

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

Ninety-first Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE



1943

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

SENATE

Wednesday, March 17, 1943.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Norman L. Kellett of Lewiston.

Journal of yesterday, read and approved.

From the House

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the County Treasurer and Clerk Hire for the County of Kennebec." (S. P. 269) (L. D. 457)

(In the Senate on March 10 passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A)

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

In the Senate, the rules were suspended and the Senate voted to reconsider its former action, whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A.

The Secretary read House Amendment A:

"House Amendment A to S. P. 269, L. D. 457. Amend said bill by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Sec. 3. Duration of act. This act shall remain in effect for a period of 2 years only.'"

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Faris of Kennebec, the bill as amended by Committee Amendment A was laid upon the table pending adoption of House Amendment A in concurrence.

The Committee on Salaries and Fees on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Recorder of Rockland Municipal Court," (H. P. 575) (L. D. 342) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(In the Senate, on March 11th, report read and accepted in concurrence. Subsequently, on motion by Mr. Elliot of Knox, returned to the House.)

Comes from the House, recommended to the Committee on Salaries and Fees.

In the Senate, the bill was recommended to the Committee on Salaries and Fees in concurrence.

The Committee on Interior Waters on "Resolve Designating Part of New Meadows River as New Meadows Lake," (H. P. 89) (L. D. 80) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Renaming Webber Pond, so-called," (H. P. 8) (L. D. 769) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted, the bill and resolve read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on Bill "An Act Relating to Superintendent of Public Buildings," (H. P. 572) (L. D. 303) reported the same in a new draft, (H. P. 1262) (L. D. 770) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on "Resolve Relating to the Dipping of Alewives in Machias River," (H. P. 1189) (L. D. 666) reported the same in a new draft, (H. P. 1265) (L. D. 772) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Taking Soft-Shell Clams, Quahaugs, or Mussels," (H. P. 633) (L. D. 353) reported the same in a new draft, (H. P. 1263) (L. D. 771) under a new title, Bill "An Act Relating to Taking of Soft-shelled Clams or Quahaugs," and that it ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence, the bills and resolves in new draft read once, and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Claims Against Estates," (H. P. 184) (L. D. 123) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted herewith.

On motion by Mr. Sanborn of Cumberland, the bill was tabled pending acceptance of the report in concurrence.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Vital Statistics; Birth Certificates of Foundlings," (H. P. 183) (L. D. 137) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted herewith.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence, and the bill

read once; Committee Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Communication

STATE OF MAINE
Bureau of Taxation
Property Division
Augusta

March 15, 1943.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the Ninety-first Legislature
State of Maine

In accordance with the request contained in Joint Legislative Order, under date of March 3, 1943, I am forwarding herewith the valuation of the several cities, towns and plantations as returned to the Bureau of Taxation for the municipal year 1942, and the valuation of the several cities, towns and plantations as fixed by the Board of Equalization for the municipal years of 1941 and 1942.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID H. STEVENS

(S. P. 448) State Tax Assessor.
Which was read, and ordered placed on file.

Sent to the House.

Referred to Committee

The following remonstrances were received and on recommendation by the Committee on Reference of Bills were referred to the following committee:

Inland Fisheries and Game

Mr. Sterling of Somerset presented the following:

"Remonstrance of John L. Foss of Athens and 30 others against (H. P. 1240) (L. D. 739) Bill "An Act Relating to Hunting of and Trapping of Foxes," (S. P. 449)

"Remonstrance of John Hutchins and 18 others of Starks against (H. P. 1240) (L. D. 739) Bill "An Act Relating to Hunting and Trapping of Foxes," (S. P. 450)

Sent down for concurrence.

