gay, Hamel, Rodolphe, Hatch, Hathaway, Hawkes, Richmond; Hawkes, Standish; Heath, Hughes, Hunt, Hurd, Ingraham, Jack, Jackson, Bath; Jacobs, Auburn; Jones, Corinna; Jones, Waterville; Jones, Windsor; Jones, Winthrop; Kitchen, Laughlin, Lenfest, Leonard, Libby, Littlefield, Farmingdale; Littlefield, Monroe; Lombard, Lowell, MacKinnon, McKnight, Merrill, Milliken, Morin, Morse, Oakland; Palmer, Patterson, Peacock, Potter, Powers, Rea, Richardson, Roach, Rogers, Yarmouth; St. Clair, Sargent, Saucier, Small, Freedom; Stanley, Sterling, Kittery; Stetson, Stone, Taylor, Towne, Varnum, Vose, Ward, Webster, Buxton—81.

ABSENT—Angell, Couture, Hill, Hubbard, Mansfield, Picher, Pike, Roy, Sturgis, Sturtevant—10.

PAIRED—Harrington, Thatcher—2.

Fifty-six having voted in favor of the motion for indefinite postponement and 81 in opposition thereto, the motion failed of passage.

On motion by Mr. Taylor of Bel-fast the bill was given its third reading.

**Passed to Be Engrossed Continued**

H. P. 1735, H. D. 809: An act relating to prohibiting business and recreation on Sunday.

Mr. RODOLPHE HAMEL of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A to H. P. 1735, and move its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to H. P. 1735.

Section 35 of said act is hereby amended by striking out in the sixteenth line thereof the words "or collection taken" so that the last sentence in said section will read as follows:

"Or to the giving of scientific, philosophical, religious or educational lectures where no admission is charged."

Thereupon House Amendment A was adopted.

(H. P. 1740) (H. D. 811) An act to require the investment in permanent securities of school funds and other trust funds held by city, town, quasi-municipal corporations and State officers.

H. P. 1741) (H. D. 814) An act relative to liens on vehicles.

(S. P. 630) (S. D. 278) An act relating to the supervision, regulation and conduct of the transportation of persons over the public highways of the State of Maine by automobiles, jitney busses and auto stages by the Public Utilities Commission.

(S. P. 766) (S. D. 411:) Resolve appropriating money to pay claims allowed by the committee on Claims.

(S. P. 535) (S. D. 212) An act relating to the Department of Public Welfare.

(S. P. 700) (H. D. 708) An act relative to jurisdiction of Prison Commissioners in matter of paroles.

(H. P. 1690) (H. D. 750) Resolve in favor of screening Whetstone Pond, or Sylvan Lake so called.

**Passed to Be Enacted**

(S. P. 381) (S. D. 162) An act

relating to the acquisition of title to lands of railroad corporations by adverse possession.

(S. P. 698) (H. D. 706) An act to re-enact Chapter 132, Public Laws 1913, relating to the title of islands belonging to the State, repealed through an error by the General Repealing Act of the 1916 Revised Statutes.

(S. P. 734) (S. D. 384) An act to incorporate Fish River Power and Storage Company.

(H. P. 1637) (H. D. 661) An act relating to fusible plugs in steam boilers.

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

(H. P. 1693) (H. D. 753) An act relating to the consolidation of corporations.

(H. P. 1703) (H. D. 762) An act in relation to the Maine School for the Deaf.

(H. P. 1704) (H. D. 764) An act in relation to the State Military and Naval Children's Home.

(H. P. 1705) (H. D. 765) An act to simplify procedure in police or municipal courts.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will announce the committee of conference appointed on the part of the House on H. P. 1280, H. D. 792, an act relating to declaration upon a contract in writing the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Williamson, the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, and the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich.

**Orders of the Day**

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair presents the first matter tabled and today assigned, majority report ought not to pass, minority report ought to pass, committees on Public Utilities, Judiciary and Interior Waters jointly, on joint order relative to water power investigation, H. D. 11, tabled on April 3rd by the gentleman from Topsham, Mr. Aldrich, the pending question being acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. ALDRICH: Mr. Speaker, this pet order of mine which, at various times, under more or less difficulty, has been kept alive, having in a very large measure, I believe, served its purpose, I now move that it be indefinitely postponed.

