

# 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

# Ninetieth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE



1941

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY

AUGUSTA, MAINE

### HOUSE

Thursday, March 20, 1941.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Washburn of Hallowell.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

From the Senate:

The following Communication: (S. P. 498)

**STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND  
WELFARE**

Augusta

March 17, 1941

To The Honorable House and Senate of the Ninetieth Maine Legislature:

In compliance with the Order of February 20, 1941 of the Ninetieth Legislature (H. P. 1504) requesting the names of persons receiving Old Age Assistance or applying for Old Age Assistance, we submit the following statement:

There is attached hereto the names and residences of all persons receiving Old Age Assistance as of March 1, 1941, together with their monthly allotments, arranged by towns and counties.

There is attached hereto the names and residences of all persons whose applications for Old Age Assistance have been investigated, arranged by towns and counties. There are no monthly allotments shown inasmuch as no monthly allotments have been approved for these cases. The Old Age Assistance Commission has not passed on these cases, and we call your attention to the fact that should additional funds be made available to the Department it will be necessary to recheck the salient points of eligibility on these cases as many of the original investigations were made months ago.

There is attached hereto the names and residences of all applicants who have filed applications for Old Age Assistance and whose applications have not been allowed, approved, or denied, arranged by towns and counties.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) **JOEL EARNEST**  
Commissioner of Health  
and Welfare

Came from the Senate, ordered placed on file.

In the House, the communication was read and ordered placed on file in concurrence.

#### **Senate Bill Requiring Reference**

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act relating to Inspectors in the Department of Secretary of State" (S. P. 500) (L. D. 1024)

Came from the Senate, referred to the Committee on Motor Vehicles.

In the House, was referred to the Committee on Motor Vehicles in concurrence.

Remonstrance from the Senate requiring reference disposed of in concurrence.

#### **Senate Reports Leave to Withdraw**

Report of the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act relative to Regulations of the Use of the Highways by Motor Vehicles Transporting Property for Hire" (S. P. 296) (L. D. 505) reporting leave to withdraw.

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act relative to the Regulation of the Use of the Highways by Motor Vehicles Transporting Property and for the Supervision and Control of Such Motor Vehicles" (S. P. 198) (L. D. 416)

Report of same Committee reporting same on Bill "An Act Providing for the Use of the Highways by Motor Vehicles Transporting Property for Hire" (S. P. 323) (L. D. 525)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House were read and accepted in concurrence.

#### **Senate Bill in First Reading**

Bill "An Act relating to Notices to the State in Actions by Towns in Pauper Cases" (S. P. 338) (L. D. 627)

Bill was read twice and tomorrow assigned.

#### **Non-Concurrent Matter**

From the Senate:

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on

Resolve in favor of Reed Plantation (H. P. 1110) (L. D. 3%) which Report and Resolve were recommended to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in the House on March 13th.

Came from the Senate, with the Report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Weston, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This matter has had some little discussion around the corridors among a great number of the members, and also it has once been recommitted to the committee.

When the bill went back before the committee, I did not have a chance to get down there and explain the matter to them again, but I would like the privilege of explaining this situation to you as it exists, and I will try and be brief.

This resolve is only a small affair, and it may seem very minor to you folks here but to the people who are concerned it is a very grave matter. It concerns a high school and grade building up in Reed Plantation, otherwise known as Wytovitlock, down in the very southern tip of Aroostook County. Situated way up there in those woods, there are approximately 100 students going to that school and the town is bankrupt. At the present time they are under this Emergency Finance Board.

A member raised the question of why this Board has not found the money for their schools. Under the present set-up, the Board is unable to find the money, unless those poor people of that town are able to pay it. They have given their very limit toward paying their teachers and trying to keep their current expenses up, and they are unable to provide that extra money.

Now, I went down and explained this matter before the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, and they very courteously listened to my argument. They agreed that something should be done but they did not believe that they themselves should set a precedent by providing funds for such a condition.

Now, several years ago they installed in that school these old-

fashioned chemical toilets, and since that time they have rusted and corroded. At the present time they are unfit for use. It is a very unsanitary condition which exists there.

They get their drinking water from a well across the street from the school. The only method of disposing of the drinking water as it comes down there is down on the floor in the basement, and there is supposed to be a solid drain there and that is clogged.

Last week Mr. Hale, the State Sanitary Engineer, was up there, and he looked the school over. He came back with the recommendation that something would have to be done. The question is, then, what can be done?

If the town cannot raise the money, and our Appropriations Committee sees unfit to provide them with funds, are we going to allow those children to have to attend school under unsanitary conditions? Let me ask you, in all fairness, if it were your children that were going to that school, what would you do about it? Would you want them to attend that school?

It might be of interest to some of you to know that last Spring and last Fall, when the days were warm and muggy, due to the conditions in that school and the obnoxious odors that came from those toilets, they had to close their school down for several days, because the children and school teachers were unable to stand the odor. This Spring, when the days get warm and muggy, they will also have to close that school down.

Now, I ask you if you call that a very sanitary condition under which children should have to attend school? If they were your children, would you want them to attend such a school?

You might say, why do not the people up there do something about it? They have not got the money. I tell you, they talk about them being poor up on the St. John River, but they are nowhere near as poor as the people are in this little group of towns located around Wytovitlock.

I am appealing to you members this morning to give us a little aid before something serious breaks out. I asked the State Engineer why he

could not condemn the school right off. He said: "The school should be condemned but it is not in my jurisdiction to condemn it until some epidemic breaks out." I ask you, why should we wait until some epidemic breaks out in that school before we do anything about it? Then the State will have to go up there and spend a much larger sum of money. I think we are all agreed that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure any time.

With that seepage from the tanks coming out on the floor of the basement of the school, and the drinking water being down on the floor there, you can well imagine what kind of a condition exists there.

Then some of our members will oppose doing anything to rectify a condition like that. I am appealing to you members this morning to help us out. Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, the process this resolve has gone through is rather complicated to me. I do not know just what motion to make to get it back here and to accept the resolve instead of the report. The motion I would like to put is to get the resolve before the House instead of one of these several reports that have apparently been made.

I would like to ask the Chair what motion should be put?

The SPEAKER: The Chair assumes the question being on concurrence or otherwise, that the gentleman from Weston (Mr. Bubar) could move to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Mr. BUBAR: Would that be the proper method, Mr. Speaker, the best way to do it?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Weston, Mr. Bubar, moves that the House insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Does the gentleman relinquish the floor?

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, just one word more, if you please.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am not sure but that this may be only one way of putting this out of the window, (Laughter), but just before we take any action on this matter, I will admit that there has been a lot of fun made about this, right straight through, and I will admit that there are some men who have tried to make a lot of light about it, to make comedy of it. No doubt some of them would like to make a speech

that would make you laugh. But let me tell you, I am real serious in this matter, and let me tell you that a serious condition exists up there.

I have taken this matter up with the Educational Department and they say they have no funds with which to take care of this matter; and that the only way I could find that money is by a small special appropriation to take care of that condition. If we wait a few weeks or months longer, until sickness and disease begin to break out among the children in that school, then the State has got to go in there and spend a much larger sum. Maybe you think that is all right but that is what I call poor economy. I have heard a great deal in this House concerning economy. If that is the kind of economy that you believe in, the right thing to do is to turn this resolve down and listen to some of these comical speeches. I admit we can have a lot of fun with the matter, but we can listen to these comical speeches and turn the thing down and later the State will have to come in and spend a large sum of money. Therefore, I am asking you this morning, in all reason and in all common sense, let us pass this resolve. It is only a matter of \$500, with what money the town would put with it, and it would remedy that condition. Now, Members of the House, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Weston, Mr. Bubar, moves the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it is necessary to obtain the consent of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division was had.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third having arisen, the question is, shall the main question be put now?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson.

Mr. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, to put the main question at this time is definitely and obviously an unfair proposition. One side only of this case has been presented. We have had no chance to hear the

other side or any other side of the question. The motion was made for the purpose of shutting off debate on any other angle of this case. I believe that the main question should not be put now.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlaufflin.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN: Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur with the statements of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action whereby we voted to have the previous question put now.

The SPEAKER: The Chair rules that the motion is out of order. The question before the House is shall the main question be put now?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Weston, Mr. Bubar.