First Reading of Printed Bills

Bill "An Act Relating to the Governor's Expense Account." (S. P. 443) (L. D. 784)

"Resolve Relating to the Completion of the Eighth Revision of the General and Public Laws." (S. P. 444) (L. D. 785)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Penalty for Interfering with any Contrivance Used in the Lobster Industry." (S. P. 445) (L. D. 786)

Which bills and resolve were severally read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Senate Committee Reports

Mr. Dow from the Committee on Banks and Banking on Bill "An Act Relating to the Transfer of Moneys in the Hands of the Superintendents or Treasurers of State Institutions," (S. P. 192) (L. D. 271) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Buck from the Committee on Towns on Bill "An Act Relating to Annual Audits of Municipalities," (S. P. 99) (L. D. 158) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Dow of Oxford, tabled pending acceptance of the committee report.)

Mr. Sterling from the same Committee on Bill "An Act to Provide for the Surrender by Town of Madrid of Its Organization," (S. P. 225) (L. D. 335) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Haskell from the Committee on Banks and Banking on Bill "An Act Relating to Savings Deposits in Savings Banks and Trust Companies," (S. P. 185) (L. D. 268) reported the same in a new draft, (S. P. 451) under a new title, Bill "An Act Relating to Savings Deposits in Trust Companies," and that it ought to pass.

Which report was read and accepted, and the bill in new draft laid upon the table for printing under the joint rules.

Passed to be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Granting Increase in Salary to County Commissioners of Washington County." (H. P. 830) (L. D. 397)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Register of Deeds for

Knox County." (H. P. 577) (L. D. 344)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Compensation for Clerk of Courts in Knox County." (H. P. 580) (L. D. 347)

Bill "An Act Increasing the Salary of the Sheriff of Knox County." (H. P. 581) (L. D. 348)

Bill "An Act to Increase the Salary of the Register of Deeds of Washington County." (H. P. 824) (L. D. 392)

Which bills were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to the Amount to be Paid for Clerk Hire in the Office of the Recorder of the Municipal Court of the City of Portland." (S. P. 58) (L. D. 51)

"Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Interest of the State in Lands in Somerset County to George H. Cook, Jr., and Howard H. Chase." (S. P. 202) (L. D. 283)

Bill "An Act to Accept the Benefits of an Act of Congress to Provide for the Promotion of Vocational Education." S. P. 211) (L. D. 323)

"Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Land to the Great Northern Paper Company." S. P. 224) (L. D. 336)

Bill "An Act Relating to Report of Controller and its Publication." (S. P. 296) (L. D. 441)

Bill "An Act Relating to Penalty for Violation of Certain Sections in the Health and Welfare Laws." (S. P. 441) (L. D. 768)

Bill "An Act Relating to State Aid for Academies." (S. P. 281) (L. D. 439)

Bill "An Act Permitting Non-resident Citizens to Transport Deer." (S. P. 188) (L. D. 274)

Which bills and resolves were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Hanold of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table, House Report from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game, "Ought to Pass" on bill,

"An Act Relative to Fox Hunting in York County" (H. P. 316) (L. D. 224) tabled by that Senator on February 19th pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator the report of the committee was accepted in concurrence, and the bill was given its first reading and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Dow of Oxford, the Senate voted to take from the table, House Report from the Committee on Banks and Banking, "Ought to Pass" on bill, "An Act Relating to Insurance Held by Loan and Building Associations" (H. P. 771) (L. D. 414) tabled by that Senator on March 16th pending consideration.

Mr. DOW of Oxford: Mr. President, I move the bill be indefinitely postponed in concurrence. In support of that motion, I would explain that while this is a unanimous committee report, the bill had reached such a stage in the proceedings of the legislature that when the sponsor was about to ask leave to withdraw, it had reached such a point he could not ask leave to withdraw. I have talked with the sponsors and members of the committee, and this motion would attain the same result, and so I ask that it be indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

The motion prevailed, and the bill was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Brown of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table, House Report from the Committee on Education, "Ought to Pass" on Bill, "An Act Relating to Age of Children Attending School" (H. P. 535) (L. D. 307) tabled by that Senator on March 12th pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the report of the committee was accepted and the bill was given its first reading.

