

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-Sixth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1933

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

ERRATA:

**The following errata are
inserted because one or more pages
in this session day have errors
noticed and corrected here.**

- Page 656—Bill an act relating to weights and measures, Senate Paper 568, Legislative Document 849—should be L. D. 859.
- Page 656—Senate Paper 571 should be 578.
- Page 661—An act closing Middle Range Pond to ice fishing, H. P. 693, L. D. 562—Should be H. P. 693, L. D. 362.
- Page 662—New draft 1632, L. D. 948 should be L. D. 984.
- Page 664—An act relating to school unions, H. P. 1624, L. D. 970—Should be H. P. 1634, L. D. 970.
- Page 669—An act relating to publicity (H. P. 1639, L. D. 975)—Should be (H. P. 1639, L. D. 973)
- Page 669—"An act extending the charter of the Fryeburg Village Fire Corporation" (H. P. 80, L. D. 380)—Should be (H. P. 870, L. D. 380)
- Page 670—Reading misspelled.
- Page 670—Resolve in favor of Frederick A. Burbish of Mt. Vernon (H. P. 747)—Should be Frederick A. Furbish.
- Page 673—An act to revise the Charter of the City of South Portland (H. P. 597, L. D. 923)—Should be (H. P. 1597, L. D. 923)
- Page 676—The President laid before the Senate, (S. P. 212, L. D. 278)—Should be (S. P. 212, L. D. 279)
- Page 679—Resolve providing for a state pension for Mary A. Leighton of Gardiner, (H. P. 74, L. D. 670)—Should be (H. P. 74, L. D. 671)
- Page 679—Resolve providing for an increase in State pension for Lester Pagen of Hermon, (H. P. 56) (L. D. 706)—Should be Lester Patten.
- Page 680—An act to assure a Balanced Budget, (S. P. 827) (L. D. 998)—Should be (S. P. 627) (L. D. 998)
- Page 684—Resolve in favor of a pension for Richard T. Kensall of Alna—Should be Richard T. Kensall.
- Page 696—An Act relating to tax foreclosures (S. P. 636)—Should be (S. P. 317)
- Page 696—Moe should be move.
- Page 714—An act relating to Reports to Towns of Excise Tax Payments (H. P. No. 117) (L. D. No. 561)—Should be (H. P. No. 1170)
- Page 716—"said sum to be used as an offset against any accounts due the State of Maine from the city of Maine."—Should be city of Eastport.
- Page 727—Thereupon H. P. 1334, L. D. 970—should be H. P. 1634, L. D. 970.
- Page 731—Resolve in favor of Lillian R. Cushman" (H. P. 900—Should be (H. P. 800)
- Page 733—reported the same in a second new draft (S. P. 837)—Should be (S. P. 637)
- Page 733—An Act concerning the improvement, protection or preservation of shade, forest or ornamental trees. (H. P. 164, L. D. 975)—Should be (H. P. 1641, L. D. 975)
- Page 755—An Act relating to Disclosures of the Affairs of Corporations and the place within Counties in which Disclosures are to be made" (H. P. No. 110) (L. D. No. 584)—Should be (H. P. No. 1103) (L. D. No. 584)
- Page 769—An act relative to closed time on deer, H. P. 1645, L. D. 921—Should be H. P. 1645, L. D. 991.
- Page 796—(S. P. 34) (L. D. 696) An act relating to dealer's registration, fees for plates, etc.—Should be (S. P. 347) (L. D. 696)
- Page 796—(H. P. No. 1694) (L. D. No. 1008) An act appointing a Commission on Taxation—Should be (H. P. No. 1694) (L. D. No. 1007)
- Page 796—(H. P. No. 1694) (L. D. No. 1006) An act relating to pauper settlement.—Should be (H. P. No. 1694) (L. D. No. 1008)
- Page 796—(S. P. No. 163) (L. D. No. 989) Resolve to repeal a resolve providing for a State pension for Carrie E. Fitch.—Should be (S. P. No. 165) (L. D. No. 989)
- Page 807—An act relating to taxation of motor vehicles (H. P. 865, L. D. 299)—Should be (H. P. 665) (L. D. 299)
- Page 812—S. P. 636, L. D. 1015: Resolve providing for a State pension for Elida F. Whitcomb of Montville.—Should be S. P. 633, L. D. 1015.
- Page 839—An Act to repeal the act incorporating number XIV Plantation in Washington County (H. P. 623, L. D. 164)—Should be (H. P. 623, L. D. 184)
- Page 840—"An act relating to the sale of real estate for taxes" (H. P. 112, L. D. 631)—Should be (H. P. 1122, L. D. 631)
- Page 842—An act to Facilitate Recounting of Ballots (H. P. 1644) (L. D. 99)—Should be (H. P. 1644) (L. D. 992)
- Page 846—Delete second paragraph.

HOUSE

Wednesday, March 22, 1933

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Dolliff of Winslow.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk has called the attention of the Speaker to the fact that in the report of yesterday's proceedings of the House in this morning's Kennebec Journal about a column was omitted. The Chair understands this was due solely to lack of space in the paper, and this of course will be printed with the other proceedings in the official record of the House.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate:

Final report of the committee on Salaries and Fees.

Comes from the Senate, read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

Senate Bills in First Reading

S. P. 592, L. D. 948: Resolve appropriating money to pay World War Veteran Claims heretofore approved by the committee on Claims.

S. P. 591, L. D. 951: Resolve appropriating money to pay pauper claims.

S. P. 599, L. D. 943: Resolve in favor of Celia I. Fowler of Ellsworth.

S. P. 609, L. D. 982: An act relative to transportation of deer within State.

S. P. 610, L. D. 983: Resolve extending open season on Mousam river.

S. P. 600, L. D. 944: Resolve regulating the taking of smelts in the York river and Smelt brook in the towns of Eliot and York in York county.

S. P. 601, L. D. 945: An act relating to by-laws of towns, cities and villages regulating vehicles.

S. P. 907, L. D. 949: An act to provide a Town Council and Manager Form of Government for the town of Washburn, in the county of Aroostook.

S. P. 603, L. D. 946: An act controlling public utility relations with

affiliated interests involving contracts and loans.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Education on Resolve in favor of several academies, institutes and seminaries. S. P. 598, L. D. 942.

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

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence, and the bill had its first reading.

Thereupon Senate Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence; and tomorrow assigned.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting ought not to pass on bill an act closing Pleasant River and tributaries to trapping, H. P. 199, L. D. 108, which was recommended to the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game in the House on March 17th.

Comes from the Senate the report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House on motion by Mr. Sterling of Caratunk the bill and accompanying report were tabled, pending further consideration, and specially assigned for Friday, March 24th.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Legal Affairs reporting ought not to pass on bill an act to amend the charter of the city of Bath, S. P. 224, L. D. 543.

Comes from the Senate with the bill and report indefinitely postponed.

In the House, bill and report indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Majority Report of the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of the town of Kennebunk (S. P. No. 270) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 588) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. Littlefield of York

—of the Senate

Messrs. Rounds of Portland
Lindsey of East Machias
Bartlett of Eliot
Haggett of Wiscasset
White of Crystal
Dow of Livermore
Devereux of Penobscot

—of the House

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Resolve.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Weatherbee of Penobscot
Kitchen of Aroostook
—of the Senate

Comes from the Senate with the Minority Report accepted.

In the House:

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, this is somewhat different from the claim talked about yesterday. The town of Wells put this in, as I understand, to offset the town of Turner. They put it in from Kennebunk and Wells. They put it in for \$20,000, only adding another cipher. The first wanted \$2,000. Their town has got a good deal of property owned by people outside the State and they are well situated. The town of Turner is not well situated. I move that the minority report be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, moves that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the minority report of the committee which was ought not to pass.

The motion prevailed.

From the Senate: Majority Report of the Committee on Labor reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Pauperizing of Unemployed Wage Earners" (S. P. No. 42) (L. D. No. 26)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Bissett of Cumberland, Winn of Androscoggin, of the Senate; Ryder of Brownville, Bushey of Waterville, Chase of Baring, Cobb of Gardiner, Chase of Limington, Allison of Biddeford, Miss Laughlin of Portland, of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reported "Ought not to pass" on same bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. Holman of Franklin of the Senate.

Comes from the Senate with the Minority Report accepted.

In the House:

Mr. FARRIS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the minority report of the committee, which was ought not to pass.

On motion by Mr. Bushey of Waterville a viva voce vote being taken, both reports were tabled and specially assigned for Friday, March 24, the pending question being the mo-

tion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, that the minority report of the committee be accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Majority Report of the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of the town of Wells (S. P. No. 269) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 587) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Littlefield of York, of the Senate; Rounds of Portland, Lindsey of East Machias, Bartlett of Eliot, Haggett of Wiscasset, White of Crystal, Dow of Livermore, Devereux of Penobscot, of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Weatherbee of Penobscot, Kitchen of Aroostook, of the Senate.

Comes from the Senate the Minority Report accepted.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland the House voted to concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the minority report, ought not to pass.

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relative to Closed Time, Daily Bag Limits and Transportation of Wild Hares and Rabbits" (S. P. No. 172) (L. D. No. 663) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 608) (L. D. No. 981) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Comes from the Senate Report read and accepted and the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A."

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence, the bill received its two several readings and tomorrow assigned.

Mr. ELLIS of Rangeley: Mr. Speaker, should not Senate Amendment A be read?

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that there are other amendments to this bill coming in which explains the reason why we did not act on Senate Amendment A this morning.

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Salaries and Fees to

which was referred for consideration all State and County Salary Matters under Joint Order, S. P. No. 34, making this interim report presenting their findings with reference to compensation of State Officials and employees, in the form of a bill under the title of "An Act reducing the compensation of State Officials and Employees" (S. P. No. 576) (L. D. No. 866) and recommending its passage.

Comes from the Senate the Report read and accepted, Senate Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed, Senate Amendment "B" adopted, and the Bill as amended by Senate Amendment B passed to be engrossed.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning, the pending question being the first reading.

Mr. CARLETON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, would it be out of order to ask that Senate Amendment B be read so that we may understand it?

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read Senate Amendment A which was indefinitely postponed and Senate Amendment B which was adopted.

(Senate Amendment A read).

On motion by Mr. Carleton, Senate Amendment B was ordered printed.

The SPEAKER: The bill now stands on the table as specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

From the Senate: Bill "An Act for the Regulation of the Practice of Hairdressing and Beauty Culture" (H. P. No. 1513) (L. D. No. 823) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on March 17th as amended by Senate Amendment "A," and by House Amendment "A" as amended, and by House Amendment "B" in non-concurrence.

Comes from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A," and by House Amendment "A" as amended, and by House Amendment "B," and also as amended by Senate Amendment "B" in non-concurrence.

In the House, Senate Amendment B read by the Clerk.