Mr. BUBAR: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention, when I made that motion, to prevent further debate, if some others would like to debate on this matter. But I did, at least, want to have those who wanted to speak, speak with some degree of reasonableness on the matter. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the main question being put now will say aye; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper.

Mr. SLEEPER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I realize that there has been a lot of talk made about this matter. A lot of people expected that I was going to get rather facetious about it. But I hope they will remember that the Members of the House all have certain things to do here, and that they cannot take time to talk about foolish things.

The Appropriations Committee had quite a scolding about a month ago about not getting out their reports. Every night for five or six weeks the Appropriations Committee met until 12:00 o'clock. Now our slate is clean and we have reported our bills out.

Now, in regard to the resolve in

question, the Appropriations Committee had a lot of feeling for Mr. Bubar and this deplorable condition, but they felt that there was nothing that they could do. As I say, we had a lot of feeling for him, but, if I must talk bluntly about it, I will have to. His resolve calls for \$500 for the installation of flush toilets in country schoolhouses.

I think every man in this House represents Districts that have country schools, and that none of them have flush closets. A further investigation by that Committee showed that the town where he wanted this installation placed does not even have running water and nine out of ten citizens do not have flush closets in their homes. We felt, of course, that anything like that was purely and simply a town proposition.

I will admit the town is bankrupt but so are most of these other towns. If anything had to be done, it should be done by the special commission headed by Frank Holley, who has charge of these bankrupt towns. He should attend to it. It is certainly not the province of the House and Senate to go around installing such things in country schoolhouses. And I could safely say that if we do this, that I could bring back bills for installations of a similar nature in Rockland, and Rockland is supposed to be a city, but still there are three schools there with outside toilets, not flush closets.

It is not simply a matter to laugh at, to have such a resolve come before this House, for a special appropriation. I have every sympathy for it; I have sympathy for those who are asking for it, and I pity the children up there. But it is not within the province of this House or the Committee on Appropriations. Every one of them had sympathy for the conditions there, but felt that we had no right under the conditions to present such a resolve to this Legislature.

If the condition is serious, they certainly ought to be able to do something in that town.

There is another angle to this matter. The building is heated by wood. We all know the conditions in Aroostook County, and what would happen if we installed flush closets in an unheated building. Everyone knows that it means the

pipes would freeze. Of course it is impractical and not feasible.

I hate to bring these things up and put these things so bluntly, but if there is an odor in the basement, all they have got to do is to construct a toilet out back, the way they are in other country school-houses.

Now, I will admit that at times the committee has tried to joke about this because we did not really feel that such a thing would be brought on the floor of the House. We hope you will see our point of view. We are not trying to be harsh. Most of us have a similar condition in the towns we come from. As a committee, we did not feel, and we hope the Legislature will see our point of view, that such a resolve was within the province of this Legislature. We felt that if conditions are really as bad as perhaps they are,— and perhaps they are—that Frank Holley, who is at the head of the Commission that attends to bankrupt towns, or perhaps the school board of that town, ought to be able to raise \$25.00 or \$50.00 for the construction of a building outside of the schoolhouse. The committee backed me up in it, and everybody that I talked with felt that we could not pass a bill like that at this time, so we reported "Ought not to pass," and we were kind enough to allow it to be recommitted in the House here, and the other members of our committee felt our duties were done, and we had been working until 11:00 and 12:00 o'clock at night on things of an important nature. The committee felt that way and they still reported "Ought not to pass." So it was turned down, for recommitment. We hope that the House will recede from its position and concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report. We are not trying to be hard about it. We are just using common sense. We believe it is impossible and that it is not feasible.

The SPEAKER: Did the gentleman make the motion that the House recede and concur?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, moves that the House recede from its action whereby it recommitted this report to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs and concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report.

Under the rules, the motion to recede and concur takes precedence of a motion to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, that the House recede from its action whereby it recommitted this report to the Committee on Appropriations, and concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winthrop, Mr. McNamara.

Mr. McNAMARA: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Winthrop, Mr. McNamara asks for a division. Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson.

Mr. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak of the merits of the bill itself. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the procedure involved. If we are to have a Committee of Conference on the question of recommitment on as small a measure as this, I will guarantee that you will not get out of this House until the first of August.

I would suggest to the House that the committee has given this matter its full consideration, and that the measure should not have appeared on the floor in the first instance. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Rockland (Mr. Sleeper) will prevail.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division was had.

One hundred and thirteen having voted in the affirmative and one in the negative, the motion prevailed and the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee was accepted in concurrence.

The following Petitions and Remonstrances were received, and upon recommendation of the Commit-

tee on Reference of Bills, were referred to the following Committees:

### Judiciary

Petition of Harold F. French and 19 other members of Queen City Grange No. 30 in favor of H. P. 1391, L. D. 769, proposed Constitutional Amendment Limiting Real Estate Taxes (H. P. 1718) (Presented by Miss Clough of Bangor)

Petition of J. Millard Hughey and 12 other members of Hollis Grange No. 132 in favor of same (H. P. 1707) (Presented by Mr. Davis of Buxton)

Petition of J. Arthur Martin and 19 other members of South Montville Grange No. 271 in favor of same (H. P. 1708) (Presented by Mr. Davis of Montville)

Petition of B. Talenbloom and 19 other members of Union Harvest Grange No. 97 in favor of same (H. P. 1709) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Guy Jackson and 19 other members of Honesty Grange No. 83 in favor of same (H. P. 1719) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Horace A. Miller and 10 other members of Tranquility Grange No. 344 in favor of same (H. P. 1720) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Virgil G. Libby and 7 other members of Sabbathday Lake Grange No. 365 in favor of same (H. P. 1721) (Presented by Mr. Doughty of Gray)

Petition of Emily Ouellette and 23 other members of Patten Grange No. 394 in favor of same (H. P. 1710) (Presented by Mr. Estabrook of Stacyville)

Petition of E. M. Holmes and 164 other members of Mountain Grange No. 164 in favor of same (H. P. 1711) (Presented by Mr. Forhan of Canton)

Petition of Bertie H. Turner and 15 other members of Union Grange No. 80 in favor of same (H. P. 1722) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of A. L. Winship and 19 other members of White Rock Grange No. 380 in favor of same (H. P. 1723) (Presented by Mr. Gould of Gorham)

Petition of Arthur H. Chandler and 14 others of Livermore Falls in favor of same (H. P. 1712) (Presented by Mr. Grua of Livermore Falls)

Petition of Paul Therrier and 24 others of Livermore in favor of

same (H. P. 1713) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of Jesse Brewer and 19 other members of Norland Grange No. 319 in favor of same (H. P. 1714) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of George H. Reilly and 19 other members of Stroudwater Grange No. 480 in favor of same (H. P. 1724) (Presented by Mr. McGlauffin of Portland)

Petition of Chas. Bailey and 4 other members of New Sharon Grange No. 238 in favor of same (H. P. 1725) (Presented by Mr. Mills of Farmington)

Petition of Mrs. C. A. Shute and 19 other members of Charleston Grange No. 325 in favor of same (H. P. 1715) (Presented by Mr. Osgood of Bradford)

Petition of Leslie B. Johnson and 19 others of Victory Grange No. 538 in favor of same (H. P. 1726) (Presented by Mr. Pierce of Bucksport)

Petition of Raymond Hutchins and 18 other members of Highland Grange No. 364 in favor of same (H. P. 1727) (Presented by same gentleman)

Petition of H. G. Harlow and 45 other members of Turner Grange No. 23 in favor of same (H. P. 1728) (Presented by Mr. Pratt of Turner)

Petition of Elmer E. Harris and 25 other members of Skowhegan Grange No. 208 in favor of same (H. P. 1716) (Presented by Mr. Savage of Skowhegan)

Petition of Louise Russell and 13 other members of Alewive Grange No. 283 in favor of same (H. P. 1717) (Presented by Mr. Sayward of Kennebunk)

Petition of Lillian Judkins and 8 other members of Upton Grange No. 404 in favor of same (H. P. 1729) (Presented by Mr. Williams of Bethel)

Sent up for concurrence.

