

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

Seventy-Seventh Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1915

HOUSE.

Thursday, February 25, 1915.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Mosher of Augusta.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Senate Bills on First Reading.

Senate 144. Resolve in favor of the assistant folder and pages of the 76th Legislature for attendance at the organization of the 77th Legislature.

Senate 142. An Act to amend Section 26 of Chapter 48 of the Revised Statutes of 1903, relating to the deposit by savings banks and institutions for savings of collateral for loans made without the State.

Senate 141. Resolve in favor of Washington State Normal School at Machias for the removing and remodeling of the O'Brien house, so called, at said school.

Senate 140. Resolve in favor of the Washington State Normal School at Machias for the completion of the partially constructed dormitory at said school and furnishings for the same.

Senate 145. Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal School for general repairs and permanent improvements.

Senate 132. Resolve providing a State pension for Michael B. Daley of Portland.

Senate 147. An Act to amend Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the salary of the stenographer of the superior court for Kennebec county.

Senate 155. An Act for the better protection of shell fish within the town of Eliot, in the county of York.

Senate 134. An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 35 of the Public Laws of 1911, relatives to the better protection of forests along railroads from fires. (Tabled pending its third reading on motion by Mr. Smith of Hampden.)

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays be-

fore the House on the question of the highest privilege the message from the Governor, as follows:

"To the Honorable House of Representatives:

"House Document No. 53 in favor of the town of Moscow, introduced by Representative Dutton of Bingham, is returned herewith unsigned. I have no objection to the amount of the resolve or the purpose of the expenditure, but the objection is on account of the uncertainty of the amount you will appropriate for ways and bridges, as previously stated in my veto message regarding resolve in favor of the town of Dresden. I have urgently requested Representative Dutton the advisability of recalling these bills and as he declined to do so I have no alternative but to return the documents unsigned.

"OAKLEY C. CURTIS,
Governor."

This is a resolve appropriating money to aid in the construction of a road in the town of Moscow. The question before the House is, shall this resolve be finally passed, the objections of the governor to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, in a few moments I will endeavor to explain to the House the reasons for this veto and the reason for the message of the Governor which was presented to the Legislature yesterday in relation to the other two resolves which were passed over the veto of the Governor which was done here yesterday and also in the Senate yesterday morning. The Governor has no objections whatever to the amount designated in these particular resolves, neither those that came up yesterday nor those that are here today and introduced by the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton. What I have to say applies, you understand, equally to each of the three resolves which are here this morning. It seems to the Governor, and it must seem to the business men, lawyers and doctors and anyone else in this House, that any one who has to pay their own personal expenses and who has not the blessed privilege of an unlimited income to

draw upon for those expenses, that the business management of your own personal finances, the business management of any corporation, of any city of county or even the business management of this State requires that expenditures shall have some relation to the amount of income reasonably in sight.

The Governor said in his veto message yesterday that in looking over the business affairs of this State and looking over the prospective income for the next two years—and by that I do not mean, for instance, the matter of inheritance taxes, where if some rich man should die in the next two years and the State may derive from that source an inheritance tax of \$1000, for that is not a matter which can be discounted in advance, and you cannot tell what the income from some of those sources in the next two years may be, but you do have a check to a certain degree upon a certain amount of income, and that involves as a business proposition that the Governor of this State can figure that he will have to meet the amounts appropriated by the Legislature and the amounts necessarily spent in the incidental expenses that come up all through the year. Now, when he is looking it over it seems to him and mind you, it is alright to talk about one-man power, and it is alright to criticize the effect of the veto, but the veto provision was not put into the Constitution unless it was with the idea that circumstances might arise where the Chief Executive would feel called upon to use it, and for that very same reason the provision is in our Constitution that a two-thirds vote is necessary to pass a bill over the veto of the Governor.

The Governor of this State in law, in fact and in the eyes of the people is charged with the responsibility for its financial affairs for the next two years; he cannot escape it and he cannot dodge it, and he cannot shoulder the responsibility upon the Legislature; the responsibility in regard to the financial condition of this State for the next two years is upon the Governor, and is largely because the people of this State thought he

was the proper man for that that he was chosen Governor, and the Governors before him have been chosen Governors. In all campaigns the speakers of all parties have advocated the election of their candidate because they said that their candidate, in the case of Governor Cobb, Governor Fernald and Governor Haines, and these different men were good men and competent to look after the general financial affairs of the State.

It is inevitable then, gentlemen, that a Governor charged with this responsibility should look around and see what total amount of appropriation he can stand for; it is inevitable that he should divide this amount among the different branches of the State and decide into what particular branches this should be divided. The Governor has expressly stated that he does not care how this amount of \$125,000 is divided, whether you give so much to one town and so much to another; he has no purpose and no desire and no wish to interfere with the province of the Legislature in that respect; he does feel that the responsibility is upon him that the total amount shall not be exceeded and that the finances of this State shall be plunged into chaos with his consent, and for that reason he has sent down this veto message.

Now in regard to this particular matter Representative Dutton, I think, will bear me out; there is nothing personal in this matter against the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton, and there is nothing personal against these three towns, and nothing personal against the county of Somerset, nothing of that nature whatever; it just happened that these three resolves happened to be the ones that came up before the Governor yesterday and were passed over the Governor's veto, otherwise they would be killed absolutely for this session. The Governor sent for Representative Dutton last night and asked the representative to withdraw these resolves and to keep them here in the House or in the Senate until such time as all the appropriations for this purpose could be collected, in order that he could see that the total amount would not be in excess of the amount that this State could fairly and properly spend for this purpose. I have conferred this morning with Representative Dutton

and with the Governor, not more than 15 minutes ago, and the gentleman from Bingham understands that situation perfectly but feels that the resolves having once been passed should not be brought back; but the responsibility for the defeat of these matters, if they are defeated—and I believe that this House will vote to sustain the Governor—the responsibility for the defeat of these matters does not rest upon the Governor, and cannot be made to rest there by any fair argument. The gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton, has had an opportunity to bring them back.

Now, gentlemen, it is not right to say that bills should not be passed just simply because they are the first ones in the hopper; it should not prove anything because a man gets his bill in first, or if he is fortunate enough to get it out of the committee first, or is fortunate enough that nobody tables it or delays its passage; that does not necessarily prove that out of this \$125,000 should necessarily come the amount covered by this particular appropriation; it may or may not. It is just like a man with an income of \$1500 a year starting out in the beginning of the year to buy everything he wanted; he bought a horse and he bought a new piano and he finally bought a second-hand automobile and a bicycle for one of the boys; when he got around to the next December he would very likely find no money for the coal bill; you have to plan your personal expenditures, and you have to plan the expenditures of the business that you are in; it is a plain matter of business, no animosity in the matter of these bills, no animosity in any other bills and no animosity towards the ways and bridges committee, but it is simply a matter of business which every business man here can understand. The Governor's idea is that none of these matters should be passed until they were all in and the House and Senate knew what amounts were asked for and reported out of the committee on ways and bridges. Then the House and Senate can pass upon them intelligently, and the Governor and the men in charge of the financial affairs of the State could have some assurance that the expenditures of the State would not exceed its revenue for the next two years.