On motion by Miss Martin of Bangor the House voted to recon-

sider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same member the House concurred with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment B; and on further motion by the same member the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

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

Placed on File

Petition of Philip H. Marx and 119 others of Rumford in favor of Amateur Sunday Sports (H. P. No. 1647) (Presented by Mr. Eldridge of Eastport)

Petition of Hillman O. Fallon and 143 others of Sanford in favor of same (H. P. No. 1648) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Creighton E. Gatchell and 69 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1649) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Guy C. Mahoney and 75 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1650) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of David J. Jones and 142 others of So. Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1651) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Edward F. Lehan and 169 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1652) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of P. Ressbea and 41 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1653) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Blaine E. Davis and 48 others of So. Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1654) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Raymond M. Chevalier and 11 others of Westbrook in favor of same (H. P. No. 1655) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Frederick W. Papalos and 157 others of Waterville in favor of same (H. P. No. 1656) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Alfred H. White and 126 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1657) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Frank S. Tilley and 31 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1658) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Thomas J. Attoyo and 22 others of Waterville in favor of

same (H. P. No. 1659) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of William A. Withee and 78 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1660) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of L. E. Pedelton and 46 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1664) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of William L. Casey, M. D. and 9 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1662) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of M. E. Seavey and 32 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1663) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of John Reardon and 29 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1664) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Katherine McIsaac and 85 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1665) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Daniel M. Maher and 158 others of Bangor in favor of same (H. P. No. 1666) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Ralph M. Brewer and 31 others of Wiscasset in favor of same (H. P. No. 1667) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Myer Matson and 93 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1668) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Peter A. Sullivan and 72 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1669) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Edward D. Welch and 73 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1670) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Oke Hallgren and 55 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1671) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Mary T. MacDonald and 124 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1672) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of William A. Flaherty and 62 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1673) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of A. Leroy Welch and 70 others of Westbrook in favor of same (H. P. No. 1674) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Charles O. Spear, Jr. and 64 others of So. Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1675) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of W. F. Freiday and 90

others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1676) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of John H. Flaherty and 50 others of So. Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1677) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Horace P. Lambert and 190 others of Waterboro in favor of same (H. P. No. 1678) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Mark W. Hennessey and 106 others of Bath in favor of same (H. P. No. 1679) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Harold F. Norris and 71 others of Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1680) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of W. O. Cook and 45 others of So. Portland in favor of same (H. P. No. 1681) (Presented by same gentleman)

Inland Fisheries and Game

Remonstrance of Willis B. Hall and 39 others against S. P. No. 573, L. D. No. 861, An Act relating to the Back Bay Sanctuary in the City of Portland (H. P. No. 1682) (Presented by Miss Laughlin of Portland)

Remonstrance of Philip C. Foster and 81 other citizens against same (H. P. No. 1683) (Presented by Mr. Carleton of Portland)

Taxation

Remonstrance of West End Drug Co. and 73 others against the Sales Tax Bill (H. P. No. 1684) (Presented by Mr. Hall of Bar Harbor)

Remonstrance of Fred C. Lyman and 113 others of Bar Harbor against same (H. P. No. 1685) (Presented by same gentleman)

Remonstrance of the Directors of the Bar Harbor Chamber of Commerce against same (H. P. No. 1688) (Presented by same gentleman)

Remonstrance of F. W. Chandler and Son and 93 others against same (H. P. No. 1686) (Presented by Mr. Morin of Brunswick)

Orders

Mr. Eldridge of Eastport, presented the following order and moved its passage:

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that notwithstanding the terms of the closing order adopted on the day of the convening of this Legislature, the separate bodies receive for consideration such measures as in the opinion of the majority of the body in which any measure is

offered are desired or are necessary to meet the conditions arising from the action of the Congress of the United States in making legal the manufacture and sale of malt beverages.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that this order have passage?

Mr. BENNETT of Presque Isle: I move the order lie on the table. Calls of "No, no."

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Bennett, that this order lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning will say aye; contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote was doubted.

The SPEAKER: The House is now simply voting on the motion of the gentleman from Presque Isle, Mr. Bennett, that this order lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning, pending its adoption. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division was had.

Forty-nine having voted in the affirmative and 76 in the negative the motion failed of passage.

The SPEAKER: The question now is on the passage of the order.

Mr. TOMPKINS of Bridgewater: Mr. Speaker, I am just after some information on this. I do not know just what this order means.

The SPEAKER: The order, as the Chair understands it, is similar in scope to the ones passed last week, suspending the closing order adopted earlier in the session by proving that any measure that in the opinion of a majority of the members of that body in which any measure is offered is designed or necessary to meet conditions arising from action of the Congress of the United States in making legal the manufacture and sale of malt beverages, may be received for consideration. If this order is adopted, it would permit the introduction in this body of any bills designed to make legal the manufacture of beer.

Mr. TOMPKINS: Does the adoption of this order mean, Mr. Speaker, the suspension of the two-thirds rule which is now necessary in order to introduce the beer bill?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would rule that until this or some other

order was passed no beer bill could be introduced except by unanimous consent. If this order passed, under its terms any beer bill could come in by a majority vote. The Chair would further rule that to adopt this order would require a two-thirds vote of the members present, it being an order in suspension of a joint rule or order previously adopted.

Mr. TOMPKINS: And, Mr. Speaker, this order is presented for one purpose only: to introduce a beer bill?

The SPEAKER: Yes, as the Chair understands it. It does not say "beer"; it says "making legal the manufacture and sale of malt beverages." The Clerk suggests we might have an ale bill under the terms of the order.

Mr. TOMPKINS: No doubt you would, Mr. Speaker. Is it in order to speak at this time on this matter?

The SPEAKER: Yes, the motion is debatable.

Mr. TOMPKINS: Mr. Speaker and members of the House, if I understand this thing right, anyone voting for the adoption of this order is voting for beer and voting for the return of beer and voting for a beer bill. If I am wrong, I wish to be corrected.

Now it is quite evident that there are many differences of opinion. If there were not, it would not be necessary to have Democrats and Republicans and so forth and so on. I want to speak against this order and against the beer bill or its return, because I realize that these are all interwoven.

I have not any animosity in my heart and no ill-will for any of the proponents of this order or of the beer bill. There is an old maxim that goes something like this: "Never hate a person as a person, but bear malice only for what the person represents." That is my attitude this morning.

Now, as you have all heard before, the real reason for the introduction of this bill and the real reason for the return of beer, when you get right down to brass tacks, is the liquor element, and the liquor dealers throughout the country who want to get back into business. There is no way of getting around it; no two ways about it.

In speaking on this order, or on this beer bill, whatever you want to call it, this morning, I will try

and be brief, but I will mention two or three times the Eighteenth Amendment, because this order and the beer bill which is planned to follow are connected and interwoven so that one speaking on it cannot help it.

Temperance is as old as America itself. The first state in the Union to have temperance was the State of Maine, back in 1851, eighty-two years ago, and by 1855 there were twelve states in the Union that had temperance laws; but by the close of the Civil War they all had a bad case of backsliding and there was only one left, the State of Maine. In 1905 there were only three states in the Union having temperance laws: Maine, Kansas and North Dakota; but by the time the United States went into the war with Germany, at the time President Wilson presented his war message to Congress, in 1917, there were twenty-six states in the Union having temperance laws. It could not be stopped at that time; it was a fact that the Eighteenth Amendment was to come into the Constitution of the United States of America, and the very Congress that passed that law was elected by the people before the war with Germany. The Eighteenth Amendment passed the Senate in August, 1917, and the House in December, 1917, and it received its first ratification by Mississippi in January, 1918, and received its thirty-sixth ratification January 16, 1919, and would become the law of the land one year later.

But one day before it was the law of the land, a very prominent gentleman presided over the funeral services of old John Barleycorn in a southern city, and as the casket containing his remains was being wheeled out, then this gentleman leaned out and said: "John, you have been God's worst enemy and you have always been Hell's best friend."

The casket containing old John Barleycorn was wheeled out to its supposedly last resting place, but during the last year I think old John Barleycorn has been turning over in his grave, and I think during the last six months he has probably been sit'ng up and has received a hypodermic from most of the 48 states, a hypodermic of beer, and he is now trying to represent Rip Van Winkle.

Recently there came to my desk a little pamphlet entitled "The Snake"—perhaps all of you have received it—that described this liquor traffic. You take a snake and cut its head off and it is still wiggling and squirming and won't die. It doesn't want to die. And the liquor traffic is another serpent. We had its head almost cut off January 16, 1920, but it has been squirming ever since. This old serpent is as active today as it was in the Garden of Eden. This old serpent has been using its influence with its newspapers and its wet line editorials to take advantage of the young people who have just been coming to the voting age. It has been taking advantage of post-war conditions. This old serpent has been taking advantage of the biggest depression that this world ever knew, and for the last two years the old serpent has been knocking at the door of Congress, howling away for beer, for wine and for liquor; and today this old serpent is sticking its fangs right into the Legislature of the State of Maine and again asking for beer.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I believe the members of this Eighty-sixth Legislature are above this bill, and I believe that we should think and talk and do something bigger and better than beer. Let us forget the beer bills and beer kegs, and one thing or another. This is below us, representatives of the people, who have been sent here to represent the eight hundred thousand people of the State of Maine.

A lot of talk has been heard recently about the tourists coming into Maine. Think of it! Such a slap in the face to give the tourists coming into the State of Maine, for us to stand up and say that they are a bunch of drunks and that they must have it or they will go to Canada. I say it is a slap in the face of every tourist that comes into the State of Maine and so long as the old flag floats over our capitol at Washington, and so long as the Stars and Stripes hang in the capitol of our State of Maine at Augusta, may the people back home never point their finger at us and say "You brought back the saloon."

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland: My purpose, Mr. Speaker, is not to discuss the merits of the beer bill, but to discuss this order, which, if adopted, would change a rule which applies to every other matter brought before this Legislature, and

those who support it will go on record as being willing to change the rule adopted in this Legislature which applies to every other measure, that is, requiring a two-thirds vote for the introduction of this bill, and will thereby certainly go on record as saying that the matter of getting beer is more important than any other measure before this Legislature, and we will have to be judged by that, because it is a proposal to reverse the accepted rule.

Just one word to the Republican members of this Legislature. Every single Republican who votes for this order is violating the platform of his party, the platform on which he was elected. If they have forgotten it, I would like to read it to them:

"We declare ourselves opposed to any form of ratification or modification of the Eighteenth Amendment, and in favor of strict and impartial enforcement of the laws enacted pursuant thereto in State and Nation."

Now it is admitted that this bill which prohibits beer was adopted subsequent to the Eighteenth Amendment and in support of it. The Eighteenth Amendment has not been repealed yet, and, furthermore, the platform of the Republican party in this State opposed itself to the modification of any laws in State or Nation enacted in support of it. That was the one plank of the Republican Platform which was adopted after long discussion; it was not adopted perfunctorily, as in the case where somebody brings in a plank and puts it through. It was fought the night before, voted down; it was brought up in convention and voted down, and this plank put in the platform, and on that platform every Republican in this State ran, and every Republican vote for this order is a vote in violation of the platform upon which he was elected.

Mr. VALLELY of Sanford: Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the member from Portland (Miss Laughlin) that at that Republican convention, where that plank was passed, there was more rum drunk than in any convention in the last twenty years. (Laughter and applause)

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, if it is a fact more rum was drunk at that convention, I am perhaps

willing to take the word of the Democratic member from Sanford, for it. (Laughter and applause)

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I want to take exception to the remarks of the gentleman from Bridgewater (Mr. Tompkins), stating that the rum element influenced the Legislature. Now I, for one, am a teetotaler, but I am not a prohibitionist; I am willing to let the other fellow have what he wants, and I like to have what I want. (Applause.)

Mr. TOMPKINS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to inform the gentleman from Portland, (Mr. Rounds) that I did not say that.

Mr. ROUNDS: What does the record say?

The SPEAKER: Just a moment. There is no necessity of getting into any discussion about that. Does anybody else desire to speak on this motion?

Mr. COBB of Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, I do not think we as Representatives should allow an order like this to come in, from the standpoint of the business of the House. The rulers of the House decided on certain days for bills to be enacted, resolves, private and special legislation; and we tried to live up to it, to expedite matters from a business standpoint. I know personally I had a good resolve that I wanted to get in here, but they would not let me put it in because the time was so limited. Our Leader, and also the Speaker, said we had got to draw the line and stop this, in order to expedite the business of the House. I know of a lot of other good resolves that members wanted to get in here after the time limit was up, and they would not let us put them in.

We have had our temperance issue; we have had two bills come in here, and they have gone through the proper committees and had a hearing and have been threshed out, and the resubmission of the beer bill has come in here, and it has been defeated by the legal processes of the workings of our Legislature. We have had the fight, and the rum element was beaten, and now they are taking this way, a minority of them to come in here and present a bill of this character, or of whatever character, by just a majority vote, where with other bills it takes unanimous consent of the House to present a bill. I say it is wrong, decidedly wrong, and I do not think, may it please the House,

that we ought to show partiality to such a bill as this in the House.