### Taxation

Remonstrance of Clifford Cormier of Madawaska and 139 others against Enactment of Soft Drink Tax (H. P. 1730) (Presented by Mr. Babin of Frenchville)

Remonstrance of Irving Whitehouse of Sherman Mills and 276 others against same (H. P. 1731) (Presented by Mr. Bowers of Sherman)

Remonstrance of Arthur W. Gibson and 265 others of Presque Isle against same (H. P. 1732) (Present-



ed by Mr. Brewer of Presque Isle)  
Remonstrance of Robert Young of  
Linneus and 28 others against same  
(H. P. 1733) (Presented by Mr.  
Bubar of Weston)

Remonstrance of Eric Rush and  
270 others of Monticello and vicini-  
ty against same (H. P. 1734) (Pre-  
sented by Mr. Good of Monticello  
by request)

Remonstrance of Donald Snow-  
man of Pittsfield and 33 others  
against same (H. P. 1735) (Present-  
ed by Mr. Hamilton of Hartland)

Remonstrance of Helan M. Mor-  
rison and 582 others of Auburn  
against same (H. P. 1736) (Pre-  
sented by Mr. Jacobs of Auburn)

Remonstrance of Patrick Bou-  
chard and 201 others of Fort Kent  
against same (H. P. 1737) (Present-  
ed by Mr. Labbe of Fort Kent)

Remonstrance of H. F. Highfield  
and 61 others of Rumford against  
same (H. P. 1738) (Presented by  
Mr. Martin of Rumford)

Remonstrance of T. R. Grant of  
Houlton and 304 others against  
same (H. P. 1739) (Presented by  
Mr. McGillicuddy of Houlton)

Remonstrance of Leo J. Berube  
and 300 others of Caswell Pl.,  
Limestone and vicinity against  
same (H. P. 1740) (Presented by  
Mr. Phair of Caswell Pl.)

Remonstrance of Fred L. Merrill  
of Mechanic Falls and 18 others  
against same (H. P. 1741) (Present-  
ed by Mr. Pratt of Turner)

Remonstrance of H. C. Dunn of  
Minot and 53 others against same  
(H. P. 1742) (Presented by same  
gentleman)

Remonstrance of P. Harold Kim-  
ball and 38 others of Waterford  
and vicinity against same (H. P.  
1743) (Presented by Mr. Wyman of  
Norway)

Remonstrance of Frank H. Hobbs  
of Norway and 165 others against  
same (H. P. 1744) (Presented by  
same gentleman)

Sent up for concurrence.

### Orders

On motion by Mr. McGlauffin of  
Portland, it was

ORDERED, that Mr. Robie of  
Auburn, be excused from attend-  
ance during the remainder of the  
week because of illness.

### House Reports of Committees Divided Report

Majority Report of the Commit-  
tee on Legal Affairs reporting  
"Ought not to pass" on Bill "An  
Act relating to Sunday Hunting in  
Unorganized Territory" (H. P. 1532)  
(L. D. 871)

Report was signed by the follow-  
ing members:

Messrs. Sanborn of Cumberland  
Morse of Waldo  
—of the Senate.  
Dwinal of Camden  
Shesong of Portland  
Lafleur of Portland  
Sylvia of Danforth  
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Commit-  
tee reporting "Ought to pass" on  
same Bill.

Report was signed by the follow-  
ing members:

Messrs: Dow of Oxford  
—of the Senate.  
Southard of Augusta  
Slosberg of Gardiner  
Donahue of Biddeford  
—of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair  
recognizes the gentleman from  
Hallowell, Mr. Keller.

Mr. KELLER: Mr. Speaker and  
fellow members of the House: I  
think about every one of you have  
been told in regard to this bill,  
which is a measure that allows peo-  
ple to hunt on Sunday in unor-  
ganized territory only. Please do  
not get confused. I will not take up  
much of your time, but I would like  
to say a few words in regard to  
the hearing before the committee.  
With all due respect to them, I  
believe there were only five wit-  
nesses that appeared before that  
committee, four for the measure  
and one against. I think you know  
who the one was.

Now if we are going to allow  
other sports on Sunday—and we do,  
because under existing statutes you  
can do most anything you wish to  
do on Sunday—I believe we should  
allow Sunday hunting. There is one  
thing I do rebel against: I do not  
see why we should discriminate  
against one particular sport which  
is mostly a laboring man's sport.

The question arose in regard to  
fatalities, whether there would not  
be more fatalities. If we go over  
the records, we find that there were  
189 fatalities last year by the auto-  
mobile, which is most everybody's

sport. I have no grievance against that. There were only ten fatalities in three months' time from the man that was hunting.

Let us see how many states there are in the Union that permit Sunday hunting. There are eighteen where there are no restrictions whatsoever, including New Hampshire on our southwest border.

Now let us take up the question of the preservation of game. The last legislature cut it down some three weeks, from five days to two weeks, to be exact; and, in spite of that fact, we shot more game last year than ever before. I believe we should take this into consideration.

At the present time you have asked approximately one million young men to shoulder a gun. I wonder if there is anything in that law that definitely states that they shall not carry a gun on Sunday. It was not so in 1917.

Another unusual thing here: Some three weeks ago we passed a measure in this House that called for an initial cost of \$38,000. These young men that are going to be mustered in under this bill, I wonder if there is anything in that bill that says that they cannot bear arms on Sunday. There is the possibility in the next two or three years, or possibly before, you will want them all to bear arms on Sunday if it becomes necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I now move that the minority report be accepted, and, further, Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken I would like to have a division of the House. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Keller, moves acceptance of the minority report "Ought to pass." The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Dwinal.

Mr. DWINAL: Mr. Speaker, I think I can explain my reasons for signing the "Ought not to pass" report in very short order. It seemed to me and to the other signers of the majority "Ought not to pass" report that there ought to be one day in the week that the game could rest. Also by what alchemy or unknown process the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Keller, reasons, if I gather his reasoning correctly, that there would be less game shot with a seven-day week than with a six-day week, I have been unable to figure out.

As far as the laboring man is concerned, I think most of them now have Saturdays off, or at least Saturday afternoon, so they are not barred from hunting any more than anyone else.

Those, in brief, are my reasons for signing the "Ought not to pass" report, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton.

Mr. DUTTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I recognize the right of every citizen in the State of Maine to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. I can see no particular wrong in a man, if he feels that he wishes to hunt on Sunday, to do so if he does not interfere with the religious rights of other people.

I have in my district perhaps a little different situation than you experience in the more thickly populated communities. In the town of Bingham the churches are located within forty to fifty rods of an unorganized township and the members of those churches strenuously object to Sunday hunting. The noise from the discharging of guns would be plainly heard within every church in Bingham. This holds equally true in Caratunk and in Jackman and in many of the other towns which are bordered by unorganized townships. While personally I see no harm in a man hunting on Sunday if he wishes, or fishing if he wishes to do that, if that is interfering with the religious rights of other people, as my constituents feel that it does, I feel that I am obliged to oppose Sunday hunting in our unorganized townships.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Southard.

Mr. SOUTHARD: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee signing the minority report, I also had reasons for making my decision the way I did.

The wild game in this State belongs to the State of Maine, all of the people of the State of Maine. Any law that fixes it so that only a privileged few have an opportunity to kill and capture that game deprives them of part of what is in effect their life. We have a forty-eight hour week for labor. Our store clerks work Saturday afternoon and Saturday night. Many of them have

to hunt on Sunday, and they should be given their chance to hunt on Sunday.

As far as religious views are concerned, if this did interfere, in my opinion, with the right to worship of any person, I should be opposed to this bill. If the sound of a gunshot so seriously interferes with the religious worship of any person, I cannot feel his religious spirit is sincere enough, is deep enough and earnest enough to merit my consideration. It ought to be better than that.

The safety angle has been mentioned in regard to this matter. I would call to your attention the fact that last year there was not a single hunting accident, fatal or otherwise, occurring in an unorganized territory. I think if this bill receives passage, the same will, in a substantial measure, be true next year. I believe that our people should have a right to hunt when they can. Because it is safe, because it does not interfere with religious worship, because I saw no argument whatsoever against it, I signed this report. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Hallowell (Mr. Keller) will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker and Members: I have sat here and listened to the proponents and opponents of this measure. I know that the law gives the right to hold turkey shoots on Sunday, I know that you can have target practice on Sunday, and I know that turkey shoots are held in small towns which are in close proximity or within the hearing of churches. I know also that we can go to baseball games, golf, and any such sport if we so desire or are interested in it. The minister preaches his sermon in the morning; he is invited out to dinner at noon; he goes for an automobile ride one hundred or two hundred miles for the rest of the day, under no rules or regulations. Why should not the laboring man, so-called, who works six days a week have that right, particularly when those who are in the know as pertaining to hunting know that morning hunting is the best hunting?