A viva voce vote being taken, the

motion prevailed, and the order was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the second matter today assigned, House report ought to pass in new draft, committee on Judiciary, on bill an act relating to licensing of operators of motor vehicles after their conviction of operating the same while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, H. P. 1468, H. D. 511, new draft being H. P. 1699, which appears never to have been printed, the report having been tabled on April 3rd by the gentleman from Kingfield, Mr. Wing, the pending question being acceptance of report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Wing the bill was retabled.

Mr. KITCHEN of Presque Isle: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended and that the ladies be allowed to smoke. (Laughter and Applause.)

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Presque Isle, (Mr. Kitchen), if he is prepared to provide the material.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle may reply if he desires.

Mr. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I will say that we will have it here shortly. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Kitchen, moves that the rules be suspended in order that the ladies be permitted to smoke. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, if that is subject to amendment, I will move that the rules be suspended and that the members, both ladies and gentleman, be allowed to smoke. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Kitchen, withdraw his motion?

The motion was withdrawn and on motion by the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, the rules were suspended and the members allowed to smoke.

#### Senate Order out of Order

From the Senate: Ordered, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet Monday, April 8th, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Comes from the Senate, read and passed.

In the House: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. McCart, offered House Amendment A and moved its adoption, as follows:

House Amendment A to joint order relative to adjournment.

Amend said order by striking out the word "three" and inserting in place thereof the word "four".

Mr. McCART: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain the amendment by stating that the train from the East does not arrive until half-past three, and therefore it will not be possible for the members from the East to get here unless they come back on Saturday.

A viva voce vote being taken, House Amendment A was adopted, and the order as amended received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the third matter today assigned, House report ought not to pass, committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on resolve in favor of an appropriation for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and childhood, H. P. 1147, H. D. 366, tabled on April 3rd by the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, the pending question being acceptance of report; and the Chair recognizes the member.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This resolve, H. D. 366, is very brief, and I think unless we are familiar with the history of the matter, perhaps some of us may not know what is involved.

This is a resolve for the appropriation of some \$25,000 a year for the next two years for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and childhood, the sum to be expended under the direction of the Department of Health.

The Appropriations Committee, as I understand, is bringing in a recommendation for a general appropriation of \$15,000 instead of \$25,000, which is \$10,000 less than the State Department of Health has been spending in the past two years, and if their recommendation is adopted instead of this resolve, it would mean cutting down that part of the work of the Department of Health and the discharge of several nurses. Now this \$25,000

in the last two years did not all come from funds of the State of Maine.

Two years ago we had this matter debated and threshed out in the Legislature on the question of the matter of whether we would accept from the Federal Government the aid for this work such as was being given in other States, being merely dependent on our acceptance. The opposition at that time, so far as it was expressed then, was on the ground that they were opposed to taking the money from the United States Government for this purpose. Some of the chief opponents said that they were in favor of it only they did not want to take the money from the Federal Government for this purpose.

That act, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, has expired by limitation, and we are now in a position to see whether we shall continue that work by the money of the State of Maine. Now in the past two years, under the expenditure of this money by the State Department of Health, there have been conferences held for the benefit of the children—perhaps I had better go back and show the sort of work that it is. This work is the spreading of information as to the proper care and feeding of children up to the age of six years, also as to the proper care of expectant mothers, so the children may be born healthy; the holding of conferences for the extending of this information, which is, of course, needed by expectant mothers and mothers of small children; and sending nurses in order to give this information and hold these conferences.

During the last two years there have been reached 12,700 children under the age of six years by this information and assistance of the nurses of the Department of Health. There have been reached 1,800 cases of expectant mothers, so that the information shall be given for a healthy child to be born and the care a mother might have for healthy children. I said two years—it is really only a year and a half because these figures are only up to December, 1928, and the money was not available until July, 1927.

Everywhere this work has been done in other states there has been a decrease in the death rate among young children and a decrease in

the death rate among mothers at childbirth. It has increased, of course, the health of children. Their physical stamina is fixed in these early years of childhood, and that is when the greatest danger and the greatest evil comes from improper feeding or malnutrition. This work is to prevent that.