I appeal to the fair-minded men of this House; it is not a question of politics whatsoever; there is no politics in it. If these had been my matters or if they had been the matters of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. McCarty, or the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Haskell, or the matters of any other member, they would have met with just precisely the same treatment, and politics do not enter into the consideration of the matter at all; it is a plain matter of business, whether the Legislature of the State of Maine is to be run on sensible business lines, in the same manner that every one of you here runs his own personal business, or whether it is to be run on a general scheme of appropriating and appropriating and appropriating whatever comes along, and finally find out that we have appropriated more money than we have to spend. For these reasons, gentlemen, I hope and believe that the members of this House will vote no, and will not vote to pass this bill notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. (Applause.)

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go into the finances of the State of Maine nor into any of the reasons why the Governor has found it necessary in his opinion to veto these particular resolves. The one thing that I do desire to object to is that these resolves relating to these towns in my county shall be made the "goat" in the matter of a difference of opinion between the Governor and the Committee on Ways and Bridges. As I understand it, this whole proposition arises through a difference of opinion upon the particular point of how much money the Ways and Bridges Committee shall be allowed to appropriate. As I understand it, the Committee on Ways and Bridges expect that it will be necessary, and that they can reasonably and safely appropriate for the use of ways and bridges a sum close to \$200,000. The Governor has different views upon that subject. He places the limit at the arbitrary point of \$125,000. The Governor makes no objection to the merits of these resolves, but asks that they be made the "goat" in a difference of opinion between himself and the committee. I would like to just say a

word in regard to the merits of this resolve for the town of Moscow. There is situated in the town of Moscow the village of Deadwater. This town has a large saw mill, employing at some times in the year more than one hundred. It has a store, a post-office, a school, a hall and a number of houses, as well as a few small farms. Those people situated in the locality have access to the outside world only over a tote road two miles and a half to connect with the main highways of Moscow. The necessity of this road has been approved by the county commissioners of Somerset county, and they have laid out this road to connect with the main highways in Moscow. The expense of this road as estimated will be \$3000. The ways and bridges committee, as I understand the resolve, have allowed the sum of \$1000 to be appropriated by the State, making it necessary for the town of Moscow, with its limited financial condition, to raise the sum of \$2000 more. I submit to the members of this Legislature if it is not a fair and just resolve.

Now as to the matter of whether this resolve shall pass over the Governor's veto, I object, and object strenuously, to these resolves, which are not party measures, being held up by party machinery. I appeal to the fairness and justice of the members of this Legislature, regardless of party, to pass these resolves regardless of the Governor's objection.

Mr. SNOW of Mars Hill: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word. We are here to do the business of the State, and we are all interested, more or less, in resolves that will come before this Legislature. We all recognize the fact that the State cannot pay all the bills that are brought in here asking for appropriations, and that there must be some limit to this thing. But we appoint 10 men on a committee who are from different parts of the State. They are assigned certain things that are asked for by the people of the State. They take those resolves and have a hearing upon them. They dig into them; they listen to the arguments of both sides for and against, if there are any, and

after due consideration they report "ought to pass" or "ought not to pass." I have heard a member of the committee on ways and bridges say that they have before the committee resolves asking for some \$600,000, and they have already eliminated some \$90,000 in bills that they have reported "ought not to pass" and resolves that have been cut down. Now they are using due consideration in all these matters. They are not trying to force anything upon the State that is not fair or not reasonable and right. They have reported as to these three that have come up "ought to pass"—these 10 men in whom you have placed confidence in to put these measures before. Now the Governor says they are meritorious bills to which there is no objection, and, if he thinks they are wise, why should they be turned down?

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, there appears to me to be much reason in what has been said by all three of the gentlemen who have already spoken; but there is this point for the House to consider in this matter which was, I think, raised by the gentleman from Bingham (Mr. Dutton.) The situation is that, while the Governor thinks that \$125,000 is all that the State can afford to expend for these purposes, the committee on ways and bridges has set a different limit—a different amount—some \$75,000 more, amounting to \$200,000. Now it is up to the House and the Senate, the Legislature all together, to decide whether either the amount lies somewhere between them, or possibly above or below either; but until we come to some decision as to how much can be expended, until we act, as it were, as a referee between those two amounts, we are not in a position to pass any of those bills, and they should all be laid upon the table. They should all be held together until such time as we can decide how much we can afford, and then so far as possible we should sort from those that are before us the ones which seems to us most deserving of the appropriation. For that reason, gentlemen, and not because I have any prejudice against these resolves—

I have no doubt the committee has worked faithfully; I have no doubt that the propositions are meritorious; I have no doubt, perhaps, that the entire \$600,000 that has been asked for may be all meritorious propositions; but the situation is that we can afford only just so much, and we should hold them all together until we can decide which ones we shall pass. I therefore trust, Mr. Speaker, that the House will stand by the Governor.

Mr. CONNELLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of this matter, would it not be well to inquire what are the motives of the Governor in vetoing this measure? Now in Section 55 of the House Rules it is provided that when a bill or resolve shall be presented by the Governor with his objections, the question shall be stated by the Chair: "Shall this bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor?" This question may be postponed not exceeding one week, or may be committed. Now I do not understand under that section that these resolves may be laid upon the table at this time; but I do understand that, under that section, they may be committed. The word "committed" having been used, and not "recommitted," I understand that that means that the bills may be committed to any committee. Had the word "recommitted" been used in the section, it probably would have meant re-committed to the committee from which it came. I understand that, with reference to the Whitefield and Dresden matters, the Governor vetoed those resolves for the purpose of getting before the House and Senate his ideas upon the subject, which were, if I am correctly informed, substantially as follows: that he wished to know the entire amount, the aggregate amount, that the committee would report "ought to pass" upon, and then, by some means or other as between himself and the committee, or with the committee, or in some other manner, determine just how many of these bills would be finally passed within the amount which he in his judgment thought would be well spent on ways and bridges. It has been said here

in argument by some of the preceding speakers that the Governor by his veto intends to substitute his judgment for that of the committee, and that by so doing he practically negatives the work of the committee; but, if I understand correctly the Governor's position in any State, he is put there for the very purpose of overlooking the work of the House and Senate. Otherwise, the veto power would not have been given him. He is given that power of veto so that he may act as he sees fit in the matter when in his best judgment he thinks the House and Senate have erred; and so in this case, believing in his best judgment, and perhaps being more familiar with the amount of money that can be raised, he thinks that it is best to have the bills rest until all bills are reported, and then to find out how much can be appropriated, and arrange some method whereby those most necessary may receive the benefit to the full amount of the appropriation.