Mr. CROWELL of Weston: Mr. Speaker, nestling in the wastes of the arctic circle, we find the island of Iceland, which prospered for years under the prohibitory law. Only seven percent of that island was tillable, and all the Icelanders could do was raise hay for their ponies. They had to go into the sea and catch codfish and market them in the markets of the world. Most of that codfish went to Spain, and after a time the Spanish merchants looked upon the prosperous and contented people of Iceland, a people who had descended from the Vikings, and they said to those people: "Unless you repeal your prohibitory law and buy our wines, we will not buy your codfish. We want you to accept a twelve per cent alcoholic content of beverages." The people of Norway also were supported largely by the codfish they caught and sold to Portugal and Spain, but they had a law that provided for a twelve per cent alcoholic content of liquor.

The wine merchants of the South looked away to the Northland and said to them: "Unless you change your twelve per cent content and accept a twenty-four per cent content of alcohol, we will not buy your fish."

That has been the contention of the alcoholic interests throughout the years, like the camel who put his head in the tent and then kept crowding in more and more, to always ask for something else. They are very modest down here in the State of Maine and in the United States, for today they are only asking for 3.2 per cent, but they have the same sinister influence back of it. They will soon want us to do the same as Spain wanted the people of Iceland to do, accept a larger alcoholic content.

The word "camouflage" came into common use due to the great World War. They are "camouflaging" the situation. They are not interested in our boys and girls. They are not interested in the State of Maine; they are interested only in the profits they can derive at the expense of the manhood, womanhood, boyhood, and girlhood of these United States. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record at this time as opposed to the order that has gone in, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that when the vote is

taken, at the proper time, that we have the roll call.

Mr. VALLELY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going back into ancient history or into Iceland; I am just going to give you a few common sense facts.

At the Republican convention in Portland last spring, in March, they passed the dry plank. Before that convention met, the chairman of the Republican National Committee asked the delegates in my town to vote for a repeal plank, as the Republican convention in Portland passed a dry plank, not knowing what was going to happen in Chicago. Then the Republican convention in Chicago passed a medium wet and dry plank, or wet on one side and dry on the other plank, whichever you want to call it. Every Republican who voted for Herbert Hoover is in duty bound to vote on this question today and to vote with the Democrats.

Mr. STOVER of Pownal: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what our House Rules are for? Did we hear any dissenting vote from these members when these rules were adopted? Now it appears like when the Germans went down through Belgium, a scrap of paper. It seems to me there is no emergency in this case as there was in the case of the banking bill, because you remember, at one of our hearings, one of the gentlemen was thankful he lived so near the line, and it looks as if some of us in other parts of the State might like to live near New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

Mr. DOW of Portland: Mr. Speaker, there are a great many people who want to change the prohibitory laws in the interests of temperance. Now I have no fault to find with them; I respect their opinion. They have a right to their opinion the same as I have a right to mine.

Now there are a lot of other people with their tongues hanging out of their mouths partially dry because they cannot get something to wet their whistles with.

Now those people who are trying to sell liquor are the ones who are working to break down prohibition, for the gratification of their own appetites, and the profit they can get from the sale of liquor.

Now in the saloons, or whatever the other places may be where liquor is sold at a profit, they will try to get everyone to drink more liquor than they are drinking, and

will try to get those who do not drink liquor to drink some, in the hope they will drink more. I look upon this as a movement to rush this beer bill through. I am not finding fault with anybody's sincere belief, but I am finding fault with the people who are rushing the thing through, who will try to increase the sale of liquor in order to make more profit.

Mr. CARIGNAN of Sanford: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the defeat of the Audet bill, most of the argument presented at that time was: "Why hasten the measure through when there are questions pending in the Federal Government?"

Now as I understand the thing, the Federal Government has acted. We are not hastening anything. We are just coming in with measures which will conform, if we see fit to pass them, with the Federal Act.

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the question with which this House is confronted now this matter we are considering, is one of solemn importance to the people of the State of Maine. A few days ago these emergency banking bills were allowed to be introduced in this Legislature because the members of the House and Senate recognized the financial condition of the State, recognized the necessity of doing something to aid that financial condition, recognized the economic situation, the poverty that is existent in many parts of the State. This Legislature has considered many measures designed to alleviate or to aid in overcoming the distress that is prevalent.

Now it seems to me that this measure has not the same reason behind it for allowing it to be introduced in this House. I am thinking of the women who have husbands who in some cases would spend a good part of their hard-earned and meager wages for beer, also the children.

I believe that history shows that the legalized liquor traffic and poverty go hand in hand, and I believe that the legalizing of the sale of beer in the State of Maine would add to rather than detract from these serious economic conditions, the serious condition of financial stress in which so many of our cities find themselves today. I am opposed to the passage of this order.

Mr. CHASE of Sebec: Mr.

Speaker, at the time of the convention in Chicago, I listened in, and about all you could hear was shouts of "We want beer." They drowned out everything else. And that seems to be what most of the talk is about. I do not know any reason why we should need beer. One would think it was the only means of sustaining life. I am opposed to this order.

Mr. TILLSON of Belgrade: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, if this order should have a passage, if the rest of the members who have orders and resolves in their desks might present them for passage? We have been prohibited from doing so. Mr. Farris ruled that we could not present them after a certain date. If this one should be allowed to pass, I would like to know if mine which I have in my desk will be allowed to pass.

Mr. HAWKES of Richmond: Mr. Speaker, I think this matter is of vital importance to the members of this Legislature. I had a resolve I was very anxious to put through this Legislature, involving a contribution of nine hundred dollars to a certain measure. I took this up with the Speaker and with the Floor Leader and they told me it was impossible to get a measure like that through this House, that the time for filing bills was closed, and there could not be any more presented.

Now today we have a resolve put in here, to favor opening the liquor question, in this House again, after we have taken it up and defeated it and settled it. Now I do not believe in this method of doing business. I am opposed to the whole business. We as Republicans have always stood for that which we believed was for the best interests of the people of the United States, and as long as we stood on those principles and fought for them, we as a Republican party, were successful, but when we weakened and began to cater to the methods of the Democratic party and tried to lock arms with them to march for the repeal of the prohibition amendment, we went down to defeat, and if this Legislature wants to go on record as favoring a Democratic measure, you will find that you will have nothing to stand on in the future. We, as a moral party, will be discredited, and there will be no reason—

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SCATES: By inference the gentleman from Richmond (Mr. Hawkes) is stating that the Democratic party is not a moral party. I want to correct that right here. (Applause).

Mr. HAWKES (continuing): I will accept the gentleman's term. As individuals there are just as good Democrats as there are Republicans.

Mr. SCATES: That is not sufficient.

The SPEAKER: Let us be orderly here.

Mr. HAWKES (continuing): But at times we stand for prohibition and we stand for those things which we believe are for the interests of the people of the United States. Now the Democrats take issue with us on that question, and they say it is not a moral question, that a man can drink as much beer as he wants to, and get drunk and have all the liberties he wants, and still he is not responsible.

Mr. THOMPSON of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, I do not just exactly like the talk of Mr. Hawkes, the gentleman from Richmond. I will agree with him that the Democratic party in the State of Maine has been known as the rum party. That is very true; but I do think we have the interests of the people at heart just as much as the Republican party, and I think it is the Republican party that is trying to re-introduce this bill. The Democratic member who introduced this bill moved for indefinite postponement, and the Republicans are the ones who are trying to resurrect this bill, not the Democratic party; but I do think the Democratic party is in favor of some kind of beer in the State of Maine.

At this point Mr. Valley of Sanford requested permission to speak for the third time to which there was objection.

Mr. VALLEY: All right, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down.

Mr. CARSWELL of Gorham: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Carswell, moves the previous question. As many as are in favor of the Chair entertaining a motion for the previous question at this time will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will make and return the count. One-third of the

members present must vote in the affirmative before the motion can be entertained.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is shall the main question be now put? As many as are in favor of the Chair putting the main question now will say aye; contrary minded no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Eldridge, that his order have passage, the Chair having ruled that it requires a two-thirds vote of the members present. The gentleman from Weston, Mr. Crowell, has requested that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays. Before that can be done one-fifth of the members present must so vote. All those in favor of the taking of the vote on this question by the yeas and nays will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had, and more than one-fifth of those present voting for the yeas and nays, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Eldridge, that his order have passage. Under the rule no member should leave his seat while a yeas and nay vote is being taken or until it has been tabulated and declared.

Mr. BENNETT of Presque Isle: Mr. Speaker, may I address the House?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is out of order unless he has some question on the matter of procedure, some parliamentary inquiry or a question as to the vote. The matter is no longer debatable under the action here taken.

Mr. BENNETT: All right, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Eldridge, that the order introduced by him have passage. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Will the Chair again state the question, please?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Eldridge, has introduced an order which, if

passed by a two-thirds vote of the House and concurred in by the Senate, will permit the introduction of measures which in the opinion of the majority of the body in which they are offered are designed or necessary to meet the conditions arising from the action of the Congress of the United States in making legal the manufacture and sale of malt beverages, and has moved the adoption of this order. A vote "yes" is in favor of the passage of the order; a vote "no" is opposed to its passage. Is the situation now clear? The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Allison, Audet, Belanger, Berry, Berwick, Boyle, Breen, Burgess, Burns, Bushey, Carignan, Carswell, Carter; Chase, Baring; Devereux, Duquette, Eastman, Eldridge, Ellis, Farris, Fenlason; Forgue, Lewiston; Friend, Goodwin, Goudy, Graves, Gross, Hall; Hamel, George; Hamel, Napoleon; Hancock, Haskell, Hastings, Hescocock, Hickey, Hobbs, Hussey, Knight, Labbee, Lancaster, Lebel, Lindsey; Littlefield, Bluehill; Luce, Mace, Mack, Mason, Mechanic Falls; Mason, Raymond; McKinney, Michaud, Morin, Nevers, Piper, Plouff, Quine, Rand, Raymond, Rea, Richardson, Rounds, Rush, Scates, Shaw, Smith, Orono; Smith, Vinalhaven; Soper, Sprague, Sterling, Stern, Thompson, Thurston, Tupper, Vaille, Viles; Ward, Harrison; Ward, Thorndike; Wentworth, Whitten, Wright.

NAY — Ashby; Bailey, Whitefield; Bailey, Woolwich; Bartlett, Bennett, Blanchard, Bucknam, Bussey, Carleton, Chase, Limington; Chase, Sebec; Clarke, Clement, Cobb, Collins, Cook, Crowell, Deering; Dow, Livermore; Dow, Portland; Drisko, Dunn, Fernald, Flanders; Fogg, Rockland; Fowles, Gallagher, Gray, Haggett, Ham, Hawkes, Hill, Hills, Holden, Laughlin; Littlefield, Alfred; Lord, MacPherson, Martin, Mayers, Newcomb, Norris, Oliver, Osgood, Plummer, Russ, Ryder; Sanborn, Baldwin; Sanborn, Weld; Sargent; Smith, Masardis; Stover, Thomas, Tillson; Tompkins, Bridgewater; Tompkins, Houlton; Walker, Rockland; Walker, Rockport; Wallingford, Webber, White, Whitney, Williams, Young.

ABSENT—Gagnon, Hanson, Jones, Leathers, Lewis, O'Connor, Peacock.

Yes, 79.

No, 64.

Absent, 7.

The **SPEAKER**: Seventy-nine having voted in the affirmative and 64 in the negative and seven being absent, the order failed of passage.

The **SPEAKER**: The House may be at ease.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Richardson from the Committee on Pensions on Petition of Harold D. Kaler and 29 others in favor of a Soldier's Pension for Will Howard of Union reported that same be referred to the 87th Legislature (H. P. No. 1613).