Now this House, in its wisdom, has appropriated \$300,000 for agriculture. I do not want to be understood for a moment as not agreeing with that appropriation. The purpose of it has been to give to the farmers of the State assistance in the proper feeding of the live stock and the production and sale of their products. We, by unanimous vote the other day, appropriated \$25,000 for an egg-laying contest, the purpose of which was to find out and to extend the information as to the proper food for hens. Now the work that we are doing here is to instruct the people of this State in the proper food for young children and the proper care for young children, that we may have a healthy citizenship.

So, if we believe it is more important to know how to feed children than to know how to feed hens, if we believe it is more important to have healthy children than to have healthy hogs, if we believe that it is not so important to build memorials to the dead—we have had several bills here for statues for memorials to the dead—if it is not more important to build statues to the dead than to rear the living to health and to service for State; if we believe it is more important to have healthy and efficient citizens and to preserve the lives of children, then we, I believe, will vote to substitute the bill for the report. (Applause)

Mr. MERRILL of Dover-Foxcroft: Mr. Speaker, I could not if I would add anything to the eloquence and logic of our esteemed member from Portland, (Miss Laughlin).

To go back to the last session a moment, those who were present here two years ago will remember that this bill was fought rather bitterly—perhaps not bitterly but with extreme earnestness. My contention at that time as against those who opposed Federal Aid, was that if we should take advantage, for the following two years, which now are the past two years, we would just



about get back what money we had put in which had been going to other States, and from which we had received no advantage. The work has gone on during the past two years with an appropriation from the State and Federal Government of between twenty-five and thirty thousand dollars, based upon the supposition, the evident intent of the members of the last Legislature that the work in the future should be carried on by our own State.

Now this year I was called before the Appropriations Committee and asked, if the committee could not find it possible to grant the increase necessary in this particular appropriation and the other appropriations asked for by the department, where, in my judgment, was the money most needed that they felt they could add to the total amount appropriated for the Health Department. I said most emphatically that this work should not be curtailed, that the saving could be very well made in the clerical force, where it was not as vital in the saving of human life and the maintaining of the standard of health. I supposed that that would be followed. Instead of that, the Appropriations Committee have given a blanket increase, practically, to the Department, of \$9,000, leaving it discretionary with the Commissioner of Health where he shall apply that \$9,000.

It is the wish of those of us who are distinctly interested in this phase of public health work, who feels that it would be a backward step of tremendous importance should this work be now curtailed, not to have nurses discharged, and the work practically abandoned instead of progressing. It is our feeling that it is of vital importance that this body should fix—taking it from the responsibility on the part of this Commissioner—that this body should fix upon where that excess shall be expended. I wish to heartily endorse the stand taken by the member from Portland (Miss Laughlin).

Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Farmingdale: Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with what both members have said, but I want to explain the position of the committee. As the member from Portland (Miss Laughlin) stated, there was set up from the State \$10,000 in previous years, and

the Federal Government appropriated \$15,000 for the Department of Health. The Budget Committee recommended for this appropriation \$10,000 and we got the head of the department before us and investigated this department and its appropriation from the State the same as we have every other department, he advised us that this \$15,000 would be taken away from him this year, but owing to the inefficient manner in which it had been spent, he thought that with an extra \$5,000 he could efficiently handle this part of this department, and in going into it further—we have given him another chance—he is still of that opinion. Therefore, the committee in looking for savings in every department, their final figure, while he has not been definitely settled, stands at \$15,000 at present; and from what information we can gather from the Department of Health this work will be as efficiently handled, very nearly, as it has been in the past.

Mr. LOCKE of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Merrill, one or two questions if I may, through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft may reply to the questions if he desires to do so.

Mr. LOCKE: I would ask the member, Mr. Speaker, if he has followed up the work of this committee relative to the expenditure of this money since the appropriation two years ago?

Mr. MERRILL: The question, if I understand it, is, if I have followed up the work of the committee having this work in charge. I have not done so intimately—only in a general way have I known of it.

Mr. LOCKE: Now, Mr. Speaker I would like to ask the member, please, if he knows whether any of this money, directly or indirectly, has been appropriated for the spread of propaganda relative to birth control?