Thereupon, Mr. Brown presented Senate Amendment "A" and moved its adoption:

"Senate Amendment 'A' to H. P. 535, L. D. 307, bill 'An Act Relating to the Age of Children Attending School'. Amend said bill by striking out the underlined words 'their 6th birthday' in the 8th line of the 2nd paragraph thereof and inserting in place thereof the underlined words

'six years of age'. Further amend said bill by striking out the underlined words '31st of December' in the 8th and 9th lines of said 2nd paragraph and inserting in place thereof the underlined words 'last day of February'."

Mr. BROWN of Aroostook: Mr. President, I wish to explain to the members of this body the purpose of the amendment. As you all know, I objected to the bill, not so much the first part of the bill which had to do with school children in cities and towns having sub-primaries, but in particular in regard to the last part of the bill under which children who lived in towns where there were no sub-primaries, and that includes a great many of our rural towns, a child could not go to school at the beginning of the school year if he became six years of age after the first of December. This, in effect, means that unless a child was five years and eight months old at the beginning of school, he could not attend school, and should he be born, we will say, the first day of January, he could not attend school until the following September when he would be six years and eight months old, nearly seven years old.

I have drafted this amendment to split the school year in two so that a child who reached his sixth birthday by the last of February would be eligible to go to school, which would be at the age of 5 1/2 years, or if his birthday came after that, he would be 6 1/2 years old.

I might say that I am still not thoroughly sold on this amendment. There is a good deal of the same objection to it that there was before. It puts the age of school children in rural districts too far ahead. I do not like this idea of an arbitrary school age. We have it in the old bill, five years of age. There is a great deal of difference in children. Some children at the age of five are more advanced physically and mentally and are more capable of going to school and assimilating than are other children at the age of 6 or 6 1-2. I believe it would work out a good deal better if we had a law where children reaching the age of five years, if upon examination by the family doctor or some school doctor, it was found that the child was fitted to go to school at that age, he could be admitted, otherwise he would not be able to go until some other age, and not have a reg-

ular standard—that is, an arbitrary age—but have a flexible standard whereby children could be graded by some physical or mental standard.

I doubt, of course, if any family would like to have their family doctor say their children could not go to school, but I believe it might be worked out. We might as well say a child could not go to school unless he was a certain height or weight. Some children—pardon my saying this, but I believe that a child in the rural district is a little further advanced, according to age, than one in the city district. They run in the open air, have something to do, do a little work. Some children in our county are picking up potatoes when they are five years old. I think they are further advanced. But this is not the argument. I am not taking issue with those from the city districts.

Regarding this amendment, I still have some objection to it. You can indefinitely postpone it or do what you want. I think I have done my part because I have called this bill back and offered an amendment and I have given the proponents of the bill an opportunity to do as they see fit.

According to parliamentary procedure, I move the adoption of Senate Amendment "A".

Mr. DOW of Oxford: Mr. President, I cannot find a copy of this amendment on my desk, and considering the fact that the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Brown, says he isn't too pleased with it, I move it lie on the table pending adoption.

The motion prevailed and the bill was laid upon the table pending adoption of Senate Amendment "A".

On motion by Mr. Good of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table, bill "An Act Permitting Pembroke Trotting Association to Conduct Amateur Races on Sunday" (S. P. 241) (L. D. 361) tabled by that Senator on March 2nd pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A".

Mr. GOOD of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I hesitate this morning to make the motion I will have to make at the end of my few remarks which I am going to make, but in view of that fact, I want to state my position. Probably there isn't

anyone in the Senate that likes horse racing any better than I used to like it. Therefore, I would hate to penalize anyone from enjoying anything they much loved.

First, I believe this is class legislation. We are asking the State to grant Pembroke something we won't allow other parts of the State. In the second place, and more important to me, is that Sunday racing—I do not believe we should grant Pembroke permissions that we should not grant other parts of the state, and I don't believe we should allow a piece of legislation like this to go through that will demoralize our Sunday or disregard the principles which we hold dear to our hearts.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would inquire if the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Good, is addressing his remarks to the adoption of Committee Amendment "A"?