This bill, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is to help or give the so-called rabbit hunter a chance to hunt rabbits on Sunday; and

you cannot hunt rabbits after dark and you cannot hunt rabbits late in the afternoon. In the time prescribed by law relative to hunting, the season is short and Sunday only adds one more day in the whole calendar year. I will just illustrate that by stating the situation in regard to the pheasant season last year. The State took off the time for pheasant shooting seven days. There was one day within the seven that the hunter could hunt pheasant, and that was on Monday. The other five days the pheasant had a rest, as he did the other three hundred and fifty days.

I cannot see why we are creating any hardship upon the people in unorganized or even organized territory, and I cannot see what harm we can do by going into the woods on Sunday, whether we go to shoot or whether we go to enjoy nature. I would like to have the "Ought to pass" report accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Ninetieth Legislature: I rise on this measure as a matter on the question of conservation.

I am sure that all of us have a great deal of respect for that wonderful animal in the State of Maine, the deer. The law is in disguise. It adds two weeks to our hunting season in unorganized townships.

The only way that we could judge what this law would do for the State is in considering what happens on the two holidays we have during the hunting season, that of Armistice Day and Thanksgiving. I believe, as do most of you who are sportsmen and love to hunt, that you know there is a great deal more hunting done on those two days than any other day in the year. It is no exaggeration to say that at least twice as many deer are killed on those days. I think anyone familiar with fish and game and deer will be sure that I am not exaggerating, and will think I am very conservative in saying so. Therefore, you can see what adding two weeks more to the hunting season would do.

Then, there is the matter of accidents. I think that none of you can recall one Thanksgiving when at least one man was not killed in the State of Maine. I believe last

year that fifteen persons lost their lives in hunting accidents. Regardless of the propaganda and fine work that the Fish and Game Department has been attempting to do here, these accidents will still have to go on.

All of us who are familiar with the roads going into unorganized townships, know the conditions that exist on them on holidays; and on the C. C. C. roads that it is just one parking space for people who are hunting.

All of us know that it is a fine idea to have one day of rest. That it is of great benefit to us. The way the law is now, it gives the deer a chance to get back to their natural feeding grounds and to have a little rest.

For these reasons I believe that it would be folly for us, as members of this Legislature, to vote that we should open Sundays to hunting, to say nothing of the moral aspect. We know that there are still people in the State of Maine who would like to see Sunday kept as a quiet and religious day.

I am sure that those who know our wild life in the State of Maine and are interested in its conservation will vote that the motion before the House will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Speaker, have I permission to ask Mr. Williams a question?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may ask his question through the Chair and the gentleman may reply if he sees fit.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Williams, by allowing Sunday hunting to go on for five or six more days in a month, or four days, would not that eliminate the gang that goes in the woods on Armistice Day and Thanksgiving? Would it not eliminate so many going in?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Jones, asks a question of the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, through the Chair. The gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, may reply if he sees fit.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will reply by saying that I do not believe it would have any effect. People would hunt just as much on holi-

days as they would on Sunday. I can see no effect, and, from the noise that I heard on this side of the House, apparently the people around here agree with me.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Turner, Mr. Pratt.

Mr. PRATT: Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Clifton, Mr. Williams, said you should have one day for the deer to rest. Now I have hunted them since I was a small boy. I go deer hunting every fall, most generally back up-country in the unorganized territory. I could take you gentlemen up there and you would find you have not game warden enough in the State of Maine and cannot appoint enough to stop them from killing deer on Sunday, so do not worry about that.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Monticello, Mr. Good.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as favoring the majority report, and I have a reason. One reason is that back years ago there was a law laid down that one day should be observed, and all down through the ages we have called that day Sunday. Our forefathers before us recognized Sunday, not only as a rest day but as a day of worship. We have today what we call the church, which is the greatest institution in America and the largest institution in America. People recognize that thing and they love that day. But, you know, as time has gone on and changes have come, people have gradually departed from some of the religious scruples that our forefathers held to, and Sunday does not mean any more than any other day. We allow come in.

I remember back when I was only a boy, my father was strict enough with me so when it came Sunday I even put up what I called my snowshoes, a pair of snowshoes made out of barrel staves, and I hung up my handsled. Now that may seem strict, but I recollect those memories and love them. It did not do me any harm.

The church organization is nearly one hundred per cent opposed to this bill. My Brother here said he did not think there were any accidents that happened in unorganized plantations on Sunday. I think I am right in saying that in an un-

organized township up in Aroostook County a man was accidentally shot and killed last year.

Talk about the laboring man not having any time to hunt! They just their vacation in the fall of the weeks, and I think they could adjust their vacation in the fall of the year if they wanted to and go hunting. I do not believe it is fair and I do not believe it is right. I do not believe that we should take away the privileges that we have held to all these years. In the town I live in, Town A, there are two adjoining towns, Town B and Town C, and that is our best hunting ground up there. If it was opened to Sunday hunting, that place would be alive with men every Sunday. Therefore I hope that the majority report will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I shall not argue this question at any length. I am not opposed to Sunday recreation in all forms, and I believe that Sunday recreation has its place. Personally I observe the day strictly. I am simply going to refer to one incident that came to my attention in this House in the month of January. The State Fish and Game Association met here, a considerable body of men from all over the State. I assume they were representatives of the fishing and hunting interests in this State, and, on the whole, I thought they were a very fine body of men. A motion was made to the effect that an effort be made to set aside this Sunday law and it was voted down by a majority of four to one without any debate. To be sure, no distinction was made between organized and unorganized territory, but it seemed to me sound that the Fish and Game Association of this State were unmistakably represented by that vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Bath, Miss Deering.

Miss DEERING: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We have thought of the deer and have thought of the fish. I am wondering if we have thought that Sunday was the one day in the week that women and children feel a little bit secure in going into the woods?

The SPEAKER: The Chair rec-

ognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I have heard considerable said here about the working man. I am in a position where I know just about the conditions that the working men are under. Their type of hunting is very much limited. The average man who works in the cotton mill or textile mill does not have two weeks' vacation. I have had some of them approach me on this subject. I have hunted all my life and I have had other times to hunt than Sunday, but I know there are others who do not have the time. I can see no objection, where a man works all the week and has a little time off Saturday afternoon and wants to go into the woods and hunt that afternoon and the next day. In regard to the noise, there would be no more noise than there would be from the backfiring of an automobile right here in the capital in five minutes.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Keller, that the minority report "Ought to Pass" be accepted. The gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Keller, has asked for a division. All those in favor of the acceptance of the minority report, "Ought to pass" 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. Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative and 47 in the negative, the motion prevailed and the minority report "Ought to pass" was accepted.

### House Reports of Committees (Continued)

#### Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Welch from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to the Digging Out of Foxes" (H. P. 1128) (L. D. 377) reported leave to withdraw.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve for Screening Outlet of Moosehead Lake at Indian Pond (H. P. 820) (L. D. 292)

Mr. LaFleur from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act relating to the Game of Beano, etc." (H. P. 1442) (L. D. 756)

Mr. Shesong from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act

relating to Registration of Vital Statistics" (H. P. 1528) (L. D. 867)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Correction of Vital Records" (H. P. 1526) (L. D. 865)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Miss Clough of Bangor, House Rule 25 was suspended for the remainder of today's session, in order to permit smoking.

#### Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Seeger from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve to Dredge Austin Stream in the county of Somerset (H. P. 1510)

Mr. Flagg from the Committee on Banks and Banking reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Interest on Small Loans" (H. P. 1119) (L. D. 371)

Mr. Goldsmith from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Savings Bank Life Insurance" (H. P. 1338) (L. D. 795)

Mr. Welch from the Committee on Claims reported same on Resolve in favor of Hazel P. Adams of Readfield (H. P. 1289)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of E. J. Bither of Houlton (H. P. 1079)

Mr. Davis from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on Resolve relating to Trapping in the county of York (H. P. 473) (L. D. 209)

Mr. Hanold from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relative to Training of Fox Hounds" (H. P. 1369) (L. D. 715) as it is covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Regulating Trapping of Muskrats in Corundel Lake (H. P. 417) (L. D. 166) as it is covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Training of Hunting Dogs" (H. P. 1515) (L. D. 857) as it is covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Trapping in Washington County" (H. P. 1380) (L. D. 809) as it is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Starrett from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Muskrats in Kennebec County" (H. P. 1383) (L. D. 573) as it is covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve relating to Plug Fishing in Belgrade Chain of Lakes (H. P. 1382) (L. D. 811)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Trapping" (H. P. 1365) (L. D. 711)

Mr. Winter from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Trapping Season" (H. P. 799) (L. D. 312) as it is covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve Regulating Muskrat Trapping in Sebasticook Lake (H. P. 418) (L. D. 167) as it is covered by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relative to Trapping of Muskrats in Aroostook County" (H. P. 804) (L. D. 317) as it is covered by other legislation.

Mr. Briggs from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Expenses of Patients in State Institutions" (H. P. 1393) (L. D. 771)

Mr. Hinckley from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Preference in State Examinations for Selective Service Inductees" (H. P. 1579) (L. D. 930)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Emergency Aid on Hospital Cases" (H. P. 1420) (L. D. 729)

Miss Clough from the Committee on Labor reported same on Bill "An Act Limiting the Hours of Labor" (H. P. 643) (L. D. 279)

Mr. Donahue from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Town Reports" (H. P. 1271) (L. D. 541)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Report Tabled

Mr. Shesong from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Signs on Pumps Dispensing Internal Combustion Fuels" (H. P. 1165) (L. D. 461)

The SPEAKER: The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Murchie.

Mr. MURCHIE: On Item 28, "Ought not to pass" report on Bill "An Act relating to Signs on Pumps Dispensing Internal Combustion Fuels" it is not my desire to clutter up the table, but I am satisfied that the committee itself was in a little bit of confusion as to just what they might do with it, and in the end they decided to report it out this way. I would like to place this matter on the table and have twenty-four hours to confer with that committee, and I will promise to take it off the table.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Calais, Mr. Murchie, moves that the report, together with the bill, lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the matter was so tabled and so assigned.

### Ought to Pass

Mr. Winter from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve Appropriating Money to Repair Fishway at Aroostook Falls (H. P. 416) (L. D. 165)

Mr. Williams from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act providing for Collection of Taxes in Case of the Death of the Collector of Taxes" (H. P. 1607) (L. D. 949)

Miss Clough from the Committee on Labor reported same on Bill "An Act relative to the Employment of Females in Executive, Administrative, Professional or Supervisory Capacities and as Personal Office Assistants" (H. P. 1235) (L. D. 497)

Mr. Sylvia from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Appointments of Health Officers" (H. P. 1448) (L. D. 760)

Reports were read and accepted.

### Ought to Pass With Committee Amendment

Mr. Sleeper from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve Appropriating Money for Control of the Fruit or Blueberry Fly in Maine (H. P. 1118) (L. D. 370) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Mr. Davis from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Hunting of Game Birds" (H. P. 1357) (L. D. 703)

Mr. Payson from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act Authorizing Cities and Towns to Appropriate Money and Acquire Lands for Use as Public Parking Places" (H. P. 1390) (L. D. 571)

Mr. Slosberg from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act to amend the Charter of the city of Gardiner" (H. P. 833) (L. D. 347)

Reports were read and accepted.

### First Reading of Printed Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Fees of Referees" (H. P. 102) (L. D. 57)

Bill "An Act relative to Increase of the State Debt Limit" (H. P. 1706) (L. D. 1026)

Bills were read twice and tomorrow assigned.

### Ought Not to Pass Reports (Continued)

Mr. Sylvia from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Establishing a Board of Well Diggers" (H. P. 1533) (L. D. 872)

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

### Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Payson from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to Airport Zoning" (H. P. 1389) (L. D. 570) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1745) under title of "An Act Regulating Airport Zoning" and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Donahue from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Town Meetings of Sanford" (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 473) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1746) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Slosberg from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to the Termination of Organization of Towns or Plantations" (H. P. 1172) (L. D. 471) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1747) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

**Passed to be Engrossed**

Bill "An Act relating to Headlights of Motor Vehicles" (S. P. 320) (L. D. 523)

Bill "An Act relative to Licenses for Dealers in Furs" (S. P. 379) (L. D. 698)

Bill "An Act relating to the Transfer of Appropriations in the Department of Health and Welfare" (S. P. 437) (L. D. 892)

Bill "An Act relating to Registration of More than One Motor Vehicle in Same Calendar Year" (S. P. 445) (L. D. 896)

Bill "An Act relating to Expense of Pauper Support" (H. P. 1441) (L. D. 755)

Bill "An Act relating to Overseers of the Poor" (H. P. 1449) (L. D. 761)

Resolve Regulating Fishing in Pemaquid River (S. P. 491) (L. D. 1016)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Land in Perkins Plantation (H. P. 1211) (L. D. 429)

**Resolve Tabled**

Resolve in favor of A. R. Thompson (H. P. 1671) (L. D. 1021)

(Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and on motion by Mr. Lane of Lincoln, tabled pending second reading.)

**Passed to be Engrossed (Continued)**

Resolve in favor of Vernon A. Soule (H. P. 1672) (L. D. 1020)

Resolve in favor of Zina N. Witham (H. P. 1673) (L. D. 1019)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bills read the third time, Resolves read the second time, all except the tabled matter passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

**Amended Bills**

Bill "An Act Amending the Law relating to Unemployment Compensation to Collect Contributions on Wages Paid" (S. P. 206) (L. D. 502)

Bill "An Act to Exempt Soldiers and Sailors from Poll Taxes" (H. P. 1484) (L. D. 613)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

**Passed to be Enacted  
(Emergency Matter)**

An Act relating to Registration of Veterans' Graves (H. P. 785) (L. D. 335)

The SPEAKER: This bill, having had its three several readings in the House and having been passed to be engrossed, having had its two several readings in the Senate and having been passed to be engrossed, and having been reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, is it now the pleasure of the House that it now be passed to be enacted?

This being an emergency measure, it requires for its passage the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire elected membership of this House. All those in favor of the passage of this bill to be enacted will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have made and returned the count.

A division of the House was had. One hundred and seventeen having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, 117 being more than two-thirds of the entire elected membership of the House, the bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Passed to be Enacted**

An Act relating to Taxation of Insurance Companies (S. P. 382) (L. D. 620)

An Act relating to Foreign Insurance Companies (S. P. 384) (L. D. 622)

An Act relative to Taxation of Street Railroad Corporations (H. P. 1238) (L. D. 499)

An Act relative to Guides' Licenses (H. P. 1359) (L. D. 705)

An Act relative to Game Preserve in Caswell Plantation (H. P. 1381) (L. D. 810)

An Act relating to State Aid for Libraries (H. P. 1652) (L. D. 1004)

**Finally Passed**

Resolve relating to the Maine Commission on Interstate Cooperation (H. P. 1114) (L. D. 1005)

Resolve in favor of Procuring Testimonials for the Purpose of Marking the Unmarked Graves of Soldiers of the Revolutionary War (H. P. 1115) (L. D. 1006)

Resolve in favor of Fort McClary (H. P. 1116) (L. D. 1007)

Resolve in favor of Mrs. Albertha



Williams of Bath (H. P. 1653) (L. D. 1008)

Resolve in favor of Mrs. Estella M. Littlefield of Hampden (H. P. 1654) (L. D. 1009)

Resolve in favor of Inez T. Fogg of Readfield (H. P. 1655) (L. D. 1010)

Resolve in favor of Florence Denison of Whiting (H. P. 1656) (L. D. 1011)

Resolve in favor of a Fish Screen in Cathance Lake (H. P. 1657) (L. D. 1012)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, Bills passed to be enacted, Resolves finally passed, all signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

### Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the first tabled and unassigned matter, House Report, "Ought not to pass," of the Committee on Claims, on Resolve in favor of Scott Robert of Camden (H. P. 1291), tabled on March 12th by Mr. Dwinal of Camden, pending acceptance; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. DWINAL: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree necessarily with the finding of the Committee on Claims; but I do not think that it is a matter of enough importance to take the time of the Legislature so I will move to accept the report of the committee.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Camden, Mr. Dwinal, moves that the House accept the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Thereupon, the "Ought not to pass" report of the Committee was accepted, and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair lays before the House the second tabled and unassigned matter, "An Act Creating the Lisbon Municipal Court," (S. P. 247) (L. D. 402), tabled on March 13th by the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Grua, pending the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Lambert, that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Sichel.