In a morning paper, the Kennebec Journal, it is said as follows: "A Democratic caucus was held Tuesday evening and it is probable that Gov. Curtis learned from it that his vetoes would be overridden." I can state, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that I was present at the Democratic caucus; and if it is to be inferred, or if it is the intention that it should be inferred from this statement, that the Democratic caucus in any way, shape or manner, decided or intimated that they did not agree with the Governor, then my understanding is absolutely incorrect. On the contrary, after a full and thorough discussion, and after a statement which was issued or came by authority of the Governor of his position, the Democratic caucus felt that his position was absolutely correct, and the Democratic caucus agreed to stand by him—not as a political measure, but as men who are here representing their various sections of the State and in the interests of the best business of the State; and in that respect I appeal to all the members here, irrespective of party, for purely business reasons, for the best interests of the State, to sus-

tain the Governor in his veto.

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: Mr. Speaker, I think it might perhaps be well at this time to lay before the members of the Legislature the matter up to date of what has taken place with the ways and bridges committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will be obliged to rule that that would not be in order at this time except by unanimous consent.

Mr. DUTTON: I would ask for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER: It will be received if there is no objection. There is no objection and the gentleman from Bingham (Mr. Dutton) may proceed.

Mr. DUTTON: Resolves reported "ought to pass," \$58,300; "ought not to pass," \$59,200. There are now pending \$496,931.53. The resolves reported "ought to pass" and asked for, \$101,690; resolves reported "ought not to pass," \$99,200; acted upon, \$200,890; reported "ought to pass," \$58,300; amount refused \$142,590. Total amount asked for to date, \$697,821.59. Under this same appropriation the committee would recommend about \$200,000. It has been put up very plainly, and perhaps forcibly (and I might say fairly) by the gentleman from Houlton. Mr. Pierce, that if these resolves are killed here in this Legislature, that the responsibility rests upon the gentleman from Bingham. Gentlemen of this Legislature: I object to that responsibility being placed upon me. These resolves have come here and have been referred to the committee. They have already been scaled down more than the proportion that would be necessary between the difference of \$125,000, as recommended by the Governor, and the \$200,000 as recommended by the committee. They have already received their cut. They have passed through both branches of this Legislature without the least objection and without a word of protest from any member. They have been signed by the Speaker of the House and by the President of the Senate and have gone up to the Governor for his action. As I understand it, they have now received the Governor's action, which is a veto. I will admit that the proposition was put up to me just before this

session, and also last night, that if I would recall those bills now, they would in the end receive, so far as consistent, influence from a Democratic source to ensure their final passage. I contend, gentlemen, that the bills have already been acted on in their natural course and in a fair, square, open and above-board manner; and, if they must be killed because I refuse to accept the terms of peace, then I am willing to go down with them. I appeal to the fairness and sense of justice of the members of this Legislature, regardless of party, to see that these meritorious measures receive their passage. (Applause).

M. PERHAM of Woodstock: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I wish in a small way to call the attention of the House to one condition that seems to have been overlooked in the course of this discussion. The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, appealed to the business men, the lawyers and doctors of this legislature, that it was a fair proposition as he put it forth; he did not appeal to the farmers whom I have the honor to represent. This question of these appropriations embraces in a broader sense more than just simply the question of whether this resolve affecting this town of Moscow should pass or not. There is a condition throughout this State today that we must meet, and I can see but one way in which to meet it. I refer to the conditions of travel which have changed greatly in the past few years. In these small towns we are supplied with roads and bridges that for years have been adequate for the travel over them. With the advent of the automobile and the great income that we claim to have in this State from the tourists that come into this State, as well as from the automobiles in our own State, the conditions have absolutely changed and are these, they have gone through these small towns and their heavy cars and they have torn our roads to pieces, they have weakened our bridges which were entirely adequate for our uses, and they have become dangerous and in many cases have become impassible. Who is liable? The town is lia-

ble to an indictment if its roads are not in a passable condition. How can they do it? As a member of that committee on ways and bridges, I wish to say that we have considered these matters and the merits of the cases as they have appeared before us; we have been compelled from a simple idea of justice and actual necessity to vote "ought to pass" on a large number of these resolves already when there has been a possibility that they may have been passed as the record shows; we have voted nearly twice as large an appropriation "ought not to pass" as we have voted "ought to pass." We have this condition in our State today, these small towns whose roads have been thus destroyed by this business which is of such value to the State of Maine, and of that there can be no doubt. These people are not coming to the town of Woodstock; they simply go through the town of Woodstock to get to some other place; we like to have them come; we have gone deep into our pockets to provide ways and bridges and we are going to continue doing that very same thing because it is all for the best interest of the State of Maine.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you and to the gentlemen of this House that these small towns must have assistance to keep their ways and bridges in condition to satisfy the demand of this increased traffic, and I appeal to you, how can we get them without special appropriations? Perhaps it would not be wise for me to undertake to discuss the policy of the State in this matter. I have my ideas which I have expressed whenever I have had a chance upon this matter. I simply wish to say that under these changed conditions which we are obliged to meet we are obliged to meet them as small towns, and most of us here represent small towns, and it is a situation that we have got to meet in this legislature. The Governor in his veto message yesterday said, "It lies with you; you provide us the revenue and we will allow these things to go on."

I believe it is our duty as repre-

sentatives here to do what we believe is for the best interests of the State of Maine, to provide suitable revenue so that all of these matters after a fair hearing before the committee showing that the towns are unable to provide the means that the State insists shall be provided for travel, that the State shall step in and help those towns and to save them from the liability of indictment, for the best interests of the State of Maine. I thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. HILL of Corinth: Mr. Speaker, as I understand this situation it is this, that the Governor thinks he has \$125,000 that he can put in to help out on our roads and bridges. The committee said \$200,000, and if I understand it, it is something like six or seven hundred thousand dollars that has already come in and been asked to cover appropriations in this matter. This matter resolves itself into this condition in my estimation, that while we have got \$200,000 to expend for roads and bridges we have \$600,000 or \$700,000 of resolves here that should receive our attention. It looks to me as though we were crowding this matter a little bit. If we only have \$200,000 to expend how are we going to comply with all these resolves that are coming here asking for \$600,000 or \$700,000? I will vote, gentlemen, to pass this resolve over the Governor's veto if you can tell me how to put seven gallons of molasses into a two gallon jug.