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Petition of Fred W. Libby and 9 others in favor of H. P. 1019 Pension for Emma Anderson.

Mr. Mason from the Committee on Taxation on Remonstrance of Fred Coffin of Freeport, Maine, against the enactment of Legislation imposing a Tax on Bill Boards (H. P. No. 1066) reported that same be placed on file.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Petitions in favor of repeal of Auxiliary Forest Law H. P. 1540 and 1541.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Remonstrances against the Passage of Motor Truck Bills H. P. 1580, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1545, 1546, 1547, 1548.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Petitions in favor of repeal of Law for Tax on Gasoline used in Fishing Boats H. P. 1160-1162, 1318-1331, 1446-1449, 1479-1483.

Mr. Mace from the Committee on Banks and Banking reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Definition of the Term 'Securities'" (H. P. No. 1023) (L. D. No. 471).

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Dow from the Committee on Banks and Banking on Bill "An Act amending the Blue Sky Law" (H. P. No. 1024) (L. D. No. 472) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1689) (L. D. No. 1002) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

(Tabled by Mr. Scates of Westbrook pending acceptance of the report and specially assigned for Friday, March 24, and new draft ordered printed.)

Mr. Mace from the Committee on Banks and Banking on Bill "An Act relating to the Rate of Interest Charged by Small Loan Agencies" (H. P. No. 23) (L. D. No. 19) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1690) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Bussey from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Hunting

and Trapping Bear" (H. P. No. 686) (L. D. No. 356) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1691) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Sterling from same Committee on Bill "An Act repealing the Bounty on Porcupines and Hedgehogs" (H. P. No. 374) (L. D. No. 214) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1692) under title of "An Act relative to the Suspension of Bounties on Porcupines and Hedgehogs" and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Hill from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Pauper Settlement" (H. P. No. 1111) (L. D. No. 620) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1694) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Mason from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act appointing a Commission on Taxation" (H. P. No. 103) (L. D. No. 77) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1693) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

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

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Towns and Town Officers" (H. P. No. 1135) (L. D. No. 645) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1695) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Blaisdell of Hancock, Farnsworth of Aroostook, Page of Somerset—of the Senate; Quine of Bangor, Chase of Sebec, Tompkins of Bridgewater, Chase of Baring, Plummer of Portland, Miss Martin of Bangor—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. Sargent of Brewer—of the House.

Mr. CHASE of Sebec: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the majority report, ought to pass in new draft.

On motion by Mr. Sargent of Brewer, both reports tabled and specially assigned for Friday, March 24, the pending question being the motion of the gentleman from Sebec, Mr. Chase, that the majority report be accepted. (500 copies of the new draft ordered printed.)

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

(H. P. No. 1644) (L. D. No. 992) An act to facilitate recounting of ballots.

(H. P. No. 1645) (L. D. No. 991) An act relative to closed time on deer.

(Tabled by Mr. Clarke of Cooper, pending assignment for third reading and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.)

(H. P. No. 1646) (L. D. No. 993) An act to acquire the American portion of the Union bridge so-called at Calais in the County of Washington connecting Maine and New Brunswick and to provide for its maintenance.

(H. P. No. 1600) (L. D. No. 994) Resolve in favor of the town of Turner.

(H. P. No. 643) (L. D. No. 999) Resolve in favor of the purchase of one hundred copies of "The History of Oxford County."

Mr. CARLETON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I now move that this resolve be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MASON of Mechanic Falls: Mr. Speaker, may I ask through the Chair of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Carleton, if his committee has taken any action on this matter?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Mason, inquires of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Carleton, if the Appropriations committee has taken any action on this matter and he may answer if he desires.

Mr. CARLETON: Mr. Speaker, we find there is no money set up in our budget and we find it impossible to take care of it at this time. We would like to do it but there are other similar resolves coming in and we feel that it cannot be done. I thought it would be a case of going through the whole rigmarole and in the end be lost.

The SPEAKER: Does that answer the gentleman's inquiry?

On motion by Mr. Mason, the resolve was tabled, and specially assigned for tomorrow morning, the pending question being the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Carleton, that the resolve be indefinitely postponed.

Passed to be Engrossed

(S. P. 340) (L. D. 546) An act relating to lobster fishermen's licenses.

(S. P. 595) (L. D. 929) An act relating to town meetings.

(S. P. 342) (L. D. 547) An act relating to measurement of lobsters.

(S. P. 559) (L. D. 920) An act to authorize the Treasurer and County Commissioners of York County to procure a loan, and issue bonds of said county therefor, for the purpose of rebuilding the Court House.

(S. P. 593) (L. D. 927) An act relating to beautification of landscape and roadsides.

(S. P. 577) (L. D. 926) An act to revise the Health and Welfare Laws.

(H. P. 1108) (L. D. 617) An act relating to the enforcement of liens for taxes on real estate.

(H. P. 1610) (L. D. 939) An act relating to absentee voters.

(Tabled by Mr. Bushey of Waterville, pending third reading and specially assigned for Friday, March 24)

(H. P. 1614) (L. D. 968) An act to repeal the act incorporating Number XIV Plantation in Washington County.

(S. P. 594) (L. D. 928) Resolve in favor of Julia A. Bradman estate.

(H. P. 1553) Resolve in favor of Lillian R. Cushman.

(Tabled temporarily by Mr. Sterling of Caratunk pending second reading)

(H. P. 1619) (L. D. 961) Resolve in favor of Kineowatha Camps Inc. of Wilton, to reimburse it for removal of floating bog on Wilson lake.

(H. P. 1642) (L. D. 978) Resolve in favor of the road leading from Greenville to Rockwood.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Caratunk, Mr. Sterling, moves to take from the table resolve in favor of Lillian R. Cushman, tabled by him a few moments ago; and the same gentleman offers House Amendment A and moves its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to H. P. 1553, resolve in favor of Lillian R. Cushman.

Amend said resolve by striking out in the last line of said resolve the words, "funds of the department of Inland Fisheries and Game" and insert in place thereof the words "general funds of the State, whenever available."

Mr. SARGENT: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: The old Greek saying is "Beware of the

Greeks bearing gifts." Now this resolve which passed in the House yesterday directed that this money be paid out of the funds of the Inland Fisheries and Game Department, and I believe that the only purpose of this amendment is to cut down the amount of the resolve. I believe that there is floating about this House, either in the form of an order, an act or a resolve something that reads like this, that if the general appropriations are not sufficient to pay the claims and resolves that the budget officer may, in his discretion, cut down the amount. I hope and trust that this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. STERLING: Mr. Speaker, the intent of this amendment is not to cut down the resolve. The intent of the amendment is to relieve the Fish and Game Department, which has already been pared to the core. I do not see why this money should be taken out of the Fish and Game Department money. If they are going to give anything, give it out of the general appropriations instead of out of the Fish and Game Department.

Mr. SARGENT: Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an act which reads as follows: "Be it enacted by the people of the State of Maine, as follows: Section 8 of Article II of Chapter 216 of the Public Laws of 1931 is hereby amended by adding after the word 'year' in the last line the following paragraph.

"In order to further provide flexibility to meet any emergency due to loss in revenue, below the estimates upon which appropriations were made by the legislature, the budget officer, with the approval of the governor and council, may reduce the amounts provided by the appropriation acts to equal the loss in revenue."

I think there have been times in the past when this expression "When funds were available" was added to the amendment that funds never were available. This resolve, as I stated yesterday, was introduced for \$2500.00, but because of the depression it was cut down to \$1500. I believe that if this amendment is adopted there never will be any money to pay this resolve. There is no reason why this resolve should not be paid out of the funds of the Inland Fisheries and Game Department. The Deputy Game Warden was working at the time for the Inland Fisheries and Game Department, and, if the claim had

gone in when due, it would have been paid by that department. I hope that this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. PLOUFF of Dexter: Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the adoption of this amendment because I see no reason why this particular gift of our State to Mrs. Cushman should not stand in the same category with other resolves of a like nature. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Caratunk Mr. Sterling that House Amendment A be adopted. All those in favor of the motion will say aye, contrary minded, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Forty-eight voting in the affirmative and 59 in the negative, the motion to adopt the amendment failed of passage.

Thereupon the resolve had its second reading, and was passed to be engrossed.

(H. P. 69) (L. D. 43) An act relating to the printing of Public Laws in newspapers.

(H. P. 1045) (L. D. 446) An act relating to parking of vehicles on highways.

(H. P. 1589) (L. D. 912) An act relating to payment for treatment of patients at State Sanatoriums.

Passed to Be Enacted

(H. P. No. 73) (L. D. No. 40) An act authorizing life insurance companies organized under the Laws of Maine to pay pensions.

(H. P. No. 125) (L. D. No. 74) An act requiring the filing and preservation of annual statements of insurance companies.

(H. P. No. 126) (L. D. No. 79) An act relating to taxes on insurance premiums.

(H. P. No. 127) (L. D. No. 70) An act relating to time limit for adjusting fire losses.

(H. P. No. 228) (L. D. No. 128) An act repealing the law relating to auxiliary State forests.

(H. P. No. 585) An act to amend the charter of Parsonsfield seminary.

An act Creating an Art Commission (H. P. No. 618) (L. D. No. 183).

An act relating to the Taking of Smelts, Minnows and other Bait Fish, White Fish, Cusk, and Suckers (H. P. No. 694) (L. D. No. 363).

An act relating to Closed Seasons in the Several Waters of the

State (H. P. No. 710) (L. D. No. 371).

An act relating to Protection of Quahaugs and Mussels (H. P. No. 1065) (L. D. No. 452).

An act relating to Roads in Unincorporated Places (H. P. No. 1071) (L. D. No. 455).

(Tabled by Mr. Tupper of Calais, pending passage to be enacted, and especially assigned for tomorrow morning).

(H. P. No. 1080) (L. D. No. 434)

An act to amend the charter or privileges of the West Bangor and Hermon Mutual Fire Insurance Company.

An act relating to State Aid for Academies (H. P. No. 1090) (L. D. No. 577).

An act relating to the Foreclosure of Real Estate Mortgages (H. P. No. 1105) (L. D. No. 588).

An act relating to Reports to Towns of Excise Tax Payments (H. P. No. 117) (L. D. No. 561).

An act relative to Dealers in Live Bait; License Therefor (H. P. No. 1522) (L. D. No. 845).

An act relating to Appropriations for Private and Public Hospitals (H. P. No. 1581) (L. D. No. 908).

An act to Define the Pauper Status of Indians (H. P. No. 1583) (L. D. No. 909).

An act Legalizing the Operation of Airplanes on Sunday (H. P. No. 1585) (L. D. No. 910).

Finally Passed

Resolve providing for a State Pension for Archibald Mullen, of Washington (H. P. No. 894) (L. D. No. 838).

Resolve providing for an increase in State Pension for William S. Smith of Alna (H. P. No. 904) (L. D. No. 839).

Resolve providing for a State Pension for Anna Foley, of Lewiston (H. P. No. 907) (L. D. No. 840).

Resolve relating to Fishing in McWain Pond, or Long Pond, so-called (H. P. No. 1393) (L. D. No. 907).

Resolve in favor of Mary E. Rogers of Carmel (H. P. No. 1519) (L. D. No. 841).

Resolve in favor of Beautifying Fort Knox (H. P. No. 1582) (L. D. No. 915).

Resolve Creating an Unemployment Insurance Recess Committee (H. P. No. 1584) (L. D. No. 916).

On motion by Mr. Thurston of Andover,

The House recessed until 4 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The Speaker in the Chair.

The SPEAKER: At recess this morning the House was proceeding on bills on their passage to be enacted,—No. 27 on Page 13 of the Calendar.