Mr. GOOD: To the indefinite postponement of the bill, Mr. President. You know we have pari-mutuel legalized in the state and they conduct it at practically every race track. There may be some exceptions but most of them do. This, it seems to me, is just a wedge to start in and have pari-mutuel. I do not think it is in this bill, but generally it is the way it originates. Other towns have as much right to ask for Sunday racing as Pembroke has. Eventually they will ask for pari-mutuel, and no doubt will get it if they grant Sunday racing. We have granted Sunday baseball in spite of the objections of some people who do not believe in it. We have legalized moving pictures which have drained the churches Sunday nights. I do not believe we care to do this at this time. Therefore I am opposed to this bill and I move it be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would point out that the bill was tabled pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A". The motion to indefinitely postpone is not in order until Committee Amendment "A" is acted upon.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. President, I move Committee Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. McGLAUFN of Cumberland: Mr. President, every morning we open this assembly with prayer. Why? Because we want Divine wisdom in our proceedings of the day,

and so highly do we regard this wisdom that all our statutes that relate to our conduct are based on the wisdom that we obtain from the Ten Commandments. Among those Commandments that we, in the past, have deemed to be wise, is one that we should "remember the Sabbath Day and keep it holy." My only interpretation of that is not that we should remember the Sabbath Day to keep horse racing. But you may well ask what harm does it do to have horse racing in Pembroke? Gentlemen of the Senate, that is not the issue. The issue is bigger than Pembroke and it is bigger than Washington County. It is a trend in the wrong direction. It is due to a trend in the wrong direction that we have crime. It is due to a trend in the wrong direction that we have so many divorces. It is due to trends in the wrong direction that nations are destroyed, as is well illustrated by the destruction of Rome. It is due to trends in the wrong direction that France is today in the position that she is, passing through Hell.

This body of men, this Senate, is composed of men who are supposed to be a little above the average citizen in wisdom and intelligence. There isn't one man in one thousand in the state of Maine that ever has had the honor and privilege to sit in this Senate. Therefore, our responsibility is large. It behooves us as a body to act wisely and as well as we can possibly do. Now, I say to you gentleman, it is the part of wisdom for us to stop the trend at its source. Already we have Sunday movies. Already we have Sunday baseball games. In this very legislature they are asking for Sunday horse racing, for Sunday hunting, for Sunday bowling, and if you are going to allow horse racing in Pembroke, why not in Presque Isle, and if in Presque Isle, why not in Skowhegan? You are opening the door to further disregarding of the Sabbath Day. It is true that even if horse racing in Pembroke would not do the slightest harm in itself, it is a trend in the wrong direction. Gentlemen, we should kill this measure in this Senate here and now.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion to indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment "A".

Mr. DUNBAR of Washington: Mr. President and members of the

Senate, I had supposed from what I was told this morning that another member of the Senate, a member of the Legal Affairs Committee, was to speak in favor of the committee report and I probably would have followed him, but I cannot let the opportunity go by this morning without speaking for a group of citizens in Washington County who are interested, and deeply interested, in this small piece of what I call harmless legislation. Only last week I learned to my surprise that France fell because her citizens were drinking too much liquor, and this morning to my surprise, I learn that France fell again because the people of France believed in the same thing that the people of Pembroke believe in. The people of Pembroke are indeed fortunate and honored to be tied up with France even in her victories and her defeats.

I have a great deal of respect for churches. God forbid I ever live in a community that does not have a church in it. But sometimes I wonder if perhaps the attendance in the church services in the evening has fallen off, or even in the forenoon services, if perhaps that to a large degree may be for the reason that we find here the churches coming in and opposing any law that attempts to liberalize the old blue laws, so-called, that came to us from the days of the Puritans. I wonder if it isn't the cause. I wonder if the churches would cooperate with the people in their efforts to have some sort of entertainment or amusement at times at least when churches are not in session, if you would not find a better spirit of cooperation among the laity of those communities who would cooperate, and say "They are cooperating with us. Let's cooperate with them by attending church more often than we do and contributing more often than we now contribute." But all along the line we have had to fight those who believed in liberalism of our blue laws. We have had to fight. They say, "You have Sunday baseball. You have Sunday movies." Yes, but how did we get them? By fighting, fighting, fighting, until finally the members of former legislatures decided it would do no harm to have such things.