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one word more in reply to the gentleman from Woodstock (Mr. Perham). That gentleman says that I did not mention the farmers. Now I think he is in error as far as the members of this legislature are concerned because in my judgment the farmers who are in this legislature are men who make their living off of the farm and are business men, otherwise they would not have been sent here, because in these modern days the farmer is a business man and it is necessary that he should be on any farm in the State

of Maine; I believe they are business men.

Now in reply to the gentleman from Woodstock (Mr. Perham) I want to say that all of these resolves have merit in them; I have enough confidence in the members of this House to believe that they would not introduce a resolve here before the committee on ways and bridges seriously unless they believed that the measure did have merit in it.

The question is right here: I have the greatest of respect for the committee on ways and bridges; I have attended some of their hearings and have noticed that they do not lay too great stress upon the arguments, but they want to find out the actual facts in regard to the road matters presented to them. I am satisfied personally from what I saw that they are endeavoring to do the best they can, but gentlemen, the responsibility finally for the total financial situation of the State of Maine is not with the committee on ways and bridges; the responsibility finally is with the Legislature, and particularly and especially with the Governor. The Governor does not wish that responsibility, he would rather not have it personally, he wants to avoid it but he is going to do his duty by the people of this State; the responsibility is up to him and he is obliged to do it, and it is the duty it seems to me of the members of this House to stand behind him: it casts no reflection upon this Legislature and absolutely none upon the gentleman from Bingham (Mr. Dutton) and absolutely none upon the members of the committee on ways and bridges; it is a plain matter of business, that the final responsibility rests with the Governor, and it is his hands that we must uphold. (Applause)

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Houlton changes the responsibility from the gentleman of Bingham to the Governor, where it belongs.

Mr. ST. CLAIR of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand about getting seven gallons into a two-gallon keg. The question here is, whether

the Governor shall decide the amount to be appropriated, or whether the Legislature shall. The Governor says that he wants to appropriate \$125,000. The committee says that they think the State can afford \$200,000; and that is all there is in this question. Does this Legislature believe the State of Maine can afford \$200,000 for roads and bridges? If it can, then we should override the veto. If we think we can afford only \$125,000, we should stand by the Governor. It is up to you gentlemen. Who is going to appropriate this money? Is the Governor of the State of Maine going to sit in his office and decide how much money we shall give to the various calls made upon the State or shall the Legislature decide? I believe it is the province of the Legislature, and that upon the Legislature rests the responsibility. I think we should override this veto and sustain this committee, because I do believe that the State of Maine can afford to appropriate \$200,000 for roads and bridges. (Applause)

Mr. SMITH of Hampden: Mr. Speaker, Senator Walker, within a few days, introduced a bill in the chamber in the other end of the corridor in favor of my town for a bridge. Now I have no personal interest in this matter. It does not appear to me at this time that it is for us to decide whether \$125,000 or \$200,000 shall be expended in appropriations for this purpose. More than that may be well used on the roads and bridges in Maine; but the question is, why not wait and give an opportunity for all these matters to be considered, and then scale them or give to the most meritorious of the number? I do not feel it to be a personal matter, other than that the amount asked for so far exceeds the limit placed by the committee, in whom we have so much confidence, that something must be done. We cannot expend \$600,000 in this matter; and it resolves itself into what bills shall receive passage at our hands to bring the matter up to \$200,000, perhaps, as the ways and bridges committee may see fit to appropriate. Give time for that, and I think the matter will work out all right. It is not a political measure, and

not one in favor of any particular rural districts of the State or any individual town.

Mr. HANSON of Sanford: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this discussion with a great deal of surprise, not because of the merit or demerit of the questions at issue—because everybody admits that the resolves are meritorious so far as they know about them, and we, therefore, assume that the committee has put up to us meritorious resolves; but the proposition of the Governor seems to be this: That he does not want us to consider a resolve by itself, and on its merits, but he wants us to put together in one large bunch these \$700,00 of resolves, and then scramble and fight and push to see what will happen. Gentlemen, you know legislation well enough to know what would happen supposing that committee should report \$500,000 of those resolves and they should all come up for action the same day. How are we going to limit ourselves? How are we going to pick out the meritorious resolves? The only way it can be done is to take them one by one as they come along. (Applause)

Mr. HIGGINS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to the gentleman from Hampden (Mr. Smith) and say that I believe that it is the duty of this House to pass resolves and bills as approved by the Committee on Ways and Bridges. I also want to call your attention to the make-up of that Committee on Ways and Bridges. In my opinion it is one of the strongest committees that we have in this Legislature; and I quite agree with the gentleman from Sanford (Mr. Hanson) that, if we leave these bills until the last moment, the fellow with the strongest pull will get the money. (Applause.)

Mr. WILKINS of Jay: Mr. Speaker, as a member of that committee, I would like to put myself right in regard to \$200,000 having the unanimous approval of the committee. I do not think that has ever been voted on in the committee room; and I can speak for myself that I for one do

not approve of that amount and shall stand by the Governor.

Mr. MULLIN of Lincolnville: Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen: I rise simply to a question of inquiry, and not to take part in the discussion; and that is, I would like to know by what method the size of the keg is determined that is all. That is, I want to know how we are to determine whether we have \$125,000 of \$200,000 or ten hundred thousand dollars, or how that matter is finally settled. How is the income for roads and bridges for the next two years determined?

Mr. THOMBS of Lincoln: Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I have also listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks of the various gentlemen concerning the matter now before the House. I do feel that we are assuming in the present discussion considerably more than is involved in the immediate question to be considered; we are undertaking to discuss the policy of the legislature from now onward. Now, I am not one of those who borrow trouble; I believe that we have sufficient trouble today if we take care of the matters that are immediately before us.

Now, what is the situation? Yesterday morning we considered matters of exactly a similar purport. The Governor then had vetoed two resolves identically the same as the resolve which we are now considering. He presented before us a message, or some gentleman speaking in his behalf, and asked us if we would not unanimously pass those resolves over his veto. We obliged him in that respect. Now, this morning under identically the same situation his representatives ask us to my mind to reverse the position which they asked us to take yesterday and say to the Governor that we now sustain you in this action; yesterday we reversed you, and today at your request we sustain you. Now, is that consistent? I want to ask you why there should be any difference this morning, or why this House should do any differently with these matters than they did with those of yesterday? We have not

exceeded any appropriation which we all know and which the Governor says he is willing that this committee on ways and bridges should have at their command, and you are all borrowing trouble when you say they are going to overrun it. It may be that they will not do that.