**Passed to Be Enacted
(Emergency Measures)**

H. P. 1521, L. D. 833: An act relating to State aid to academies.

The SPEAKER: This being an emergency measure, it is necessary that it have the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire membership of this body. All those in favor of the passage of the bill to be enacted will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty-four voting in the affirmative and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

S. P. 230, L. D. 796: An act to incorporate the town of Lincoln School District.

The SPEAKER: This being an emergency measure, it is necessary that it have the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire membership of this body. All those in favor of the passage of the bill to be enacted will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty-six voting in the affirmative and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

H. P. 851, L. D. 262: Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution raising the State debt limit.

On motion by Mr. Fernald of Winterport, tabled pending final passage, and specially assigned for Friday, March 24.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER: Proceeding under Orders of the Day, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Baring, Mr. Chase.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: It is with feeling of profound sorrow that I rise at this time to announce the death of Robert J. Peacock which occurred at his home in Lubec early this morning. Mr. Peacock was a member of this House at one time, also a member of the Senate and of the Executive Council, and he has

a worthy son, one of the members of this House, Carroll B. Peacock, whose seat is vacant today. Mr. Speaker, I would now present the following resolutions and move their passage.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Baring, Mr. Chase, introduces out of order resolutions and move their adoption. The Clerk will read the resolutions.

WHEREAS, it has been learned with profound sorrow of the passing of Honorable Robert J. Peacock of Lubec, formerly a member of this House, of the Maine Senate, and the Executive Council and a business leader of eastern Maine;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that in the passing of Mr. Peacock, Maine has lost a citizen of high standing and sterling worth.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the sympathy of the members of this House be conveyed to our fellow-member, Honorable Carroll B. Peacock, son of the deceased, and a copy of these resolutions be sent to the members of his immediate family.

Thereupon the resolutions were unanimously adopted.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day the Chair lays before the House the first matter tabled and specially assigned for today, bill an act relative to fishing licenses for residents and non-residents; fees thereof, revocation thereof, H. P. 1624, L. D. 958, tabled March 21 by Miss Martin of Bangor, pending third reading; and the Chair recognizes that member.

Miss MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment A to H. P. 1624, L. D. 958, bill an act relative to fishing licenses for residents and non-residents; fees therefor; revocation thereof.

Amend said bill by inserting after the word "shall" in the twenty-second line of section one, the word "willfully."

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

The Chair lays before the House the second matter tabled and specially assigned for today, H. P. 1633, L. D. 977, resolve in favor of the city

of Eastport, tabled by Mr. Carleton of Portland March 21, pending passage to be engrossed; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. CARLETON: Mr. Speaker, I now offer House Amendment A.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read House Amendment A.

House Amendment A to H. P. 1633, L. D. 977, resolve in favor of the city of Eastport.

Amend said resolve by striking out in the last line "said sum to be paid from general State funds", and substitute in place thereof "said sum to be used as an offset against any accounts due the State of Maine from the city of Maine."

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

The Chair lays before the House the third matter tabled and specially assigned for today, House report ought not to pass of the committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act to revise the charter of the city of Eastport, H. P. 861, L. D. 401, tabled March 21 by Mr. Eldridge of Eastport, pending the acceptance of the ought not to pass report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Eldridge, the report ought not to pass was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth matter tabled and today assigned, majority report, ought to pass in new draft; minority report, ought not to pass, of the Committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act legalizing amateur sports and games under certain conditions on Sunday, H. P. 633, L. D. 186, new draft, H. P. 1611, L. D. 940, tabled on March 21 by the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Eldridge, and the Chair now recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. ELDRIDGE: Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, I do not intend to take a lot of the valuable time of the House this afternoon in speaking about this Legislative Document 940. I do, however, wish to say a few words in explanation of the bill reported here in a new draft. I wish that all members would please turn to Legislative Document 940.

Mr. Speaker, this bill came before the Legal Affairs Committee, an interesting hearing was held on the bill, and the bill was afterwards reported out in a new draft, ought to

pass—eight voting ought to pass and two ought not to pass.

The original bill as drawn provided for commercial as well as amateur sports. There were only two exceptions made in regard to outdoor competitive sports that were included in the bill,—boxing and wrestling. However, in the new draft the committee saw fit to add air circuses and horse races to the exceptions.

The committee feels now that the bill being considered at the present time is a very worthy bill and well worth passing here this afternoon.

The bill, instead of being a general amateur sport bill, to be forced upon the people of the State, carries the so-called local option provision, which means that if the city of Portland, Eastport, Biddeford, or what not, or the town of Lubec, Whiting, or Dennysville sees fit to let the people of that particular area or town vote upon the bill by an article in the town warrant, on petition of twenty-five voters, they shall cause the same to be inserted. However, if the residents or people of these communities see fit not to have amateur sports in that particular town, they do not have them forced upon them by a change in the general law.

In speaking with one of the outstanding opponents of the bill, I was informed by him that this is a very satisfactory bill, and one that he does not very strenuously oppose. It seems the real opposition to the bill comes from the fact that it might be or will be used as a wedge for some other sessions of the Legislature to provide for Sunday dancing, Sunday movies, or some other form of Sunday entertainment.

The bill was introduced by me. It was not introduced by me with the idea that it is to be used as a wedge. I am opposed to Sunday dancing, or movies, or any other kind of entertainment that six days in the week is long enough for. I am, however, very much interested in outdoor competitive sports on Sunday. I think in Section 39C, the area around Churches or other places of religious worship is very well protected. Under this section the local authorities may designate certain areas where competitive Sunday sports can be played. As I understand the provisions of this particular bill, it would seem reasonable and seem assured that the local authorities will not permit a ball game

or any other competitive sport to be engaged in nearby a place of worship.

So much for the bill, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me, members of this House, that the time has come when we should make some provision for the repeal of our Sunday laws. We all know that the people of the State have been for the past few years enjoying the same sports on Sunday that they have on week days. It seems to me we are instilling into the youngsters of today, who will be the citizens and law-makers of tomorrow, a great disrespect for the laws of our State. On Sundays, when youngsters have nothing else to do, after they have been to Church and Sunday School, with the afternoon free, what is the first thing they think of? Baseball, swimming, tennis, or what not? It seems to me those youngsters, by going out to the ball park, and knowing they are doing this in violation of the law—it seems to me it is starting in rather young and early to start out with that form of lawlessness so evident in the larger cities of the country today.

It seems to me that an outdoor baseball game, outdoor football game, where a man can take his family and stay out in the fresh air and enjoy himself through an hour of football or baseball—it seems to me to be an ideal way to spend Sunday. That man, with his family, knows where his boys and girls are at that particular time of the day. The average man, who works hard during the week—if there is such a man in the State today—it seems to me there is something more than this spirit of resting on Sunday. I suppose the word "resting" might be interpreted in many different ways, but it seems to me the idea of resting is something more than sitting on the porch or lying in bed and just actually resting. It seems to me that a man to rest, should relax. Any man that has any red blood in his veins at all and cares to go and watch an interesting game of baseball, certainly is relaxing during the nine innings. After he gets home he spends the rest of that evening telling his friends what a wonderful game it was. I think you will find he is able to go to work a better citizen on Monday morning. A man feels as though, after he has been to Church the day before, he has done his best.

He does not have to lie around and wonder what his idle mind might bring to him.

I had occasion to wonder in regard to our present law, in regard to both violations and prosecutions under this law. As we all know, the law has been on the statute books for some time. I had occasion to look through the Attorney General's report. I found all of the crimes and misdemeanors listed as far as the report showed, and I could find nothing to show any conviction under Sunday baseball. I went to the Attorney General's Office, and the Assistant told me that he was aware that there had been a conviction or two, he did not know where, he did not know when; his office had no record of it.

It seems to me, if we are going to have this law on the books, we should enforce it. If we are not going to enforce these laws, we should repeal them.

I noticed an item in the newspaper the other day that there are only six states in these United States of ours that do not allow Sunday baseball. I hope, within the next three or four days, to be able to read in the newspapers that there are only five states that do not have Sunday baseball, and Maine will be a State that does have Sunday baseball.

Mr. Speaker, at the hearing there was quite a lot of talk about the fact that there was no popular demand for Sunday baseball. This statement was made shortly after a gentleman in favor of the bill had told the committee that about three years ago, when part of the Boston Braves or part of the Red Sox, was playing at Togus over here, there were twelve thousand people at the ball game. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this constitutes, at least in the city of Augusta, a popular demand. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I asked the sporting editor of one of the Portland papers, the Press Herald, to send to me, if he would and could, certain Monday morning editions, which would carry some interesting news in regard to Sunday sports. I do not want to take a lot of time to go through all of these papers, but I have one here dated October 24th, 1932, stating that at Bridgton, Maine, that there were about eighteen hundred people at the football game when Bridgton defeated Notre Dame. On

this particular page, on October 24th, "Westbrook Tops Brunswick, 7-0. 1,500 Watch Home Outfit Rally in Final Quarter," and "Fifth Subdues 101st Team . . . before a Crowd of 2500 Fans." Here is another at Fort Williams where 2,000 fans were present. Here is a baseball game at Togus where the "Colored Giants Beat All-Stars . . . fully 2,500 Fans Brave a Cold Raw Wind to Watch the Big Leaguers." And on the same page: "Westbrook Romps to 47 to 0 Win"—no statement of crowd. "Sanford Whacks Portland Indies . . . Before a Large Crown of Spectators."

All of these games, Mr. Speaker, were played on Sunday. I could go on like this for some time, but there is something further, I think, could be mentioned in regard to competitive outdoor sports. At Biddeford I notice the Maine Champion Horseshoe Pitcher obtained his title. This also happened on Sunday. "1500 See Bulldogs Down Blue Waves." Another game at Portland and two others in Sanford.

This baseball bill or football bill, or Sunday sports bill had no organized majority, but I think I am safe in saying it has an unorganized majority. I think the people of the State of Maine who are interested in these outdoor sports, if they could be consolidated, would become an organized majority.

We were handicapped today in that a number of petitions came before the House and appear on the calendar today, but they seem to come from one locality in the State. But this majority in favor of amateur sports are unorganized, and without funds and without workers.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take too much time. I hope the majority report of the committee will be accepted.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Eldridge, moves to accept the majority report of the committee, ought to pass in new draft.

MR. TOMPKINS of Bridgewater: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: As the gentleman from Eastport (Mr. Eldridge) has just said, this came from the committee with a divided report. Being a member of that committee, the Legal Affairs Committee, I am one of the two who signed the minority report. At this time I would like to take just a few moments of your

valuable time and speak against this Sunday Recreation Bill, Amateur Sunday Sports Bill. In my case—in my personal case—I have a principle at stake, and my argument will be my sincere conviction, and I believe if any man or woman has a sincere conviction on this thing, and has not got backbone enough to stand up here and speak it out, he or she is not worthy of a seat in this or in any other Legislature.

Now there was a similar bill to this before the Eighty-fifth Legislature, and you who are here now and who were members of that Legislature know the stand that I took then, and I have not changed my mind any since. I do not intend to stand here and argue with you this afternoon as to which is the proper day we should keep. I have no argument with our Hebrew Brethren who follow their great Leader and Law-Giver, Moses, and who keep the seventh day. I have no argument with the sincere Seventh Day Adventist who keeps the seventh day.

I would like to ask who it is that wants this change in our Sunday laws. I have a little clipping from one of the newspapers. I will just read a sentence or two: "Washington, D. C., Feb. 10, 1933. The House Labor Committee approved and ordered favorably reported the Connery five-day week, six-hour day bill. A similar measure, the Black bill, is pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Both bills are supported by organized labor * * *."

"The bill forbids transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of certain goods produced by persons working more than five days a week or six hours a day."

Now think this over: Six hours a day every day in the week—that gives you six or eight or more hours every day for baseball, and it gives you all day Saturday. What more does anyone want?

Now there are some who come up and say "We want this bill for the children, for the boys and girls." Bless your soul, the boys and girls do play now everywhere—we expect them to; they always did and always will.