Mr. SICHOL: Mr. Speaker and

Members of this House: I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston (Mr. Lambert) to indefinitely postpone this measure, and I ask the indulgence of this House to bear me out on a few facts concerning the history of this bill.

As may be seen in referring to the calendar, the bill was duly presented, and represented by the members of the town of Lisbon before the Committee on Judiciary. The Committee on Judiciary passed upon this measure, and reported that it "Ought to pass". Subsequently, it received the sanction of the Senate—

The SPEAKER: The Chair will remind the gentleman that he must not refer to any action in the other body.

Mr. SICHOL (Continuing): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When this bill entered here in the House, it received a stormy reception and its voyage has been a little rocky.

Now, the bill, upon the suggestion of the Business Men's Club in the town of Lisbon, was drawn up by a local attorney and presented to a member of the Senate for its presentation.

The members of the Business Men's Club of the town felt that it would be a matter of some convenience to the members of the town in having a local municipal court.

Now, at the committee hearing there appeared four citizens of that town, consisting of two attorneys, a doctor, and a retired educator. Only two members spoke in favor of it. Because there was no opposition to the bill, perhaps the other members who were present did not feel that they should take up the time of the committee.

In short, the bill seeks to establish a municipal court in the town of Lisbon, giving them jurisdiction over civil cases in matters up to \$300. It can be likened to the rights which the municipal courts have in the cities of Auburn and Lewiston. It provides for a justice selected from one of the attorneys resident in the town of Lisbon, at a salary of \$600. The town, under the bill, provides at its own expense a court room; provides at its own expense quarters for the jail. The salary for said Justice comes out of the town but, as a matter of set-up that \$600, with proceeds derived from the Court, consisting of fines

and other costs of the Court, are going to be submitted to the county.

Now, notwithstanding the local attorneys' reputation for racket dealing propensities, as brought forth before this House, the people, nevertheless are in the majority in favor of this bill.

The question was presented to them before the town meeting by me, and I attempted at that time to present the matter before them squarely, and cleanly. They were unanimously in favor of this bill and desired it.

I also might state an Androscoggin representative made a poll of investigation of the citizens of our town, due perhaps to the flattering remarks made by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Lambert, concerning myself and other attorneys practicing in that town, perhaps. Nevertheless, when this bill was presented, there were five attorneys in our town, and since that time one of them has died and one has moved out of the town. The one who was most interested in the bill has moved out of this town. Now, I had nothing to do with that, or the attorneys who remained in our town, had nothing to do with the evacuation of the other lawyer.

Now, this representative made a poll of the town, and investigation of the opinion of the members of our town. I am happy to inform you he received the unanimous approval of the bill, and I therefore hope that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston (Mr. Lambert) that the bill be indefinitely postponed, does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Lambert, that the bill be indefinitely postponed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Lambert.

Mr. LAMBERT: Mr. Speaker, before this matter is finally placed before this House, I wish to reiterate my understanding of last week, for fear that some of you members might forget what I said last week. Not to bore you with any more charges whatsoever, I would enlighten you to the best of my ability on the matter. From an economic viewpoint, it is a matter that only Judges or people who are interested in courts can safely judge in a proper manner.

I had a talk this morning with the resident Justice, Judge Manser,

and Judge Manser wants me to quote to you that he is definitely against a Municipal Court in Lisbon. The Lisbon citizens, according to the able representative from Lisbon Falls (Mr. Sichel), sent word to you that they want it. Do they know the facts as they exist?

Here are some of the facts. You cannot tell me or anyone here that some of the citizens on the street in Lisbon know whether or not a Municipal Court is needed, in preference to a trial justice. I want you to bear with me, to just have that in mind, when you vote. Are they in a position to know? That is one of the questions I am going to put up to you.

I want you to understand that the town of Lisbon, since its organization, has always had a trial justice. If this bill does not go through, they still can have their trial justice, to try their civil cases.

Yesterday, the Androscoggin delegation was called upon to take a vote upon it, and I will admit that they unanimously, practically — which is in the opposite direction to the vote that they took a short while previously, as I stated last week,—voted for the granting of the Municipal Court to the town of Lisbon.

I still voted against it. I did not try to influence their vote whatsoever. I did not ask anyone of the Androscoggin delegation to vote with me on it.

I feel also that the vote of the Androscoggin delegation, to be worth anything, ought to have been taken before this bill was heard before the committee. That matter was brought up after that bill had passed the committee.

I had a conference this morning with the Lewiston Police Department. I found that Deputies Wallace and Lampke, since January 1st, had brought five cases only to the city of Lewiston.

I took a definite stand against that bill. That bill has had plenty of publicity. I have not received one single letter from any citizen of Lisbon favoring this bill or any opposition whatsoever. They are not interested in it probably.

As far as the Business Men's Club is concerned, as my opponent charges, I will say to you that the Business Men's Club is not in a position to know, as our able Justice Manser would be able to know, about the need of a court. They

would still have their trial justice that they have always lived under, and they show good business under.

The Representative from Lisbon (Mr. Sichel) has also told you that there were five lawyers. I made certain charges last week, and I still claim those charges were all right. He has told you they started with five and he has definitely told you that now there are only two, which sustains my claim.

As far as a poll being conducted, I will tell you that the Representative from Turner (Mr. Pratt) has told me that he went to Lisbon and found some for and some against.

From a political angle, I will tell you this: He also informed me that the Postmaster in Lisbon was in favor of this bill, and he is a Democrat. Still, I am opposed to it. (Laughter) I want you to understand I am still opposed to it, before I relinquish the floor.

You will probably notice that I am pretty much worked up over this matter, and I tell you that you would be worked up, too, if you had had such a document as the one placed on the desk of every representative, regarding the charges I made last week. I have not got the means to have things like that printed. I am not going to get any job out of this thing, one way or the other. (Laughter)

This sheet that was placed on your desk, gentlemen, I want you to read. In the entire piece there is not one single sole argument in favor of a municipal court in the town of Lisbon Falls. They have not shown me any, and until I have been shown any, I am not going to vote for it. I do not care if I am all alone; but I certainly will not give them a municipal court or my vote anyway. That is all I have to say and I thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Grua.

Mr. GRUA: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think this ought not to be made a matter of personalities or politics or anything of that kind. I feel that if the citizens of Lisbon Falls do feel they want a court down there, that they have been paying their share of our county taxes all these years and they should be allowed to have it. Personally, it is entirely immaterial to me whether or not they get it, as far as I am concerned, because I do not expect to practice

down in Lisbon Falls. But we have gone to the trouble, some of us who were interested, to find out as best we could what the sentiment down there really is in regard to this bill, and, so far as I can ascertain, the majority of the people down there actually do want this court.

Now that is a community of some six thousand people; they are twelve miles from the nearest municipal court; they have no trial justice there now. If a trial justice were to be appointed, it would necessarily have to be a layman, because no lawyer is going to take the job ordinarily at the fees a trial justice gets. Some of you members may have had occasion to have come before a layman trial justice, and you know about what kind of justice you get. We feel that a municipal court, if there is to be a court there, is a proper court, with a judge who is learned in the law to administer justice in a proper manner.

I am reliably informed that due to the distance the officers have to travel and the trouble it is, that when they arrest people, a great many drunks and people that ought to be arrested for disturbing the peace, they simply warn them and allow them to go, because they do not wish to take the trouble to go up to Auburn, twelve miles, and put them in jail and the next day go back to hear the case. I submit that is not giving the people down there the sort of justice they ought to have.

Now we have heard quite a little about the expense of this. I think every lawyer will bear me out in saying that if there is a municipal court handy we will try a great many of our cases up to three hundred dollars in that local court and most likely abide by the decision of that court, whereas, if we have to go to the county seat, we are quite likely to bring all our cases that involve more than twenty dollars into the Superior Court in the first instance, rather than take a chance that the other side may appeal the case to the Superior Court and we will have two trips to make to the county seat.