Now, I will ask you if it is not fair to put these resolves in exactly the same place that we placed those of yesterday, and let this thing work out in time. Let us not worry about what the others are going to do; mine have not come along yet, and I don't know where they are going to land, but I am willing to take a chance along with the rest of you. Let us put all five of these matters into the same place and then see what will become of them all. If the gentlemen speaking in the interests of the Governor desire to keep these matters in their control let them employ such tactics in the two branches of the legislature here as will delay those matters, if that is the course they desire to take. But let us be fair with ourselves; let us be consistent, and let us put these resolves with the others and then see what will come of it and how the matter will work out. We have heard a great deal here this morning about the veto power of the Governor; we all realize that there is such a power full well, but, gentlemen, there is a power higher than the veto power of the Governor of the State of Maine, and that power rests with the two bodies of this legislature, and to my mind a sense of fairness demands that this morning you vote exactly as you did yesterday morning and put this matter along with these others and let tomorrow's and next morning's worries be taken care of when that time comes. (Applause.)

Mr. GALLAGHER of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I had made up my mind not to say a word on this matter; but the contention is made that in all fairness we reverse our action of yesterday. It is well understood among a majority of the members of this House that there was a tentative understanding between certain members of the

Ways and Bridges Committee and a majority of the House that they had agreed that bills in excess of \$125,000, or thereabouts, would not be presented. It was also understood that before bills would be presented from that committee that all measures referred to them would have had consideration. There has been no question as to the merits of these particular bills, but, of course, there is a limit in the amount that can be appropriated; and in justice to every man who has a bill before this House asking an appropriation for ways and bridges, and in justice to our Governor, it seems to me that the House should reverse itself, and that we should have a unanimous refusal to passing these bills over the Governor's veto. Therefore I hope every man here will vote no.

Mr. VARNEY of Windham: Mr. Speaker, it has been remarked here quite often that this is a business proposition. It seems to me that we are overlooking one of the business propositions in connection with this matter, and that is in regard to the conditions that have changed. All of our large places of business have automobiles and automobile trucks to go over our roads, requiring stronger bridges. In my own county of Cumberland two years ago an automobile truck went over a bridge with 15 tons and as it passed over the bridge broke down. And so we find that is the condition all over the State. Now, are the automobiles paying anything and are we receiving anything from the tax on automobiles towards supporting our bridges? I think not.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the Resolve appropriating money to aid in the construction of a road in the town of Moscow. This resolve was finally passed by this House on Feb. 19, finally passed by the Senate on Feb. 23, and it has been returned to this House this morning by the Governor without his approval. The question now before the House is, shall this resolve be finally passed notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? Under the Constitution this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays. All those in favor of

the final passage of this resolve, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor, when their names are called will answer yes; all those opposed will answer no. This requires a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to this House. The clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Albert, Allen, Ames, Averill, Beal, Benn, Besse, Blake of Oakland, Bonney, Bradbury, Bragdon, Brann, Bussey, Campbell, Carson, Chaplin, Chamberlin, Clement, Cobb, Coffin, Dalgic, Danforth, Dilling, Drummond, Dutton, Ellis, Erskine, Evans, Fay, Ford Gould, Grant, Greateon, Greenlaw, Hanson of Sanford, Harper, Hart, Higgins, Holt of Gouldsboro, Jordan, Lawrence, Libby, Littlefield, Lombard, Mansir, McKinley, McNally, Meader, Mitchell, Morrison, Morse, Nicholas, O'Connell, Perham, Peterson, Ranney, Ricker, Russell of Alfred, Ryder, St. Clair of Calais, St. Clair of Rockland, Sanborn, Snow, Tabbutt, Thombs, Tobey, Towle, Tuttle, Varney, Washburn, Waterhouse, Wescott, Wise—73.

NAY—Ballard, Bernier, Blake of New Gloucester, Bourque, Brawn, Brown of Auburn, Brown of New Sharon, Chadbourn, Clifford, Colcord, Connellan, Connors, Corliss, Currier, Davis, Descoteaux, Douglass, Drapeau, Durgain, Edwards, Fossett, Gallagher, Gerrish, Gilmour, Goldthwait, Gooding, Goodwin, Greeley, Greenleaf, Haskell, Hill, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Holt of Skowhegan, Jameson, Leader, Lewis, Lord, Maxwell, McCarty, McCarrison, McCurdy, McIntire, Michaud, Millett, Mulligan, Mullin, Neilon, Newell, Noyes, Peabbles, Perkins, Picher, Pierce of Farmington, Pierce of Houlton, Plummer, Pollard, Roberts, Robinson, Russell of Lewiston, Small, Smith, Tate, Thibodeau of Fort Kent, Trafton, Turner, Ward, Waggatt, Webb, Welch, Wheeler, Wilkins, Wilson, Woodman, Wyman—75.

ABSENT—Hanson of Saco, Haraden, Watts—3.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-three having voted in the affirmative and 75 in the negative, the House has sustained the veto of the Governor and refuses to finally pass the resolve.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing and altering the road in Pleasant Ridge plantation in the county of Somerset. This resolve is returned to this House by the Governor unsigned, with the following message:

"To the Honorable House of Representatives:

House Document No. 56, in favor of Pleasant Ridge plantation, introduced

by Representative Dutton of Bingham, is returned herewith unsigned. I have no objection to the amount of the resolve or the purpose of expenditure; but the objection is on account of the uncertainty of the amount you will provide for ways and bridges, as previously stated in my veto message regarding resolve in favor of the town of Dresden. I have urgently requested Representative Dutton the advisability of recalling these bills, and, as he declined to do so, I have no alternative but to return the document unsigned.

OAKLEY C. CURTIS,
Governor."

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is, shall this resolve be finally passed notwithstanding the objection of the Governor? Under the Constitution this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays. All those in favor of the final passage of this resolve, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor, when their names are called will answer yes; all those opposed will answer no. This requires a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to this House. The clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Albert, Allen, Ames, Averill, Beal, Benn, Besse, Blake of Oakland, Bonney, Bradbury, Bragdon, Brann, Bussey, Campbell, Carson, Chaplin, Chamberlin, Clement, Cobb, Coffin, Dalgic, Danforth, Dilling, Drummond, Dutton, Ellis, Evans, Fay, Ford, Gould, Grant, Greateon, Greenlaw, Hanson of Sanford, Harper, Hart, Higgins, Holt of Gouldsboro, Jordan, Lawrence, Libby, Littlefield, Mansir, McKinley, McNally, Meader, Mitchell, Morrison, Morse, Nicholas, O'Connell, Perham, Peterson, Ranney, Ricker, Russell of Alfred, Ryder, St. Clair of Calais, St. Clair of Rockland, Sanborn, Snow, Tabbutt, Thombs, Tobey, Towle, Tuttle, Varney, Washburn, Waterhouse, Wescott, Wise—71.