Another fellow comes up and says "We need amusement." We are amused to death now. It is not amusement that is at the bottom of this, and not because they want to

have boys and girls have a chance to play, and it is not because the working men want a chance to play ball. When you get down to brass tacks, it is simply the crowd who wants to put our Sabbath into commercialism, nothing else.

I do not claim that you can make people good by law. I do not claim you can send anyone to heaven by law, and I do not believe you can compel morality by law, but I do believe you can create conditions by proper legislation that will build up a better class of citizenry. We are all proud that we are Americans. We have the best country in the world, the richest country in the world, and it is our home. We have the best and most free institution of any country today, and they are ours, and they are not there because our forefathers and people all down the ages have only kept half a day for the Sabbath.

Now I do know it does say in the Good Book that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. I have not the time or the inclination to go into the Biblical exegesis and explain why this statement was made by the leader of all men, but I can assure you that it was not made for man to fish or to play ball or to get drunk and do these other things. But the Sabbath was made for man, so he could have bodily rest, and it was made for the development of his mind and for his spiritual edification.

The laws of our Puritan Fathers were strict but they were not loose, and you and I may wake up some day to the fact that their strictness was right and that we, in our looseness today, are wrong.

When the Great Creator got ready to bestow the United States of America, to whom did he give it? Not to the Spanish or to the French—although at one time the French had a pretty good foothold—but He gave it to our Pilgrim Fathers because they were the only group of people at that time who were fitted for that undertaking. They were God-fearing, law-abiding people, and they kept the Sabbath all down through the ages, and because of them we have the great country that we have today.

Now if Sunday should be turned over to recreational activities today then all of the teachings we have had from the Good Book all down

through the ages are wrong, and all of the laws made and enforced by that great people who have preceded us in the past have been wrong, and all the teachings we have received from our parents are absolutely wrong in that respect. And if it is right to do it, it always has been right.

This bill calls, as has been stated, for local option. It is altogether too optional and altogether too local. Now I trust that every member of this Legislature believes that the foundation of all law is found in the Bible. I refer to the Ten Commandments. Every lawyer within the sound of my voice will say that is right. These Ten Commandments have never been changed, have never been added to, and nothing has ever been taken away from them. They are different from the Mosaic laws, which, in addition to, and together with the Ten Commandments, governed God's chosen people, the Jews, and which were gradually enlarged upon by the Hebrew lawyers until they filled many volumes which are known today as the Talmud.

You are all familiar with the Ten Commandments, and you know the fourth: "Remember the Sabbath Day and keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work" but on the seventh rest. That does not say "Remember and keep half the Sabbath Day holy."

Somebody said at the hearing, and may say this afternoon, that the Sabbath Day is a man-made affair. That is not right, and you all know it is not right. It was not made by Abraham or Moses or George Washington or any other man. No living man had anything to do with it. That is why I take my stand today. Others may do as they believe, but I feel that I, as a mere man, have no right to legislate over and overrule my Creator, and shall not in this particular case, until I am notified and satisfied that God himself has repealed the Fourth Commandment.

Now as soon as I have finished I hope no man will rise and say "That man Tompkins from Bridge-water has said that if this Sunday bill passes that the sun will cease to shine and that vegetables will cease to grow and that all life on earth will be put out." I do not say that, but I say this: That if we save the Sabbath Day, we save our State and Nation. America has al-

ways been known as a Sabbath-observing country, and we are a Sabbath-observing people, but today there are countless forces working to destroy the very foundations of our State and Nation such as indifference, greed and commercialism, and I say that, and honestly believe it,—that if you lose the Sabbath Day out of our American life, you will eventually destroy our Nation. Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Eastport (Mr. Eldridge) will not prevail.

Mr. KNIGHT of Waterford: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature: I wish to make a very brief statement on this bill. We have had Sunday sports for at least five years in this State, and wish to legalize this practice. In the district from which I come, most of the young people in the larger cities, and the older people, favor these Sunday sports, and I wish to go on record in favor of the majority report.

Mr. CHASE of Sebec: Mr. Speaker, whatever I say on this subject I am going to read. As one of the two who signed the minority report ought not to pass on the Sunday Amateur Sports Law, which legalizes certain Sunday sports, I most strenuously oppose the enactment of such legislation. It is certainly a step backward for the well-being of any community.

When the hearing was held before our committee, the opponents outnumbered the proponents. The proposed bill does not prohibit a group of citizens, young or old, from buying or leasing a piece of land, field or fairgrounds, for the purpose of carrying on automobile races, foot races, greased pig races, potato races, side shows and other sports, such as are carried on at our town and country fairs and charging admission thereto. Doubtless such would call out a much larger audience than if held some other day of the week.

Many people who favor this bill claim it is needed for recreation for those who are employed and are working all the week. Is it true that a majority of our people are not employed more than half the time, many not at all? Whenever employment conditions are good, every industry ceases operation every Saturday afternoon. Not many industries at the present time operate more than three or four days each week. Week-days of unem-

ployment and daylight saving should be sufficient for those needing recreation, and we should not use our Sabbath Day for any such purpose.

All over our State baseball and golf are played, and I have yet to hear of anyone being troubled for so doing.

I have recently received a protest signed by Judge Martin L. Durgin, who was a former member of the House and Senate: "Hon. Charles J. Chase:

I desire to enter my protest against the bill providing for Sunday sports, for the following reasons:

First, from the standpoint of Christianity, it is in my belief utterly wrong to turn the Lord's Day into a day of sport and festivity, when thought of the young people will be turned from the nobler things of life to that of fun, and in many country towns will become a most effective agency to destroy Sunday Schools.

Second, it is wrong in principle in that it strikes at the Protestant church especially, for many of the Protestant services are held in the afternoon, especially in the country towns.

Third, this is an entering wedge for commercializing the Lord's Day, for it will only require an amendment later so that fees may be charged, and that will surely come as it has in the State of Massachusetts, and we shall have a Continental Sunday in time if this bill becomes a law. Nobody borrows any trouble about the Blue Laws, save those who desire to break them. Many of them are practically a dead letter and they are never thought of save when the Legislature is in session and some member desires to have a law enacted to make the Lord's Day the sporting day of all the week. If this bill becomes a law, you will see at the next Legislature a bill offered to amend it and so on until we shall have an open Sunday for all sports when fees will be charged and collected as in other States where the Sunday of our fathers will be only a memory.

"In closing, let me say that my objection to the passage of this bill is not based on religious prejudice, for I am a member of no church and never was. I am what they would call in trotting horse parlance a "rank outsider," but I do believe most clearly and strenu-

ously that we should pause from our worldly pursuits at least once in the seven days constituting our week and pay some homage to that great Creator over and above us all and teach our young that they should never lose sight of this important duty and privilege.

No one is compelled to attend church if he desires not to, but he should not lend his influence toward that which would disturb others who do attend. It is much better in my opinion that our children be found at Sunday Schools on the Sabbath day and being taught there those things that will strengthen and enlarge their mental calibre, than to be grouped at a ball field yelling their appropriation to some athletic favorite. I may say further, that I have been a follower of sports more or less all my life and enjoy them, but I have a fear that we are carrying the thing too far and that if we do not call a halt, brawn will take the place of brain and mentality will be invited to go way back and sit down."

I have here a petition of protest from the town of Milo, in my class, signed by almost a hundred of the outstanding citizens there.

Should any one town in any county of our State vote to allow the establishing of a place for Sunday sports and all other towns refuse so to do, the town voting for the exhibition would be over-run with people. Posters advertising the same would be printed and displayed in every conspicuous place available. the same as is now done for our Town and County Fairs. There would be a constant procession through every town and village in autos, many of which should be in "auto graveyards" so-called—doubtless lasting from daylight into well into the night, cause annoyance to many who prefer to have the Sabbath observed as it should be. I have many postcards and letters, one signed by the Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. at Brownville Junction. Mr. Hay, one signed by Alfred G. Hempstead, a welfare worker of the Great Northern Paper Company, and lots of postal cards and letters protesting against this from many towns in our county.

Here is a clipping from a paper: "Pennsylvania Senate Action Kills Hoped for Sunday Baseball."

I hope the minority report will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The House stays in order very well and listens to anybody loudly enough so they can be heard.

Mr. YOUNG of York: Mr. Speaker and members of the Eighty-sixth Legislature: This is an act legalizing amateur sports and games engaged in under certain conditions on Sunday. This act legalizes what I consider is already being done. I come from a section that is a summer resort. There is a country club there, and you cannot stop them from playing golf; it is private. The men go fishing. Go down to the wharf any Sunday morning, and there are parties going out, boat-loads of them. The reason I am standing here talking on this matter is because I think it was said here that anyone ought not to be afraid to get up and express his mind. Those people go fishing; they play golf. You can go to any beach resort and go on the roller coaster, watch the amusements, go in bathing, and go automobile riding. I daresay ninety-five per cent of the members of this House, if it is a good day, are out enjoying the scenery and seeing what they can see. If that is not an outdoor sport, what is it?

If Sunday is meant to stay at home, all right. I say that outdoor sports would include any of those I have mentioned, particularly Sunday driving. People drive along the shore, drive anywhere, and look around to see what they can see, the same as if they went to a ball game, and the more excitement they can find, the better they like it. That is human nature.

What do the young fellows do now who cannot play baseball or who have no automobiles? They go down and hang around the drug store. They sell things in drug stores—I understand they are only supposed to sell medicine or drugs on Sunday, but you can buy anything you want which they usually have to sell. Everything is open. There are Sunday movies; I have even seen bowling. Your beaches are lined.

I want to say further that I believe in the Sabbath, and I believe in keeping it holy. I do believe that this is not a set-back. I think this is something that will give young people something to do, and will take them away from things they are doing which are much worse than Sunday baseball.

Mr. WALKER of Rockland: Mr.

Speaker, the tenor of the discussion against the majority report is obviously based upon religious grounds. I favor the majority report, because I do not believe in legislating on what is a conscientious question. It would be just as consistent to legislate that people should go to church on Sunday, and if they did not appear, to send a truant officer after them, as to legislate as to what they shall or shall not do on Sunday upon religious or conscientious grounds.

There is a lack of distinction here between Sunday and the Sabbath. The Sabbath is a Hebrew Institution, and it has nothing to do with the first day of the week that we observe as Christians. The Ten Commandments have no reference to Sunday. Anybody who intends to follow the Ten Commandments in this respect should ally himself with the Seventh Day Adventists or with the Jews. The day has never been changed. We cannot go into the theological aspect of this question, although it has been raised inferentially.

Now if we want people to do certain things which we think contribute to their citizenship, it is a cheap, evasive way to attempt to secure results by a method which is completely outworn and outgrown and exploded by experience. It cannot be done, and when the Church invokes the policeman to secure results which can only be secured by spiritual power, it has abdicated its place and revealed itself as in a state of moral decadence.

Why is it that people are no longer found in their accustomed places of worship on Sunday? Partly because religious organization has lost its spiritual power and has turned more and more to secular law and the police magistrate to secure its results.

Sunday was first legalized under the reign of Constantine the Great in the Fourth Century. The observance of that day was built up against the forces of paganism. The church in that day was able to get this day recognized against all law and against all custom. Today, they come into these legislative halls and ask legislative sanction as to how people shall spend their day of rest, so that it will not conflict with worship and at places which do not interfere with it. It is none of our business what people do on Sunday so long as they do not interfere with

the rights of other people. I am in favor of the majority report, and I am in favor of a much more sweeping provision. If we want the spirit that animated our forefathers, let us get it in the way that it was gotten in the first place. Puritanism failed, but puritanical laws remain like appendices on our statute books and are of no force or value whatever. I would that the Legislature might wash its hands of the whole business and cease to allow hypocritical legislation to remain on the statute books which purports to rule upon a private matter of private conscience. I am in favor of the majority report. (Applause)

Mr. FENLASON of Anson: Mr. Speaker, I think this matter has been thoroughly discussed and presumably one hundred per cent of the members know what they want to do with it. Now I object to having any more oratory forced upon the House at this time of day, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Anson, Mr. Fenlason, moves the previous question. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question at this time, which requires one-fifth of the members present, will rise and stand until counted and the monitors make and return the count.