I remember speaking here before a committee, I believe it was four

years ago, in favor of Sunday movies and I made the prediction that if given the opportunity in my town to vote, they would vote at least two to one for Sunday movies. I was sneered at by the opposition for making such a statement, but when the opportunity came to vote, the town I come from voted four to one for Sunday movies. We have Sunday baseball and we had to fight to get that. Now we come to this piece of legislation.

This is a unanimous committee report from the Committee on Legal Affairs which heard the evidence in this case. I am old fashioned. I had believed, when I came to this legislature, that reports that came from a committee, unanimous reports, were something to be looked upon with careful consideration and that until such time as some members of the committee felt they had done wrong we ought to go along with those reports. But I find that isn't so. I went along with one report that came from a committee of which the previous speaker and my friend was a member. It meant a lot to a certain community. But I felt that I must be wrong about it and I took the judgment of the committee. I hope they were right about it. Time will tell.

Now, we had a good hearing on this bill. The people who were interested in it came before our committee. There was just one person who appeared in opposition and he wasn't in the committee room more than half a minute, any longer than to announce his name and to say, "Gentlemen, the churches of Maine are opposed to this bill." I thought it was a pretty broad statement to make because I don't believe that he represented another great church in Maine to speak for them or to say that they may be opposed to it.

But in the little town of Pembroke, Maine—and they are God-fearing people—it used to be quite a prosperous town years ago; they had a large iron works there and it was such an important town that they used to hold a fair there and they had one of the finest fair grounds anywhere in Washington County. The Iron Works went and the town went down and the fair grounds went down and grew up to grass and the buildings disappeared. Two or three years ago

one man bought the fair grounds and it was thought that they might like to rebuild the grounds and have some new buildings with the idea that sometime later they could hold fairs in Pembroke. That is what is behind this bill. And they conceived the idea of having these races on Sunday. There aren't horse trotters there as we know horse trotters. There is none of the Sullivan and Mawhinney Stable of which Machias is so proud, in Pembroke. I doubt if any horse that trots a mile in Pembroke does so in less than three minutes and a half. They are farmers' horses. There is no fence around the grounds. They were charging a little admission. There was no entrance fee and in this bill there is no entrance fee. There were no purses paid and in this bill there are no purses paid. But the purpose of charging that small fee, and the small fee that is right in the bill here of 35c, was for the purpose of getting a little revenue with the idea in mind of rebuilding that race track in the hope that some day they would rehabilitate it in such a way that they could hold a fair in Pembroke.

There has been no harm done. It has been conducted decently and properly and it had been going along for a couple of years until one certain gentleman in another town some distance from Pembroke heard about it and he took it up with the proper authorities and with our sheriff and they, of course, had to stop it.

Now, they were disappointed. In their hearts, in my opinion, immediately there began to rankle a feeling against the church. That was wrong. Then this bill was introduced and a thousand people from Pembroke and those little surrounding towns of Dennysville, Perry and Cooper signed their names to petitions in favor of this bill. I didn't read the names carefully but I was told by my colleague Senator Washburn that his wife went over them carefully and made the statement to him that they were surprised to see the kind of people, the high class of people, in those surrounding towns who had signed the petitions in favor of this bill.

I have no doubt but that there were many church members who signed those petitions. There would have to be if they had a thousand

names from that little locality because Pembroke is a small town.

Now, the bill as drawn was to permit Sunday racing at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon. There was no time limit. They could have raced until midnight if they so desired. Whoever drew up the bill made an error and I suggested to the committee that there should be a top limit to it and I said, "Would six o'clock be all right when they can play baseball until seven, I believe?" "Oh," they said, "Certainly." And that is the amendment to this bill to permit racing from 1:30 in the afternoon until six o'clock.