NAY—Ballard, Bernier, Blake of New Gloucester, Bourque, Brawn, Brown of Auburn, Brown of New Sharon, Chadbourn, Clifford, Colcord, Connellan, Connors, Corliss, Currier, Davis, Descoteaux, Douglass, Drapeau, Durgain, Edwards, Fossett, Gallagher, Gerrish, Gilmour, Goldthwait, Gooding, Goodwin, Greeley, Greenleaf, Haskell, Hill, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Holt of Skowhegan, Jameson, Leader, Lewis, Lord, Maxwell, McCarty, McCarrison, McCurdy, McIntire, Michaud, Millett, Mulligan, Mullin, Neilon, Newell, Noyes, Peabbles, Perkins, Picher, Pierce of Farmington, Pierce of Houlton, Plummer, Pollard, Roberts, Robinson, Russell of Lewiston, Small, Smith, Tate, Thibodeau of Fort Kent, Trafton, Turner,

Ward, Wasgatt, Webb, Welch, Wheeler, Wilkins, Wilson, Woodman, Wyman—75.
 ABSENT—Erskine, Hanson of Saco, Haraden, Lombard, Watts—5.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-one having voted in the affirmative and 75 in the negative, the House refuses to finally pass the resolve, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve appropriating money to aid in the improvement of highway in Caratunk plantation which has been returned to this House by the Governor without his approval, together with the following message: "To the Honorable House of Representatives.

"House Document No. 55 in favor of an appropriation for highway to aid Caratunk plantation introduced by Representative Dutton of Bingham is returned herewith unsigned. I have no objection to the amount of the resolve or the purpose of the expenditure, but the objection is on account of the uncertainty of the amount you will appropriate for ways and bridges, as previously stated in my veto message regarding resolve in favor of the town of Dresden. I have urgently requested Representative Dutton the advisability of recalling these bills, and as he declined to do so I have no alternative but to return the document unsigned.

"OAKLEY C. CURTIS,
 "Governor."

The question before the House is, shall this resolve be finally passed notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? This requires under the Constitution a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to this House, and the vote will be taken by the yeas and nays. All those in favor of passing this Resolve, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor, when their names are called will answer yes; all those opposed will answer no. The clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Albert, Allen, Ames, Averill, Beal, Benn, Besse, Blake of Oakland, Bonney, Bradbury, Bragdon, Brann, Bussey, Campbell, Carson, Chaplin, Chamberlin, Clement, Cobb, Coffin, Dagle, Danforth, Dilling, Drummond, Dutton, Ellis, Evans, Fay, Ford, Gould, Grant, Groaton, Greenlaw, Hanson of

Sanford, Harper, Hart, Higgins, Holt of Gouldsboro, Jordan, Lawrence, Libby, Littlefield, Lombard, Mansir, McKinley, McNally, Meader, Mitchell, Morrison, Morse, Nicholas, O'Connell, Perham, Peterson, Ranney, Ricker, Russell of Alfred, Ryder, St. Clair of Calais, St. Clair of Rockland, Sanborn, Snow, Thombs, Tobey, Towle, Tuttle, Varney, Washburn, Waterhouse, Wescott, Wise—71.

NAY—Ballard, Bernier, Blake of New Gloucester, Bourque, Brawn, Brown of Auburn, Brown of New Sharon, Chadbourn, Clifford, Colcord, Connellan, Connors, Corliss, Currier, Davis, Descoteaux, Douglass, Drapeau, Durgan, Edwards, Fossett, Gallagher, Gerrish, Gilmour, Goldthwait, Gooding, Goodwin, Greeley, Greenleaf, Haskell, Hill, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Holt of Skowhegan, Jameson, Leader, Lewis, Lord, Maxwell, McCarty, McCarrison, McCurdy, McIntire, Michaud, Millett, Mulligan, Mullin, Neilson, Newell, Noyes, Peabbles, Perkins, Picher, Pierce of Farmington, Pierce of Houlton, Plummer, Pollard, Roberts, Robinson, Russell of Lewiston, Small, Smith, Tabbutt, Tate, Thibodeau of Fort Kent, Trafton, Turner, Ward, Wasgatt, Webb, Welch, Wheeler, Wilkins, Wilson, Woodman, Wyman—76.
 ABSENT—Erskine, Hanson of Saco, Haraden, Watts—4.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-one having voted in the affirmative and 76 in the negative, the House refuses to finally pass this resolve, notwithstanding the Governor's veto.

The following bills, petitions, etc., were presented and, on recommendation of the committee on reference of bills, were referred to the following committees:

Agriculture.

By Mr. Holt of Skowhegan: An Act to amend Section four of Chapter 35 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to the manufacture, transportation and sale of dairy products and their imitations. (Ordered printed and referred.)

Education.

By Mr. Tobey of Eliot: Resolution of John F. Hill Grange representing 136 members favoring An Act to provide for the distribution of State school funds.

Placed on File.

By Mr. Webb of Cherryfield: Remonstrance of the Men's Bible Class of the First Baptist church of Cherryfield against the proposed amendment to the Sunday observance law.

Judiciary.

By Mr. Wilson of Levant: Remonstrance against House Bill No. 144, in regard to registration of physicians and surgeons, signed by Charles R. Perkins and 25 others; also remonstrance against same signed by A. W. Clark and 16 others; also remonstrance against same signed by W. L. Gordon and 27 others; also remonstrance against same signed by John Dyer and 24 others; also remonstrance against same signed by C. H. Brown and 25 others.

By Mr. Millett of Belfast: Resolution from Seaside Grange representing 98 members, relating to telegraphs, telephones and other public utilities.

By Mr. Ward of Augusta: of Capital Grange representing 200 members relating to same.

By Mr. Jameson of Friendship: Of Limerick Valley Pomona Grange representing 400 members relating to same.

By Mr. Bonney of Bowdoinham: Of Sagadahoc Grange representing 151 members relating to same.

By Mr. Tate of Topsham: Of Merry-meeting Grange representing 183 members relating to same.