Mr. MERRILL: I have never heard an intimation, even, that it has been so used.

Mr. CARLETON of Portland: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The members of the Appropriations Committee have gone over this as well as the other expenses of the State, and I find that our increases of the different de-

partments are \$327,000 and \$320,000 respectively for the next two years. Also in this budget you will find \$125,500 was spent in the two years previous. That budget has been raised \$6,000 and if now we are in a position to raise \$5,000 more through this committee, what is the use of a budget? What is the use of people going around and getting the ideas of the heads of departments, and then have these resolves come in here? We don't know where we are. I hope that the \$15,000 will be sufficient for this department.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, there must be a misunderstanding somewhere as to what the head of this department said. I inquired of the head of this department and he stated he had never said he would be satisfied with this amount. I interviewed two nurses in charge of the department. Both of them said it would curtail very much the work that they had been doing in the past two years. The statement as to inefficient management is most amazing, because this money has been expended solely under the Department of Health of the State of Maine, and by nobody else, and I can hardly understand how the head of that department would say he had managed it inefficiently. We want to get away from any misunderstanding on that line. It has been handled by nobody but the Department of Health. Now when it comes to the matter of all this money that we are going to spend, we come right back to this—what are we going to improve and what we will not—whether we will make the more important improvements or not? This may increase the tax rate, but is not the health and welfare of our future citizens of this State, the health of the young children of the State, important enough compared with all the others, so that it should get the amount that is necessary to carry on this work?

I would like to say in reference to the questions by the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Locke, that I have been a little bit in touch with the way this work has been done, and I am positive there has not been one dollar in the State expended more efficiently than the money for that purpose has been expended, and not any has accomplished as good results for this State.

Mr. MERRILL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say, regarding the Commissioner of Health that the Commissioner of Health told me that this is his attitude in making up his budget: He specifies the sums which he deems necessary for the adequate carrying on of his department. He says "There my duties cease. If they do not see fit to give me that money, I have to curtail. It is not for me to dictate. I take whatever money is allowed me, and I do the best I can with it. If I am not allowed enough, some part of the service necessarily must suffer."

Now that is the whole question. The Commissioner of Health has to do the best he can with what money is given him. He does make specifications and recommendations as to the amount, and he should be listened to. There is no subject on which we legislate that is of the importance of this matter of public health, and it should not be treated with anything but the the greatest amount of consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: What a poor place for us to economize; We spend millions for education of our children, and we are quarrelling over a few thousand dollars to educate mothers how to care for them when they are young.

I have a youngster three years old. The period of his public education has not yet begun, but the period of his up-bringing and the maintaining of his health has begun. I wish that all children throughout the State could have the care which we are fortunate enough to be able to give to this child. I think this appropriation should be made and the work, instead of being curtailed or even being carried on as at present, should be extended as rapidly as possible. (Applause)

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Speaker, I just want to clear up my use of the word "inefficiency" as the member from Portland (Miss Laughlin) has alluded to us. It was told us, and of course we all know that if the Federal Government spent money, they did it under their supervision. They come down here and see what is done with the money they give us, and the travelling expenses of the supervisors, their ho-

tel bills, and all those things are taken out of this appropriation, the way it has been reported to us; and the question was brought up that it could be done much more efficiently with State of Maine nurses and save quite a lot of money, as the bill for first-class hotels and first-class travelling amounted to considerable.

Mr. PERHAM of West Paris: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I am in favor of substituting the bill for the report, as the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, and Mr. Williamson of Augusta, have mentioned.

The gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Merrill, was given permission to address the House the third time.

Mr. MERRILL: Mr. Speaker, I am instigated to speak a third time because of a statement which has been made—evidently with absolute fairness, but with the grossest misunderstanding of the facts. We had to contend with this same ignorance of the language in the bill two years ago. That bill provided that in states where there was no organization set up which could carry on this kind of work that the Federal Government should supervise it but in states having an organization—and our State is one so recognized—the Federal Government has not the slightest restriction or power of inspection; not a dollar of the money goes for Federal inspection; every dollar is spent in the actual carrying on of the work of the forces of the Health Department of this State, and not one penny goes anywhere else.