Some of you may not know it, but my information is that it costs the county about one hundred and twenty-five dollars a day to try a case with a jury and it costs the county about thirty dollars a day to try a case before the Superior

Court without a jury. Now if there were only three or four cases in the run of a year brought to the Superior Court which otherwise might have been disposed of by the municipal court in the town of Lisbon, I submit, so far as I can see, those cases would pay for the cost of this court.

At any rate, the rest of us in Androscoggin County feel that if these people want this court they should have it and we are willing they should have it.

This matter was presented before the Judiciary Committee, of which I happen to be a member; it was properly advertised; it was not hurried; anybody in the whole State of Maine had the right to appear there, yet none of this opposition developed and we heard nothing about it until this matter came up here, as you know. Therefore, I do not see how it can be said that any party has not had an opportunity to be heard. If the people of Lisbon Falls are opposed to this bill, why have they not been here to say so? I hope very much that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston (Mr. Lambert) on this matter, may not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Sichel.

Mr. SICHOL: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Lewiston (Mr. Lambert), when he says that he has heard nothing from the citizenry in favor of this bill, may I not remind the gentleman that he represents Lewiston and not Lisbon, and it should be my duty as the representative from Lisbon to speak the minds and opinions of my constituents.

Now as to the opinion of Judge Manser: I have a lot of regard and respect for the opinion of any Justice, but I must also remind the representative from Lewiston that Justice Manser is a citizen of the City of Auburn and not of Lisbon.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Lambert, that the bill be indefinitely postponed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Boutin.

Mr. BOUTIN: Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of the Lisbon court for the reason I know the public wants it, and, furthermore, it seems to me the citizens of Lisbon, after all, are taxpayers and

they return quite a sum of money to the towns. As far as I can find out, it only costs two or three hundred dollars more of the county's money. If they do not get it they will spend it somewhere else. That is one thing that is true in Androscoggin County. I move the previous question and ask for a division of the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Boutin, moves the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain the motion for the previous question, it requires the consent of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question 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.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third of the members present having arisen the previous question is ordered. The question before the House is: Shall the main question be put now? As many as are in favor of the main question being put now will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Lambert, that the bill be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of the bill will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion for indefinite postponement did not prevail, and the bill was given its second reading and tomorrow assigned for third reading.

The Chair lays before the House the third tabled and unassigned matter, House Report "Ought Not to Pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Assist Rural Sanitation Activities" (H. P. 830) (L. D. 344) tabled on March 13 by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Southard, pending motion of the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Mills, to substitute the Bill for the Report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Mills.

Mr. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, the hour is rather late, and I will not speak at any length on this measure, but I would like to review just a few facts before the vote is taken.

We in the State of Maine have gone through a period during the last fifteen or twenty years of regulation and licensing which is coming almost down to the absurd. This morning we have had before us a bill which would license and regulate the digging of wells. We have previously had bills to license the barbers, the architects, the watch-makers, the plumbers, and the list goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it is time we struck a few blows; I think it is time that we broke a few of the shackles under which we have placed the people of the State in regard to regulation and licensing. I notice that a former candidate for Governor appeared at the hearing yesterday for the bill to license the digging of wells. I would like to submit, inasmuch as Shakespeare pointed out that the digging of graves is the most ancient of professions—inasmuch as Adam dug—we should follow that up by having a licensing law for gravediggers.

Back in 1937 we passed the Plumbing Code, a very strict law; but the Legislature in its wisdom put in a section containing exceptions from that law and I believe it was the intent of the Legislature at that time to except rural districts from the application of the law, but, through inadvertence, it failed to do it. Now the exceptions stated that the regulations shall not apply to the regular employees of public utilities—they usually get in on the ground floor—"as defined in Section 15 of Chapter 62 of the Revised Statutes as amended, when working as such." And then they say that the provisions of Sections 180 to 183-L—that is the plumbing code—shall not apply in cities, towns or plantations that have a population of three thousand or less. I think there was a reason for that, not the reason that many people put forward that many of the rural members of the Legislature are always trying to get some little exception, but for the very sound reason you do not need, outside of the congested areas, the same strictness in regulation of your plumbing and facilities of that kind because you are not congested and there is no necessity for it.

If the law had stopped there it would have been all right, but, in some way, perhaps through an amendment, this section was put in

which rendered innocuous that previous one. It said further that all plumbing installed by any person whatsoever shall comply with the requirements of the rules and regulations of the State Bureau of Health relating to plumbing and all local ordinances. That made those few sentences just above almost meaningless because if you move out in the country today and you have the ancient facilities and you decide you are going to make improvements, before you can do that you have to send into Augusta and get a permit from the State House before you can make that very definite improvement. The old facilities are all right under the law, the facilities mentioned this morning by the gentleman from Weston, Mr. Bubar, but the minute you want to make this improvement someone from Augusta has got to see the house and the inspector has got to see whether it is done right or not. I feel that Thomas Paine really said something when he said that every man's house is his castle. I think if I live five miles away from everywhere, way out in the country, it is no one's business in the State House how I improve my property. You can let the situation exist as it is and they cannot do anything about it, but the minute you want to make an improvement you have got to get permission from Augusta to do it. I think that is intolerable. I do not think the Legislature ever intended to saddle onto rural people any such regulations.

When the Department of Health was given that power they exercised that power. They passed one hundred and sixty-nine rules, telling you the size of pipe, the distance away from the sink the trap should be, and if it is not right they make you tear it out and put in another one. That has happened over the State a number of times.

Now at the committee hearing a number of objections were raised, and I will say they were valid objections, but perhaps in my zeal to strike the blow for liberty and freedom of the press I did go a little too far. They brought out that under the bill, as I noticed it, that overnight camps and commercial places and camps bordering upon water supplies would not be affected if this bill went through. I went to the Chairman of the committee and asked his help and prepared an amendment to take

care of those objections. The amendment which I will offer, if this measure goes through, is this:

"but the said rules and regulations shall apply within the city limits of all cities, to all commercial boarding or eating establishments, to all public or private camps catering to guests or campers for pay, and to any sewerage disposal bordering upon or draining into any stream or body of water used for water supply or bathing."

I submit that takes care of the objections that were raised. I want to tell you that afternoon of the hearing the plumbers had very able council here, and I felt more or less like the fellow who had his ears pinned back until a member of the House happened to wander in and find what the hearing was about and expressed the feeling of his district along the same lines. I was told that afternoon I was speaking of an isolated instance, but I have found since that time that this same complaint has come from many people in other parts of the State, and I would like to point out that if this motion prevails I will submit this amendment, and, in my opinion, that takes care of all the objections that were raised this afternoon. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Southard.

Mr. SOUTHARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think the proposal of the gentleman from Farmington (Mr. Mills) is a good deal like the story of the young man who asked the young lady if it would be improper if he kissed another young lady's hand. She said it would not be improper but it would be decidedly out of place. I think this legislation is decidedly out of place. The reason I think so is this: Chapter 149 of the Public Laws of 1937 set up a plumbing licensing board; Sections 180 to 183-M all set up a plumbing licensing board for the regulation of plumbing. Excepted from that regulation on plumbing were all cities and towns and plantations with a population of 3000 or under.

Now since 1926 the State Bureau of Health had issued plumbing regulations, regulating not the plumbers but the work to be done. To guard our public health, it set up these regulations and enforced them. In the revision of the Public Health laws, Chapter 1 of the

Public Laws of 1933, they were specifically given the power to issue those regulations and enforce them.

Now those regulations have done a great deal of good. Those regulations govern not only municipal water systems but also private water systems. If you wish to install a new private water system your system has to come up to these minimum regulations. As an example of what those regulations may have done, I would suggest that in 1940 out of one hundred examinations made of private water systems eighty-three cases of dissolved lead were found in the system, eighty-three cases which could have caused lead poisoning. While you cannot ascribe it all to these regulations, I would also call your attention to the fact that in 1926, the year when these regulations first went into effect, our total death rate in the State of Maine was eight per hundred thousand and last year it was .21 of one per cent, cut down nineteen times..