A division was had.

The SPEAKER: A sufficient number obviously having arisen, the previous question is ordered. The question now is shall the main question be now put? All those in favor will say aye; contrary minded no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Eastport, Mr. Eldridge, that the majority report of the committee on Legal Affairs reporting ought to pass in new draft on Legislative Document 940 be accepted. All those in favor of this motion will say aye; contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed, and the majority report ought to pass in new draft was accepted. Thereupon, under suspension of the rules, the bill had its two several readings and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair lays before the House the fifth matter tabled and specially

assigned for today, ought not to pass House report of the committee on Claims on resolve in favor of Vito Mininni, Inc., of Biddeford, H. P. 799, tabled on March 21 by Mr. Duquette of Biddeford, pending acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Duquette, the report ought not to pass was accepted.

The Chair lays before the House the sixth matter tabled and specially assigned for today House report ought not to pass of the committee on Claims on resolve in favor of Vito Mininni, Inc., of Biddeford, H. P. 798, tabled March 21 by Mr. Duquette of Biddeford, pending acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Duquette, the report ought not to pass was accepted.

The Chair lays before the House the seventh matter, tabled and specially assigned for today, majority report ought not to pass and minority report ought to pass in new draft of the committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act providing for a new charter for the City of Portland, H. P. 859, L. D. 402, new draft, H. P. 1617, L. D. 969, tabled March 21 by Mr. Plummer of Portland, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I have good reason to believe that there is somebody who is going to oppose my bill. (Laughter) Someone wrote a letter to the editor of the Portland Press-Herald—I don't know who wrote it because they failed to sign their name, they also signed the name of a well known writer in Brunswick. They said speaking of the charter which I had put in (not naming me) that I had put into the Legislature—they said this: "Why will Portland persist in sending old fossils down to the Legislature at Augusta?" (Laughter) I looked in Websters' Unabridged Dictionary and I find it there stated than an old fossil is a petrified animal. (Laughter) I didn't like that name, and I will say that the lady whose name was used wrote to the paper stating that she did not sign the name. I was all set to give her a good kick, (Laughter) but when I

found out the kind of fellow who apparently wrote this, I made up my mind that it was pretty hard to kick nothing. (Laughter).

The question before the House is the acceptance of the minority report of the Legal Affairs committee, ought to pass in new draft, and I will support the new draft and move that the new draft be accepted.

Someone has asked me if there is any call for this in Portland. Well, I hold in my hand petitions amounting to somewhere about 2,000. I haven't counted them exactly, but if the House wishes I will read these petitions. (Laughter).

I want to say first to the members here that this is a matter that interests the people of Portland. Of course you know that the Legislature could pass an act and tell us what kind of a city or government we should have. We do not ask that and do not expect it, in fact do not want it; so we are coming to you today and asking you to let us vote on what kind of a city government we will have in Portland, Maine.

Our present charter provides for five councilors elected at large by the voters in Portland. They are unpledged, no party designation. We have a City Manager who is appointed by the City Council. They have absolute control of all matters of the city of Portland except the schools which are not under the management of the City Council but are managed by the Superintendent School Committee.

The principal changes that we make here is from the five councilors and the City Manager. We propose to have twelve aldermen and a mayor. The mayor would be elected from the city at large and the aldermen elected from each ward in the city. I believe in representation. You know you might elect this whole House from the city of Portland; we wouldn't kick (Laughter). We have got men enough up there so we could elect the whole of you and let us govern the whole State. Probably it would not be satisfactory.

I believe that each locality has its peculiar problems and that the representation of the State should come from all parts of the State. I also believe that in a city like Portland the different wards should be represented. They are not under the form that we now have. Our city is divided into two sections by Back Bay. Portland originally was an is-

land, old Portland, proper, I'm speaking of now, and since I was a boy I have seen the water entirely surround the city on a high run of tides.

Now anyone who knows our city knows that the old Portland is situated south of the Back Bay district and Ward one begins on the hill on the Eastern Promenade and the wards extend up to the Western Promenade and out to the Stroud-water district, there being seven wards. When Deering was taken on, Deering was divided into two wards and the two wards, covering the Woodfords district, Morrill's district and East Deering, all lay north of the Back Bay, being so divided. Ward seven, eight and nine have two precincts. Those wards are more than twice as large as the wards in the old city proper.

We have had this city charter for ten years and no representative has ever been elected from Wards two, three, four or six. No representative has ever been elected from any of those wards. Just to show you here—and it will not take me but a minute—how the wards have been represented for the ten years since the city charter was formed. In 1924, Ward seven had two councilors, Ward eight had two councilors and Ward five had one. In 1927 Ward seven had two, Ward eight, two and Ward five, one. In 1928, Ward seven had three and Ward eight had two. In 1929, Ward nine, the ward in which I live got a councilor, Ward seven had two and Ward eight had two. In 1931, Ward nine had one, Ward seven had one and Ward eight had two and Ward one got one. In 1932, Ward nine had one, Ward seven one, Ward eight one, and Ward one got two. I read this just to show you how the several wards in the city have never had representation under our present form of government.

The friends of this present city government have given us a pretty good argument on our side as to some of the conditions at Portland so far as our council is concerned. They have come to the Legislature and asked you to pass a law that no councilman should accept any office under the city government that drew any pay for two years after they went out of office. The conditions were that one of our councilors was appointed City Marshal a short time ago. It is rather a well known fact up there that one

of the councilmen is working to be treasurer and the third one is out to be Chief of the Fire Department. That shows something as to what the ring is there because the City Manager is elected by the council.

Now I want to say this: Portland has one-tenth of the population of the State. Three councilors in Portland have absolute control of the city legislation, and, of course, as they appoint the manager, they have absolute control of the appointment and have in their hands all the patronage. They expend millions of dollars and it is all done by three men because three men control that council. I submit that that is altogether too much power to give to any three men, I don't care who they are.

You see our city charter was adopted in 1923. From 1923 to 1929 everything was going, we all built roads, we built schoolhouses, in fact we rode on a high wave. You built your schoolhouses, you built roads and some of them have not been paid for yet, but everything was perfectly smooth. In 1929, however, we struck a snag and since that time the going has been a little rocky for all of us. There is no question about that. Our city council has spent money freely and they are spending it freely now. They have bought fire boats, they have put radios in their cars and I would not be a mite surprised to open up the paper tomorrow morning and find that they had bought an airplane.

Some of them say this is not a proper time to stir these things up. I say that it is the proper time. I say things ought to be stirred up right now. We would have been better off if we had stirred up some things two years ago. It is time for us to set our house in order if it ever was, and on that score I say that now is the proper time and it ought not to be put off one single day.

So far as I am concerned personally, this is my second term here. I have voted charters to all parts of the State, and I have made no distinction as to whether those charters were City Manager charters or simply Aldermen charters. I think that you are better able than anybody else to decide what kind of a charter you will have. As I say, I voted two years ago for a charter for Bangor. I voted two years ago

for a charter for this man over here from Brewer. I have voted this year for two charters for South Portland. I cannot remember the charters that we have voted. So gentlemen, all I have to say is this: Just give us down in Portland a chance, after the ten years, to decide what kind of a city government we want. (Applause)

Mr. BUCKNAM of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I wish I were able to entertain you as well as my colleague, Mr. Plummer. There is nobody I would less like to oppose than him in regard to this matter, but it seems to me very necessary that we should not disturb the matter as it stands today. Considering the general conditions of business Portland is in a very good condition and this is no time to make any radical change. At the hearing before the Legal Affairs committee the majority report, ought not to pass, prevailed. As a citizen taxpayer in the city of Portland I ask the members of this House to uphold the majority report, ought not to pass.

A few weeks ago I attended the hearing before the committee on Legal Affairs regarding the proposed change in the charter of the city of Portland, and I wish you might all have been present and heard the facts and figures as they were presented. May I say that the city of Portland needs no change in its form of government, I thank you.

Mr. DOW of Portland: Mr. Speaker, if the person who wrote the communication to the newspaper in regard to the gentleman who signed the minority report had known him as we do, he never would have said that he was an old fossil. Instead of being a petrified animal he is very much alive even though many years have passed over his head. He is young in spirit and very vigorous in what he tells us is the proper thing. While I dislike to be opposed to him for many reasons, yet we are friendly and have talked over many matters; but I feel that the people who have talked to me about the city government of the city of Portland do not want a change in the city charter, particularly at this time when other problems should receive all of our attention. It is very easy to get petitions signed, opposing or favoring a certain thing. Persons will sign petitions just to get rid of you

and sometimes I feel that petitions do not carry much weight. I have not heard as I have been around Portland much opposition to the present form of government. To be sure, there may be faults and they make mistakes. That is simply because people sometimes let things alone if they think they are going along all right. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Plummer, will not prevail.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, it is true that we have a radio out at the City Home and paid twenty-five dollars for it so as to give those poor people a little chance to hear what was going on.

Mr. PLUMMER: I didn't say anything about that.

Mr. ROUNDS: It is also true that the gentleman ran down here with my bill in 1929 with the date 1929 all on it when it came into this House.

Mr. PLUMMER: I did not.

Mr. ROUNDS: All right, I can prove that you did. Now they changed it over, threw my bill out of the window and he started one of his own. It is true that the three members come from seven, eight and nine, but I got my vote from one, two, three, four, five and six, but I think the good man from nine voted for me. Very few up that way voted for me although I live in ward eight. I used to live down in the slums of the city they said, in ward three, and I pretty nearly had my way down there. (Laughter). He comes here and criticizes this government. Now there have been more miles of road built in the last ten years than there was in one hundred years before. There have been more miles of sewer laid than in five years before this form of government. Our taxes have not been increased, our bonds are about where they were and we have paid off something over \$600,000 of bonds last year. If we had not, that would have been tied up in the bank and you down here would have been trying to get them out so we could pay our bills.

It is true that the three members come from ward eight, and it is also true that his bill calls for six members from wards, eight, nine and seven. The six other wards can have one, and what will they do? I have been a politician for a good many years, they say, since along in the 80's. I say that the lower wards are controlled by men

from the upper wards, else they lose their jobs. I lost my job because I would not be controlled by one of the greatest corporations in this State. That was all right and I did it for a purpose. I thought it was right and I have stood that way ever since. Now if you would change the ward lines and give them equal representation with nine aldermen, as my bill called for, I would gladly vote for it; but no! You have two wards up there. The gentleman said Portland was an island. It has not been in my day and I guess it hasn't been in his. (Laughter).

Ward seven, as he tells about, is out beyond where he says is an island. Ward seven and two run beyond it. I want to correct the gentleman in some of his remarks, that's all. If they would change the ward lines, one from each ward, I would certainly like to vote for it. Ward seven wants a million dollar schoolhouse—that is what they want—Ward eight wants a million five hundred thousand dollars in drains, sewers and streets. Ward nine wants more. The other six wards do not want five thousand dollars laid out at the present time.

Now what they are going to do is to hornswoggle them. They hornswoggled you in 1923 and got a new charter. They have sold the gas company and sold it cheap when they could, the honorable gentlemen. I am one of the rough scuff. They have sold everything they could get hold of that would pay the city anything, but anything that would come our way they have gone against it. That is what they have done in the last ten years except that they have built the sewers and streets as I say. They have built more sewers and streets since they have been in there than they did in any two years before. They are coming down now to where they want to change the charter. I do not say but what they can change the charter and get just as good men. I have found no fault only since I got in there they begun to holler in the newspapers and everywhere else that the rough scuff was getting in. Ward one came in almost three to one, that is what it was. Ward two came in and they say there was only 48 Democrats in the primaries, but in the election there was between six and seven hundred and so they voted for me. (Laughter). Ward

three, my old ward, gave me a very good vote, ward four gave me a good vote, ward five gave me a good vote and ward six gave me a good vote, but when it came to seven they didn't want the longshoreman which I have been called in the Legislature, so they didn't vote so much for me. In ward eight I got a few scattering votes, some of them knew me. In ward nine I got a very fair vote. That's the way I was elected, and when I was elected I told them one time that I guessed I was doing two-thirds of the talking in trying to straighten things out. I said I would have to do it all if I remained another two months but I got sick and I let them go ahead at that time.