By Mr. Westcott of Bluehill: Of Lakeside Grange representing 129 members relating to same; of Verona Grange representing 161 members relating to same; of New Century Grange representing 111 members relating to same; of Frederick Robie Grange representing 82 members relating to same; of Pleasant Valley Grange representing 68 members relating to same; of Massapaqua Grange representing 120 members relating to same; of Wilson Valley Grange representing 53 members relating to same; of Norland Grange representing 249 members relating to same.

By Mr. Tate of Topsham: Of Topsham Grange representing 220 members relating to same.

By Mr. Peabbles of Cape Elizabeth: Of North Scarboro Grange representing 161 members relating to same.

By Mr. Ricker of Castine: Of Alamoosook Grange representing 70

members relating to same; also of Castine Grange representing 147 members relating to same.

By Mr. Lawrence of Fairfield: Of Victor Grange of Fairfield representing 220 members relating to same.

By Mr. Gerrish of Greenville: Of East Sangerville Grange representing 100 members relating to same.

By Mr. Higgins of Brewer: Of Highland Grange representing 89 members; of Mattanawcook Grange representing 140 members; of Olamon Grange representing 65 members; of Penobscot Grange representing 108 members, relating to same.

By Mr. Besse of Clinton: Of Clinton Grange representing 285 members, relating to same.

By Mr. Pierce of Houlton: Of Houlton Grange representing 1058 members, relating to same.

By Mr. Blake of New Gloucester: Of Cumberland County Pomona Grange, representing 2022 members, relating to same.

By Mr. Brown of New Sharon: Of New Sharon Grange representing 91 members, relating to same.

By Mr. Tobey or Eliot: Of John F. Hill Grange of Eliot representing 136 members, relating to same.

State School for Boys and Industrial School for Girls.

By Mr. Grant of St. Albans: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ripley for passage of an act to establish a reformatory for women; also petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Albans, in favor of same.

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Higgins from the committee on appropriations and financial affairs, reported "ought to pass" on resolve in favor of Arthur C. Smith, secretary of the committee on State School for Boys and Industrial School for Girls, for expenses of that committee on a visit to the boys' school.

Mr. Russell from the same committee, reported "ought to pass" on Resolve in favor of Peter Harmon of Thorndike.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass," Resolve in favor of Levite V. Thibodeau.

Mr. Lord from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on Resolve in favor of James J. Clement of Montville.

Mr. Morse from the committee on banks and banking, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to amend Chapter 119 of the Public Laws of 1907, relating to banks, institutions for savings, trust companies and loan and building associations.

Mr. Wescott from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to amend Sections 4, 7 and 8 and adding Section 12 to Chapter 65 of the Public Laws of 1911, relating to the department of labor and industry.

Mr. Descoteaux from the same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to amend Section four of Chapter 87 of the Public Laws of 1911, relating to employment agencies.

Mr. Greenleaf from the committee on legal affairs, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 55 of Chapter 79 of the Revised Statutes, relating to exceptions and motions for new trials.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 71 of Chapter 79 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the jurisdiction of the superior Court for Cumberland county in divorce cases.

Mr. Thombs from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to extend the rights, powers and privileges of the Barrows Falls Light and Power Company.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act additional to Chapter 201 of the Private and Special Laws of the State of Maine for the year 1911, relating to the Guilford Water District.

Mr. Hanson from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Chapter 522 of the Private and Special Laws of 1897, establishing the Sanford municipal court, as amended by Chapter 340 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to legalize and confirm the incorporation and doings of the Congregational Church Society of Stonington

and to change the name of said corporation.

Mr. Hill from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Lincoln Light and Power Company.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Lincoln Sewerage Company.

Mr. Thibodeau from the committee on library, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" Resolve in favor of a History of Pemaquid, of Bristol.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act in favor of an appropriation to restore the early records in the office of the clerk of courts for York County.

Mr. Dutton from the committee on mercantile affairs and insurance, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act providing for punishment of offences against habitations and other buildings.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 25 of Chapter 28 of the Revised Statutes of 1903, relating to appointment of inspector of buildings.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act requiring reports from property owners in case of fire and fixing liability of owners under certain conditions.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act relating to qualifications of insurance agents.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act prohibiting the rebating of premiums of fire insurance.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act providing licenses for adjusters of fire losses.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to extend the time in which the Maine Title Insurance Company is authorized to commence business.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act relating to cancellation of in-

surance agent's license for over-insurance.

Mr. Greenleaf from the committee on revision of statutes, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 91 of Chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes, relating to guide posts at crossings of ways.

Mr. Clifford from the same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 81 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to sealing milk bottles and jars.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Chapter 31 of the Revised Statutes by including shooting galleries in the provisions thereof.

Mr. Greenleaf from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to repeal Chapter 64 of the Revised Statutes, relating to masters, apprentices and servants.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 20 of Chapter 67 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the distribution of personal estate.

Mr. Conners from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 11 of Chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the determination of highway boundaries which are doubtful, uncertain or lost.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 40 of Chapter 66 of the Revised Statutes, relating to notices of appointment by executors and administrators.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to repeal certain obsolete sections of Chapter 26 of the Revised Statutes, relating to fences of common fields.

Mr. Greenleaf from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 43 of Chapter 66 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the appointment of an agent or attorney by non-resident executors or administrators.

Mr. Wilson from the committee on salaries and fees, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to fix the salary of the governor.

Mr. Ford from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act

to regulate the employment of subordinates by legislative committees.

Mr. Sanborn from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to fix the salaries of the judge and recorder of the Eastport municipal court.

Mr. Goldthwait from the committee on sea and shore fisheries, on petition of Albert M. Graves and 41 others of Topsham, Elmer G. Powers and 40 others of Topsham and Albert F. Adams and 19 others of Bowdoinham, reported bill, An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 251 of the Special Laws of 1904, as amended by Chapter 28 of the Special Laws of 1909, entitled "An Act for the better protection of alewives, shad and sturgeon in the various rivers of Maine."

Mr. Hodgkins from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act for the better protection of clams within the limits of the town of Harpswell, in the county of Cumberland.

Mr. Gooding from the committee on taxation, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to exempt neat stock thirty months old and under and all sheep and swine from taxation.

Mr. Besse from the committee on ways and bridges, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" Resolve in favor of aid in repairing highway in town of Concord.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" Resolve in favor of repairing the main highway leading from the town of Franklin, in Hancock county, to the town of Cherryfield, in Washington county.

The reports were accepted and the several bills and resolves ordered printed under the joint rules.