Now, I have spoken longer than I should. It is all right for some people to say, "No, you can't do anything on Sunday." And in this locality, let me tell you, there are no moving pictures and with the rationing of gas the people have no way of legally going to some other town to enjoy an afternoon or evening at the movies. In these times when we are pent up and wondering what is going to happen next I wonder if perhaps it isn't well to give people a chance to have a little recreation I think so. I think they should have that right. I think it is a trend in the right direction.

This won't last long. If they can get the fair grounds built up they will hold a fair. If they can't, it will be one of those things that come up for a short season and then pass on. I am not worried as to what Portland may ask the right to do, or some other community. When that time comes we will meet it. But Portland has its baseball on Sunday and its Sunday movies, and the people of Pembroke have only the right to work with no outlet on Sunday.

I hope the motion of the gentleman from Aroostook, will not prevail.

Mr. McGLAUFILIN: Mr. President, I will take just a moment more. My father and my mother were both born in the town of Charlotte just a few miles from Pembroke. It was there that they got their religious teaching. They later moved to Aroostook and it was from them that I got my religious teaching. So you can trace the principles for which I stand right back to Washington County. And in those days the people of Washington County were God-fearing people who respected the Ten Commandments and I want to say to you that notwithstanding the petitions that have

been presented here, I venture to say that there are hundreds of Christian men and women in Pembroke today and thousands of them in Washington County who do not approve this bill.

Mr. SANBORN of Cumberland: Mr. President, I fear there is a bit of an oversight. I think it is proper to draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that the pending motion is for the indefinite postponement of the Committee Amendment. It occurs to me that the discussion up to this point has been mainly directed to the merits or demerits of the bill itself, a discussion which has gone so far as to include an argument to the effect that a town which has no movies at all voted four to one for Sunday movies, which might seem inconsistent.

Now, the amendment is one which limits the hours of the day within which horse racing may go on and I would suggest that unless it is the purpose of the Senate ultimately to postpone the bill itself we be careful about indefinitely postponing the amendment because if we postpone the amendment and if the bill is then passed, it will permit horse racing in Pembroke at any hour, all day and all night if they want it.

I think perhaps, however, in this same connection I should say just a word as a member of the committee. Those who presented the case in favor of the bill certainly presented an exceptionally strong case. So far as that particular locality was concerned and so far as what was proposed and expected and desired was concerned, there seemed to be very little if anything objectionable about it. However, when we were in Executive session and the vote was polled and we were unanimous in reporting out the bill "Ought to Pass," those who were there will bear me out, I know, in their recollection that I made the observation that personally I supposed I was pretty old-fashioned and that if it were left to me I should probably vote "Ought Not to Pass," but I didn't think it wise and I do not think now it would have been wise to have submitted a minority report. My objections to the bill were simply that it would be opening a door, it would be going one step further in a direction which I feel, as my colleague on my right feels, is a move in the wrong direction.

I couldn't see any reason, and I don't see any reason, why, if they

are going to have horse trotting in Pembroke they shouldn't have it in Old Orchard or in any other part of the state they want. I think probably, although by no means certainly, that this Body would not endorse such a practice as a statewide affair.

So that I have this to say, that if it is the purpose of this Body ultimately to approve the measure I certainly hope the motion to indefinitely postpone the amendment will not prevail. I think it should be passed, if it is to be passed with the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Good, for the indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment A. This bill was read once on March 2nd, Committee Amendment A was adopted and the bill as amended was the next day assigned for second reading. The action of the Senate was then reconsidered and the bill was laid upon the table pending the adoption of Committee Amendment A. And, I repeat, the question now before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Good, for the indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment A. Is the Senate ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being had

The motion to indefinitely postpone Committee Amendment A did not prevail.

Mr. GOOD of Aroostook: Mr. President, I now move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Aroostook, Senator Good now moves that the bill be indefinitely postponed. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. GOOD: Mr. President, when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

A division of the Senate was had.

Eleven having voted in the affirmative and nineteen opposed, the motion to indefinitely postpone the bill did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Dunbar of Washington, a viva voce vote being had, Committee Amendment A was adopted and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Elliot of Knox Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.