Mr. CARLETON of Winterport: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to go on record as being in favor of the motion of our Representative from Portland (Miss Laughlin). While at the present I have not any small children of my own, I am the proud grandfather of eight children, the last being a healthy boy about six months old at the present time. When one of these children was about two months old, it was very delicate, and I feel that through the assistance of one of these nurses, it was brought back to health. I feel that the money has been well expended, and I want to go on record as in favor of this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, I wish also to go on rec-

ord as being in favor of the motion of the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin. If efficiency and economy are desirable in the raising of the chickens and hens and horses and cattle of this State, why should we neglect the children? Shall we allow deterioration in the health of our children in this State when we are taking care of the live stock. I think that we should increase the health standing of those who control the destinies and affairs of our State. I consider this an economic measure for the benefit of the State.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question.

The question was called for.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question. The member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, has asked for a division. The question before the House is on the motion of the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, that the bill, House Paper 1147, or, rather, resolve so numbered, be substituted for the ought not to pass report. As many as are in favor of the motion will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have returned the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and fourteen having voted in the affirmative and two in the negative, the motion for substitution of the resolve for the report prevailed; and on further motion by Miss Laughlin the resolve was given its first reading and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will announce that the Senate has just concurred with the House in the adoption of the amendment to the order relating to adjournment, so that both branches have concurred in the adjournment to Monday next at 4 P. M.

Mr. KITCHEN of Presque Isle: Mr. Speaker, in order to convenience a member of this body, I move that the rules be suspended and that we take up out of order, the fifth unassigned matter, House order relative to printing engineer's report on investigation of concrete on projects 102A, 102B and 103A, State Highway Commission, tabled by me on April 4th, the pending question being passage.

The motion prevailed.

Mr. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Friend.

Mr. FRIEND: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw my order of yesterday afternoon.

Permission of the House was granted and the order withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House report of the committee of Conference on bill an act relating to pilots for the Port of Portland. The committee of Conference reporting on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on House Paper 862 bill an act relating to pilots for the Port of Portland, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report that they are unable to agree, the report being signed by all of the conferees.

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adhere.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to accept the report of the committee of Conference?

Mr. FARRIS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the question of the acceptance of the report of the committee of Conference.

Thereupon, the report was accepted.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House adhere to its former action.

The SPEAKER: The member from Portland, Miss Laughlin, moves that the House adhere to its former action.

Mr. FARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate, the motion to recede taking precedence over the motion to adhere.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I trust that this motion will not prevail. This matter was thoroughly discussed by this House; it was voted on by a roll call vote. We moved to insist and appoint a committee of Conference. It does not seem that there should be any argument in this House, after having the matter thoroughly discuss-

ed, and even proceeding to a roll call vote and then recede from the action that we took. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Augusta (Mr. Farris) will not prevail, and that the House will maintain the position it took when this bill was before it.

Mr. FOSTER of Ellsworth: Mr. Speaker, is this motion debatable at this time?

The SPEAKER: The motion is debatable.

Mr. FOSTER: I would like to say just a word in support of the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, that the House recede and concur with the Senate who passed this bill by a vote of 18 to 12.

If the proponents of this bill in any way felt that it would deprive the Port of Portland of its pilotage, if it would hazard the Port of Portland or the lives of the people coming into the Port of Portland, the pulp and paper industries of this State would be the last ones to support it.

The act of 1927 in no way protects the harbor of Portland; it simply protects the pilots of the Port of Portland, to enable them to collect a fee for a service that is not performed and is not necessary to be performed.

I do not care to go into the details of this thing any further. I think we all understand it, and in the consideration of this question I hope you will vote in accordance with your best judgment, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, (Mr. Farris) will prevail.

Mr. PERHAM of West Paris: Mr. Speaker, again I would like to stand up in favor of sticking by Miss Laughlin and our former vote and against the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. BUTLER of Bath: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I stood up here a few days ago and they said I made a speech. I am not going to make any speech now. The gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster, says this bill is to protect the pilots. This bill is to protect the big paper companies of the State of Maine. That is what they want. It is not to protect the pilots. The poor pilots have all they can do to get along now. All the

paper companies and the pulp companies want is to take this money from the pilots.