As I say, if they would change the ward lines and give us nine aldermen I would vote for it right off, but this bill I cannot vote for.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of Mr. Plummer to accept the minority report of the committee on Legal Affairs, ought to pass in new draft.

Mr. SARGENT of Brewer: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I believe it is my duty to at least defend the majority report of the committee on Legal Affairs. There appeared before the committee quite a number of representative citizens of the city of Portland who seriously objected to the change in this charter. One man especially made a great impression upon the committee. He gave in great detail the present conditions in the city of Portland, and, so far as I know, no one disputed him. He showed the present financial condition, the past working of the Council, and there was no one there who disputed him. There were several who objected simply because there was no opportunity or no school for politicians. They said that under the old form of government they were able to train their sons to be better politicians. That seemed to be the only argument they had.

I have been a member of this Legislature for the past four sessions and I have sat on the Legal Affairs committee during that time. I think that every session there has been a charter or a bill asking for a new charter for the city of Portland, and in 1929, I believe, they put this Legislature on wheels and carted them into the city of Portland and we had a public hearing

there. All parts of the city were represented and all conditions and classes of people were there. There was crying and wailing and gnashing of teeth. (Laughter) The committee, I believe, in 1929 reported favorably upon a new charter for the city of Portland, and I believe that that charter went before the people and was defeated by a substantial majority.

As I have observed this thing, the people of Portland, instead of trying to amend their present charter, instead of trying to correct some things that might be corrected, have continually tried to throw monkey wrenches. They have elected, from the testimony that was given, opponents to the present form of government, and those opponents after they had served seemed to be the ones most in favor of the present form of government. I think that the charter of Portland ought to be left alone at the present time. If there are any changes which should be made, they should come here like other communities and agree upon such changes as will work a benefit.

Mr. VILES of Madison: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Viles, moves the previous question. 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 make and return the count.

A sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is, shall the main question be now put? As many as are in favor of the Chair putting the main question now will say aye, those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Plummer, to accept the report ought to pass in new draft, being the minority report of the committee on Legal Affairs on an act providing for a new charter for the city of Portland. All those in favor of this motion will say aye contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Twenty-eight voting in the affirmative and 63 in the negative, the motion failed of passage.

On motion by Mr. Dow of Portland, it was voted to accept the majority report of the committee, which was ought not to pass.

The Chair lays before the House the eighth matter tabled and today assigned resolve regulating ice fishing in York county, H. P. 1625, L. D. 964, tabled March 21 by Mr. Carignan of Sanford, pending assignment for second reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. CARIGNAN: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A and move its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to H. P. 1625, L. D. 964, entitled resolve regulating ice fishing in York county.

Amend said resolve by inserting in the third line thereof after the word "the" the following words: "Opening and closing dates of the."

Thereupon, House Amendment A was adopted and tomorrow assigned for the second reading of the resolve.

The SPEAKER: The ninth matter as printed on the calendar is an error in printing. The bill is in order for its third reading. Is it now the pleasure of the House to take up out of order the third reading of a bill?

Thereupon H. P. 1334, L. D. 970, bill an act relating to school unions had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

The Chair lays before the House the tenth matter tabled and today assigned, bill an act relating to the size of fish and weight of catch limited, H. P. 1567, L. D. 900, tabled March 21 by Mr. Drisko of Jonesboro, pending first reading, and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Drisko, the bill had its two several readings.

Thereupon Mr. Drisko offered House Amendment A and moved its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to bill an act relating to the size of fish and weight of catch limited, H. P. 1557, L. D. 900.

Amend said bill by striking out in the tenth line thereof the figures "15" and inserting in place thereof "25," and by striking out in the tenth line and in the twelfth and fourteenth lines the figure "5" and inserting in place thereof "7½". Also amend said bill by striking out of the twenty-sixth line the figures "15" and inserting in place thereof

the figures "25". Also further amend said bill by inserting after the word "county" in the twenty-sixth line the words "and Grand Lake in Washington County".

Thereupon House Amendment A was adopted.

Mr. Berry of Waterville offered House Amendment B and moved its adoption as follows:

House Amendment B to H. P. 1567, L. D. 900, entitled an act relating to the size of fish and weight of catch limited.

Amend said bill by adding at the end thereof the following: "Except that no trout of less than ten inches in length shall be taken, caught or killed from the waters of North, Long, Great, East, Ellis, McGrath Ponds and Snow pond or Messalonskee lake of the Belgrade Chain of lakes, in the counties of Kennebec and Somerset."

Thereupon House Amendment B was adopted and tomorrow assigned for the third reading of the bill as amended.

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, haven't we had about enough oratory and work in one day? Of course there is this additional calendar with divided reports which, judging from what we have had this afternoon, will take us along until eight o'clock tonight. This is a suggestion. I would like to adjourn. I don't know about the rest of you. I move that we adjourn.

The SPEAKER: Would there be any objection to having these matters of this advance journal tabled and specially assigned for some particular day?

Mr. SCATES: No, none whatever, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Will you withdraw your motion to adjourn?

Mr. SCATES: I will.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the member from Portland, Miss Laughlin.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Bucknam.

On motion by Mr. Bucknam, the House voted to reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it accepted the majority report, ought not to pass on H. P. 1632, L. D. 984, bill an act relating to eligibility of members of city governments to certain offices; and on further motion by the same gentleman the minority report ought to pass in new draft was accepted.

On motion by Miss Laughlin, the

bill and accompanying reports were tabled pending the acceptance of either report and specially assigned for tomorrow morning, the pending question being the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Bucknam, to accept the minority report.

Mr. MASON of Mechanic Falls: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to take from the table a resolve tabled by me this morning?

The SPEAKER: The Chair was hoping that members would allow time for specially assigning these matters on the advance journal. Unless it is very important, would the gentleman be willing to defer?

The SPEAKER: It is the pleasure of the House now to take up, out of order, papers from the Senate?

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Taxation on Bill "An act to raise an Excise Tax on Corporations Organized for making, generating, selling, distributing and/or supplying Electricity or Electric Current for Power, Lighting, Heating, manufacturing or Mechanical Purposes" (I. B. No. 1) (L. D. No. 811) reporting that the committee recommends that no action be taken by the Legislature with reference to passing the accompanying bill and that no competing measure be submitted; that the Initiative Bill be submitted to the Election of this State in accordance with the Constitution; that a Certified Copy of this Report be transmitted to the Governor.

Comes from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House on motion by Mr. Tompkins of Houlton bill and report tabled and specially assigned for Friday, March 24.

From the Senate: Report of same committee on Bill "An act establishing a Low Rate Tax on Intangible Personal Property in Accordance with Constitutional Amendment permitting the same (I. B. No. 2) (L. D. No. 812) reporting that the committee recommends that no action be taken by the Legislature with reference to passing the accompanying bill and that no competing measure be submitted; that the Initiative Bill be submitted to the election of this State in accordance with the Constitution; that a certified copy of this report be transmitted to the Governor.

Comes from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House on motion by Mr. Tompkins of Houlton bill and report tabled and specially assigned for Friday, March 24.

From the Senate: Majority report of the committee on Judiciary on Bill "An act to provide for the nomination of candidates for elective office" (S. P. No. 40) (L. D. No. 14) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 604) (L. D. No. 950) under same title and that it "Ought to pass".

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Weeks of Somerset, Holmes of Androscoggin—of the Senate. Hill of So. Portland, Farris of Augusta, Eldridge of Eastport, Goudy of So. Portland, Tompkins of Houlton—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Miss Laughlin of Portland, Mr. Fernald of Winterport—of the House.

Comes from the Senate the majority report, ought to pass in new draft, accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Crowell of Weston tabled and specially assigned for Friday, March 24.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Salaries and Fees to which was referred for consideration all State and County salary matters under joint order, S. P. No. 34, reporting that they have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to make this interim report presenting their findings with reference to salaries of members and officers of legislature in the form of a bill under title of "An act to reduce salaries of members and certain officers of Legislature" (S. P. No. 574) (L. D. No. 865) and recommending its passage.

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

In the House:

Mr. TOMPKINS of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure

of the House to accept the report of the committee?

The report was accepted in concurrence, and the bill had its two several readings.

Senate Amendment A read. Also Senate Amendment A to Senate Amendment A.

House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A to S. P. 574, L. D. 865, an act to reduce salaries of members and certain officers of the Legislature.

Amend said amendment by striking out the emergency preamble therein.

Mr. BELANGER of Winslow: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Tompkins?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may answer if he wishes.

Mr. BELANGER: Can he explain the reason for the amendment, House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A.

Mr. TOMPKINS: It is to give the members of the House and Senate the option, as I understand it, of accepting or rejecting the cut. It is a personal matter with them.

Mr. CARLETON: Mr. Speaker, may I speak at this time?

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A, and the gentleman may speak on that if he desires.

Mr. CARLETON: I wanted to speak about the Treasurer giving two checks. Is this the right time?

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A which removes the emergency preamble and the emergency provision from the bill.

Mr. CARLETON: I wanted to explain about the checks, that is all.

The SPEAKER: It is not in order at this time.

Thereupon, the House adopted House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A.

Mr. TOMPKINS of Houlton: Mr. Speaker I offer House Amendment B to Senate Amendment A and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read House Amendment B.

House Amendment B to Senate Amendment A to S. P. 574.

Amend said amendment by striking out of section seven the following words: "In view of the emergency set forth in the preamble."

Thereupon the House adopted

House Amendment B to Senate Amendment A.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is the adoption of Senate Amendment A to Senate Amendment A which covers the matter of the divided checks. Does anybody need to have that read again? If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Carleton.

Mr. CARLETON: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I object to the division of the checks. I hope to return to the general fund one tenth of my salary. I expect the Treasurer to give me a check for \$613.00. I want it in one check. I will give him my check for \$60.00, but I do not want any split sentences.

Mr. RUSS of Woodstock: Mr. Speaker, I rise for information. What I would like to know is if this is cutting this present Legislature and also future Legislatures on other years.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has no knowledge of the purpose of this bill. Can Mr. Lindsey of East Machias answer the question of Mr. Russ?

Mr. LINDSEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to answer that question. I want to speak on that two-check business.

The SPEAKER: I would like to have the question answered, if anyone can answer it that has been asked by the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Russ.

Miss MARTIN of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this matter until tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the matter was tabled, the pending question being the adoption of Senate Amendment A to Senate Amendment A, and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

From the Senate: Report of same Committee under same Order making this interim report present-

ing their findings with reference to county attorneys' salaries in the form of a Bill under title of "An Act to Reduce Salaries of County Attorneys" (S. P. No. 575) (L. D. No. 863) and recommending its passage.

Comes from the Senate, Report read and accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A."

In the House, on motion by Mr. Tompkins of Houlton, tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

From the Senate: Bill "An Act to Reduce Certain Fees of Deputy Sheriffs for the next two years" (H. P. No. 1399) (L. D. No. 802) which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in the House on March 14th.

Comes from the Senate with House Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed and the bill passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Flanders of Auburn, tabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning, pending further consideration.

From the Senate: Bill "An Act providing for Pensions for Call-firemen in Augusta" (H. P. No. 879) (L. D. No. 315) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on March 20th.

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

In the House, on motion by Mr. Tompkins of Houlton, tabled pending further consideration, and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion by Mr. Burns of Eagle Lake.

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.