The bill of the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Mills, is not directed at the plumbers, it is directed at any regulation at all in the small towns. No board can establish any regulation, the State Board of Health or the town or city; there is to be no regulation of that sort of thing at all. Now in the law giving the State Board of Health power to prescribe these regulations a provision was put in that the State Board should have public hearings twice a year on regulations, and anyone who felt the regulations were bad could come in and prove it, and, if they were justified, the regulations would be changed. If any of these particular rules and regulations are incorrect, there is a way to change them.

So much for the original bill. As far as the amendment is concerned, I suppose in this case the motion to substitute the bill for the report depends entirely on the acceptance of the amendment. If that amendment is put into the law, we have this situation: All public or private camps catering to guests or campers for pay must have plumbing to conform to these rules. This year I do not let my camp and I do not have to pay any plumber, but next year if I let my camp I have to put in the required minimum system. There will be a considerable holler on that. It will not be directed to Mr. Mills, but it will

be directed to the State Bureau of Health; it will be their fault.

Further than that, the amendment says: "and to any sewerage disposal bordering upon or draining into any stream or body of water used for water supply or bathing." How are you going to tell what that means? The amendment is not practical, although it is perhaps an improvement on the original bill. It is not a practical health measure at all. I therefore hope that the motion of the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Mills, will fail and that the "Ought not to pass" report will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs.

Mr. DOWNS: Mr. Speaker, this is evidently a matter of a more serious nature than appears on the surface. I do not wish to abuse the privilege of tabling, but I do believe it concerns particularly the rural members of this Legislature. I move you sir, that the matter lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rome, Mr. Downs, moves that the matter lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning. As many as are in favor of this matter lying on the table and being specially assigned for tomorrow morning will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed, and the bill was so tabled and so assigned.

The Chair lays before the House the fourth tabled and unassigned matter, Majority Report "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and Minority Report "Ought not to pass" of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Regulate the Practice of Architecture and to Create a Board to Provide for the Examination and Registration of Architects". (H. P. 647) (L. D. 283), both reports tabled on March 14th by the gentleman from Gardiner Mr. Slosberg, pending acceptance of either report; the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg.

Mr. SLOSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I now move the acceptance of the minority report "Ought not to pass".

In support of that motion, I want

to say at the outset, that I have nothing against the architects. I appreciate very much what they are trying to do in this bill, and that is, to set up a Board to regulate the standards of architects, so that our standards will meet the requirements of the American Institute of Architecture, thereby allowing Maine architects to practice in other states and allow reciprocity between those states.

Section 13 of the Act sets up the following qualifications and I submit that those qualifications are rather stiff: "An applicant shall be at least 25 years of age, a graduate of an approved 4-year high school including not less than one year in the basic sciences of chemistry and physics, and 3 years of mathematics, or equivalent training, and after completion thereof he must have had: 1st, satisfactory training in a school or college of architecture approved by the board, with graduation therefrom, as evidenced by a diploma setting forth a satisfactory degree, and 3 years practical experience in the office of an experienced architect, or architects, engaged in the practice of architecture as a profession; or 2nd, 9 years of practical experience in the office of an experienced architect or architects, engaged in the practice of architecture as a profession; or 3rd, training fully equivalent to that required in 1st or 2nd."

I submit that those requirements make it almost impossible for the average young fellow to become an architect, if the Board does not want him to.

The purpose of these requirements as I understand it,—and as I said before—was to meet the requirements of the American Institute of Architecture.

The majority of the members of the Legal Affairs Committee have offered an amendment lessening the stringency of these requirements, and, I submit that if that is done, the requirements will not meet the approval of the American Institute of Architecture. Therefore, one of the prime purposes of this bill will have been defeated.

There will no longer be any reciprocity. Therefore, it seems to me that the purpose of the bill is such as to prevent anyone from using the word of "architect" or derivative thereof, without being licensed by the Board. My objection to that is more or less along the lines that

the gentleman from Farmington, Mr. Mills, stated before, in the other bill. That is, I think that it is time to call a halt in the creation of Boards. I think it is time to draw a line as to what boards we should have and what boards we should not have.

I personally feel that this bill is unnecessary legislation, Mr. Speaker. When the vote is taken on it, I ask that there be a division of the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg, moves the acceptance of the Minority Report, "Ought not to pass," and asks that when a vote is taken upon it, that it be taken by a division of the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Shesong.

Mr. SHESONG: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I recognize that the hour is getting late, and I am sorry that it comes at this time. But I think my duty requires that I defend this bill, because I put it in. Two years ago, architects came down here with a bill which was considered very carefully by the Legal Affairs Committee. There were a lot of objections to that bill, and the architects voluntarily withdrew it. I was one of those who opposed the bill two years ago. Now, they have met all the objections raised, so that at the hearing there was not a single voice raised in opposition to the bill before the committee.

All this bill does is to establish for the architects the right to call themselves professional men. It follows identically the same type of legislation which the professional engineers already have. In 1935 the professional engineers got the right to call themselves engineers, and had certain regulations made in regard to the practice of that profession.

This bill simply puts the architects in that same category as the engineers.

I do not think that it is fair to compare engineers and architects in the same category as plumbers or barbers. I feel that architects are a professional class, and as such entitled to protection. Therefore, this bill is put in for the purpose of giving them the same right which other professional men have in this State.

I will not take your time to go through the merits of the bill. It

is perfectly understandable. There is nothing secretive about it, as far as I know, and I have had an opportunity to study it the last two years. The amendments which were made, which the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg, has mentioned, were made to meet the requirements of the suggestions of the members of the Committee who signed the majority report.

I hope that the members of this House will not support the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg, that the minority report be accepted. I think this bill should have passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Grua.

Mr. GRUA: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I just want to say a word relative to this matter.

I am very much opposed to any further regulations than are absolutely necessary. I think we have created too many boards. As you can see under this bill, a man has to pay fees, and those fees go to some board; and there will be more fellows drawing pay at the expense of the public. I am not convinced that we need this and am very much opposed to it, and hope that the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner (Mr. Slosberg) that the House accept the Minority Report, "Ought not to pass", will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Leavitt.

Mr. LEAVITT: Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature there are several lawyers and several doctors. Lawyers have their Boards of Registration. At least, they have to pass bar examinations before they can become lawyers. Doctors have very rigid examinations and they have to serve a period of internship for so long before they can become a doctor.

There happens to be no architect here in this body to defend the architects. They will have to be defended by someone not in that profession. I happen to know a great many architects. I work with some architects, and I know the amount of education, the amount of research, and the amount of knowledge that they have to have before they are capable of building a house, before they are worthy to be hired by people to build houses and save



them money, and make them worth while to hire.

I do not believe, despite the fact of the debate here, that the restrictions in that bill are too severe to impose upon a man before he becomes an architect. I hope that this House will vote in favor of this bill. I hope it will vote against the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Shesong.

Mr. SHESONG: Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill is self-supporting. As far as expense to the State, there is absolutely none under the terms of the bill itself.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg, that the House accept the minority report, "Ought not to pass". The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Patterson.

Mr. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak on this matter at all, but I will say that I think we have got boards enough and every one of them costs the man who has to have anything done a good deal more every time. I could have spoken about the other bill but I did not. I think we have boards enough, and I myself shall vote "Ought not to pass".

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Donahue.

Mr. DONAHUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Ninetieth Legislature: As one of the members of the Legal Affairs Committee who signed the minority report I will say I have not been convinced that this bill will be self-supporting. The facts developed before the committee show that approximately thirty-five or forty architects would register under the bill. The bill does not operate the same as the restric-

tions relative to practicing law or medicine; the bill merely says if a man wants to call himself an architect he shall pay a fee and pass an examination. He can still practice architecture providing he does not use the word architect or any derivative thereof. In other words, he can still do the same work. That is not true under the restrictions applicable to the legal profession or the medical profession. For the reasons advanced by the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg, and for the additional reason I do not believe this bill will be self-supporting, I hope that his motion prevails.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg, that the minority report "Ought not to pass" be accepted. The gentleman from Gardiner asks for a division. Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Gardiner, Mr. Slosberg, that the House accept the minority report, "Ought not to pass" 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. Eighty-nine having voted in the affirmative and nine in the negative, the motion prevailed and the minority report, "Ought not to pass" was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson.

Mr. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, the hour of 12:30 has arrived and there is a great deal to be done by the members this afternoon. I move that we now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Payson, moves that the House do now adjourn. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the House adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.