Now I will tell you why they do it. They have these ships chartered on a time charter, and the consignees of the pulpwood pay the port charges, and there is no other way they see to get a few dollars back except to take it from the pilots. Now if they had these ships chartered on what we call a straight charter and the ship paid its own bill, they wouldn't say a word about the pilots. I hope you gentleman will vote the way you did before.

Mr. PEACOCK of Readfield: Mr. Speaker, there has been absolutely no change in the facts in regard to this matter as discussed in our previous meeting. I trust that the House will sustain its former vote, and that the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, will not prevail.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one word more. The matter here to my mind is not primarily whether we are going to protect the big pulp mills, not primarily whether we are providing work for the pilots; the primary thing here is whether we will adopt a rule for the safety and lives of people on the ships coming into the port of Portland, a rule which all the sea faring world has said is a right rule, a necessary rule, a rule of safety and a rule which has been adopted by every other port in the United States, I trust that the motion of the gentleman that we should go back on our former action will not prevail. I would like to inquire of the Speaker, in view of the action taken by this House, whether it would require a two-thirds vote to reverse our former action.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of the opinion that the motion to recede and concur is perfectly in order at this time, and requires only a majority vote.

Mr. TAYLOR of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the committee before which this matter was taken up, the matter, of course, came to us through the various interests for and against the bill, but in considering the matter by the committee, we thought it was only just and fair that we should consider it as a safety measure, not the question of whether we

should follow strictly along the lines of an old custom that has been carried on, because it was shown, as far as we could find out, that under the law prior to that passed in 1927 that the safety of the harbor was as safe-guarded as it was after the passage of that act; and that the act itself accomplishes only one purpose. It is not shown that it has changed the safety of the harbor, but, rather, that it has afforded practically a closed corporation of the pilots of the port of Portland; therefore, I ask you to support the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris.

Mr. JACK of Lisbon Falls: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether we are proceeding correctly. Will the Chair refer to page 52, rule 13?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lisbon Falls, Mr. Jack, rises to a point of order, and calls attention to the 13th joint rule. He suggests that the motion to recede is out of order by virtue of the provisions of the thirteenth joint rule, if the Chair correctly understands the gentleman.

Mr. JACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has always entertained considerable doubt as to the correct meaning to be attributed to the last clause of the thirteenth rule "that no other action shall be had except through another committee of Conference," but the Chair will rule as to the best of its ability that the motion to recede and concur is in order. The ruling of the Chair may be appealed from like all the Chair's rulings.

Mr. HURD of Berwick: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't look to me as if the question as to the port of Portland comes before us now. With all due respect to the Honorable Senate, I think the question for us to decide is as to whether we wish the Senate, to dictate our minds or whether we have minds of our own. (Applause)

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, this bill demonstrates the advantages and disadvantages of the bi-nominal system. If you recall the vote taken in the House and the vote taken in the Senate, I believe you will agree I am correct in saying that in the whole Legislature this bill has the approval of the majority by just one

vote, the House having voted by five votes and the Senate by six. Now both sides of this proposition have presented their facts very fairly. I do not think there is any question of anybody dictating the votes. It is so close there must be a great deal of merit on each side, and I have been hopeful from the beginning that there might be some basis for compromise in this matter. The committee of Conference apparently has been unable to agree. Without attempting to deal with the merits of the proposition, I should simply like to point out how equally divided the sentiment is, and to say that in view of the fact that the division is so even, I believe that the vote should be by the yeas and nays.

**THE SPEAKER:** Is the House ready for the question? The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, that the House recede and concur. The gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Chase, has moved that when the vote is taken that it be taken by the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have returned the count.

A sufficient number arose.

**THE SPEAKER:** A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays will be called for.

The gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Sargent, was given permission of the House to be excused from voting, he having stated that he was paired with the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Thatcher, Mr. Sargent stated that he would vote no and Mr. Thatcher yes.

**THE SPEAKER:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in giving passage to bill an act regulating pilots for the Port of Portland.

Miss **LAUGHLIN:** Mr. Speaker, will you explain a little more fully exactly what this vote means, a vote of yes and a vote of no?

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair will endeavor to explain the situation more fully. A vote of yes on the motion will be in favor of the House receding and concurring. The effect of receding and concur-

ring will be to resuscitate the bill; a vote of no would be against receding and concurring and would leave the bill dead between the two Houses, the Senate having given passage to the bill, the House having refused passage to the bill, and a committee of Conference having been unable to reach any agreement. Is the question clear to the House? The Clerk will call the roll.

**YEA**—Adams, Belleau, Bishop, Blanchard, Blodgett, Boston, Burgett, Portland; Burkett, Union; Burns, Chase, Clark, Day, Eaton, Farris, Folsom, Ford, Foster, Friend, Gillespie, Hamel, Rodolphe, Hammond, Harrington, Hatch, Hathaway, Hawkes, Standish; Hill, Holman, Hughes, Jack, Jacobs, Wells; Jones, Winthrop; Kane, King, Kitchen, Lewis, Littlefield, Farmingdale; Lowell; MacKinnon; McKnight, McLean, Melcher, Merrill, Morse, Oakland; Morse, Rumford; Rackliff, Robie, Rogers, Greenville; Rogers, Yarmouth; Rumill, Saucier, Seavey, Small, Freedom; Small, East Machias; Sterling, Kittery; Sterling, Caratunk Plantation; Taylor; Tucker; Varnum, Vose, Webster, Auburn; White, Dyer Brook; Wright—62.

**NAY**—Aldrich, Allen, Camden; Allen, Sanford; Anderson, New Sweden; Anderson, South Portland; Angell, Ashby; Bachelder, Bailey, Bisbee, Bissett, Blaisdell, Bove, Boynton, Briggs, Burr, Butler, Buzzell, Campbell, Carleton, Portland; Carleton, Winterport; Clifford, Comins, Crawford, Daigle, Dudley, Fogg, Gagne, Gay, Hamel, George; Hawkes, Richmond; Heath, Holbrook, Hunt, Hurd; Ingraham, Jackson, Bath; Jackson, Portland; Jacobs, Auburn; Jones, Corinna; Jones, Waterville; Jones, Windsor; Laughlin, Lenfest, Leonard, Libby, Littlefield, Monroe; Locke, Lombard; McCart, Milliken, Morin, O'Connell, Palmer, Patterson, Peacock, Perham, Perkins, Potter, Powers, Pratt, Quint, Rea, Richardson, Roach, Rounds, St. Clair, Stanley, Stetson, Stone, Stuart, Towne, Ward, Webster, Buxton; Wight, Newry; Williamson, Wing—77.

**ABSENT**—Couture, Hubbard, Mansfield, Picher, Pike, Roy, Sturgis, Sturtevant—8.

**PAIRED**—Sargent, Thatcher—2.

**THE SPEAKER:** The chair presents the fourth matter today assigned, bill an act relating to license fees for small loan agencies, S. P. 649, S. D. 300, tabled on April 4th by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jackson, the pending question being third reading; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman.

**THE SPEAKER:** The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jackson, moves

that the bill have its third reading at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be retabled until Monday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Williamson, moves that this bill, Senate Paper 649, Senate Document 300, an act relating to license fees for small loan agencies lie upon the table and be specially assigned for Monday next. As many as are in favor of the gentleman's motion will say aye; as many as are opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail; and on motion by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jackson, the bill was given its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the fifth matter today assigned, resolve in favor of State School for Girls, S. P. 414, S. D. 166, tabled on April 4 by the gentleman from Farmingdale, Mr. Littlefield, the pending question being final passage; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield the House voted to reconsider its action whereby this resolve was passed to be engrossed, and that gentleman offered House Amendment A and moved its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to S. P. 414. Amend said resolve by striking out the word "six" in the fourth line thereof, and by striking out the entire fifteenth to twenty-first lines inclusive, beginning with the word "special" and ending with the numerals "800.00".

Thereupon House Amendment A was adopted, and on motion by Mr. Littlefield the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the first unassigned matter, House report ought to pass in new draft from the committee on Banks and Banking on bill an act relating to interest charged by small loan agencies, the new draft being numbered H. P. 1742, H. D. 813, the report having been tabled on April 4th by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jackson, pending its acceptance; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON: Mr. Speaker, I

now move the acceptance of the report of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by one of the persons interested in opposing this bill to have it remain on the table, and for that reason I ask that it lie on the table until Monday.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to re-table failed of passage.

On motion by Mr. Jackson, a viva voce vote being taken, it was voted to accept the report of the committee; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill had its two several readings and Monday assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the second unassigned matter, majority report ought to pass in new draft and minority report, ought not to pass, from the committee on Ways and Bridges on bill an act to authorize the Treasurer of the State, under the direction of the Governor and Council, to issue bonds for State highway and bridge construction, conditional on the adoption by the people of a Constitutional Amendment authorizing such bonds, the new draft being numbered H. P. 1728, H. D. 801, tabled on April 4th by the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Merrill, pending acceptance of either report.

On motion by Mr. Merrill, a viva voce vote being taken, the matter was retabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents the third unassigned matter, majority report, ought not to pass, and minority report, ought to pass, from the committee on Ways and Bridges, on bill an act to provide funds for the construction of State highways, H. P. 1225, H. D. 409, tabled on April 4th by the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Kitchen, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Kitchen a viva voce vote being taken, the matter was retabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth unassigned matter majority report ought not to pass, and minority report ought to pass from the committees on Ways and Bridges and Taxation jointly on bill an act re-

lating to a tax on gasoline, H. P. 1244, H. D. 412, tabled on April 4th by the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Kitchen, pending acceptance of either report.

On motion by Mr. Kitchen, a viva voce vote being taken, the matter was retabled.

The SPEAKER: Is there further business under orders of the day?

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to ask that S. D. 397, an act relative to certification of cases to the law court be tabled for the purpose of correcting a clerical error. I am not sure that that paper is before the House. It does not appear on the printed calendar.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman know whether the bill was passed to be enacted this morning?

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall. It was called to my attention just a moment ago.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is advised that the bill is not before the House. Is there further business under orders of the day?

On motion by Mr. Allen of Camden, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby report of the committee on Judiciary on bill an act to revise the workmen's compensation act, being the fourth specially assigned matter for Tuesday next was assigned for that day; and on further motion by the same gentleman it was voted to take that matter from the table. On motion by the same gentleman the House accepted the report of the committee, ought to pass in concurrence, and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill had its two several readings.

Mr. Allen thereupon offered House Amendment A and moved its adoption, as follows; and that the same be printed.

House Amendment A.

Amend Senate Document 410, S. P. 761, by substituting in lines eight and nine of the third paragraph of section 28 the words "two thousand" for the words "fifteen hundred."

The amendment was adopted.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Camden, move for the printing of the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion.

Thereupon the bill as amended

was assigned for its third reading on Monday, April 8.

The SPEAKER: Is there any further business under orders of the day?

Mr. JACKSON of Bath: Mr. Speaker, if in order, I wish to make a correction. I am advised by my friend, Mr. McCart of Eastport, that his remarks some days ago to which I referred this morning, referred to the Spear committee in distinction from any special committee that might be appointed and not to any committee in the House.

The SPEAKER: The House hears the correction.

The following reports were taken up out of order under suspension of the rules:

Majority report of the committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act barring professional Sunday sports and allowing recreation that does not disturb and annoy the nearby public (H. P. 1503) (H. D. 528) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1748) under title of "An act to provide for the appointment of a Commission to recommend changes in the Sunday law" and that it ought to pass.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CROSBY of Penobscot  
MURCHIE of Washington  
—Of the Senate  
BLAISDELL of Franklin  
BURKETT of Portland  
PEACOCK of Readfield  
SARGENT of Brewer  
TAYLOR of Belfast  
BELLEAU of Lewiston

—Of the House

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DWINAL of Knox  
—Of the Senate  
JACK of Lisbon Falls

—Of the House

(On motion by Mr. Perham of West Paris, a viva voce vote being taken, both reports tabled, pending acceptance of either, and 1000 copies of the new draft ordered printed.)

Mr. Comins from the Committee on Public Utilities on bill an act relating to eminent domain for ferries (H. P. 1478) (H. D. 518) re-



porting same in a new draft (H. P. 1749) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Report was read and accepted and the new draft ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

On motion by Mr. Merrill of Dover-Foxcroft

Adjourned until Monday, April 8th, at 4 P. M.