Mr. Hanson from the committee on legal affairs, on bill, An Act to amend Section 11 of Chapter 221 of the Public Laws of 1913, relative to the time of closing the polls at primary elections, reported that the same "ought not to pass," the subject matter being embodied in another bill already before the legislature.

Mr. Thombs from same committee, on bill, An Act to repeal Chapter 215 of the Private and Special Laws of 1887, and amendatory of Chapter 281 of the Private and Special Laws of 1901, relating to Eastern Maine Institute, reported leave to recommend that the same be referred

to the committee on education.

Mr. Welch from the committee on salaries and fees, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act relating to the compensation of justices of the supreme judicial court.

Mr. Lawrence from the committee on State lands and forest preservation, reported "ought not to pass" on Resolve authorizing the land agent to convey certain lands in Township No. 5, Range 4 (Lynchtown) in the county of Oxford.

Mr. Gooding from the committee on taxation, on bill, An Act to exempt live stock from taxation, reported that the same "ought not to pass," the subject matter of this bill being included in another bill.

Mr. Brawn from the same committee, reported "ought not to pass" on bill, An Act increasing the amount of exemption from taxation on musical instruments. (Tabled pending acceptance on motion by Mr. McCarty of Lewiston.)

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought not to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Chapter 163 of the Public Laws of 1905, as amended by Chapter 29 of the Public Laws of 1907, relating to taxation of soldiers and sailors.

The reports were accepted.

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves.

House 302: An Act to provide for a closed time on bull moose. (This bill received its second reading, and on motion by Mr. Washburn of Perry the vote was reconsidered whereby it received its second reading and on further motion by Mr. Washburn the bill was tabled and specially assigned for consideration on Thursday of next week.)

House 307: An Act to amend Section 11 of Chapter 211 of the Private and Special Laws of 1895, as amended by Chapter 101 of the Laws of 1909, relating to salaries of Judge and recorder of the Bangor municipal court.

Mr. Hill of Corinth moved that this bill be recommitted to the committee on salaries and fees.

Mr. THOMBS of Lincoln: Mr. Speaker, coming from the county of Penobscot I am naturally interested in this matter pertaining to our municipal court at Bangor, and I wish to say in respect to

the general motion to recommit this matter, while not a member of the committee on salaries and fees which had this matter under consideration, I believe that the matter came to them in the regular way, was properly advertised and that a fair hearing was had upon the matter. Now, unless the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Hill, can assign some good and sufficient reason for asking the recommitment of this matter I would most respectfully request, in order to expedite the business of this session, that this matter be now left in its present state and that any arguments against it be presented to the House so that we may all be able to judge upon the merits of the question. If we are going to send all these matters back without any good and sufficient reason being shown for so doing, I think we will not be able to adjourn here in sufficient time to do our haying this summer.

Mr. HILL: Mr. Speaker, one reason for opposition to this measure is that I am opposed to the increase in the salary of the judge of the municipal court from the present amount provided. I understand the judge of that court at present is receiving \$1500, and he knew what it was when he took the position.

Mr. THOMBS: Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order. I think the gentleman is out of order and is discussing the merits of the matter.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will sustain the point of order. The merits of the question are not in order for discussion.

Mr. HILL: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say only I would like to have it recommitted so that we may have a hearing upon it and that the matter should come before the committee. In the interest of Penobscot County I would like to have Mr. Gallagher make a few remarks upon the question.

Mr. GALLAGHER of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the recommitment of this bill to the committee for this reason, at the time of the hearing there were members of the delegation from Penobscot County who were anxious to be heard in relation to the matter but who were occupied with other committees and for that reason were not able to be present, through no fault

of theirs. Also since the report of the committee has been made there has been a protest entered to the committee by certain interested people in Bangor, and I do not believe if the bill has any merit that some hope it has that the report will be much different. I think in justice to the members of the delegation who would like to be heard, that it would be best to recommit the bill and I am heartily in favor of recommitting it.

The question being on the motion of Mr. Hill of Corinth, that the bill be recommitment to the committee on salaries and fees,

Mr. Thombs of Lincoln called for a division.

A division was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Hill, that this bill be recommitment to the committee on salaries and fees. All those in favor of that motion will please rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have returned the count.

A division being had, 65 voted in the affirmative and 63 in the negative.

So the motion prevailed, and the bill was recommitment to the committee on salaries and fees.

House 324: An Act to amend paragraph two of Section 13 of Chapter nine of the Revised Statutes so that the same may conform to Paragraph one of said Section as amended.

House 325: An Act to amend Section 54 of Chapter two of the Revised Statutes, relating to the bond of the Treasurer of State.

House 326: An Act to amend Section 47 of Chapter two of the Revised Statutes, relating to the notification of appointment and qualification of justices of the peace, trial justices and notaries public.

House 327: An Act to amend Section 25 of Chapter three of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 138 of the Public Laws of 1905, relating to the printing of the reports of the State Departments.

House 329: An Act to amend Section 53 of Chapter 66 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the duties of executors and administrators.

House 300: Resolve in favor of the

secretary of the committee on Indian Affairs to defray expenses of said committee in visiting reservations at Pleasant Point and Oldtown.

House 301: Memorial to Congress relative to retirement and pension of civil service employees. (Tabled pending its second reading for filing of statement of facts on motion by Mr. Ryder of Brownville.)

House 303: Resolve in favor of Sarah A. Robinson of Mt. Vernon.

House 304: Resolve in favor of Annie L. Durham of Belfast.

House 305: Resolve providing a state pension for Hannah M. Condon.

House 306: Resolve in favor of Elias Lyons.

House 309: Resolve to provide for improvement of highway in the towns of Greenwood and Woodstock.

House 317: Resolve for aid in building highway bridge across Carrabassett river in the town of Kingfield.

House 318: Resolve in favor of aid in building a bridge in the town of Crystal. (Tabled pending its second reading on motion by Mr. Campbell of Island Falls.)

House 319: Resolve in favor of building a road around Cook Hill, in the town of Jackson.

House 320: Resolve in favor of Aroostook River Bridge in the town of Ashland.

House 321: Resolve in favor of repairing highway in the town of Solon.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Senate 120: An Act additional to Chapter 48 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the borrowing of money and pledging of securities as collateral therefor by savings banks and institutions for savings.

Senate 121: An Act to amend Section 21 of Chapter 48 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 69 of the Public Laws of 1907, relating to deposits in savings banks and institutions for savings in the names of married women and minors.

Senate 122: Resolve in favor of the Western State Normal School at Gorham for furnishings for the new dormitory.

Senate 123: Resolve in favor of the Western State Normal School at Gor-

ham, for the completion of the partially constructed dormitory.

Senate 126: Resolve in favor of the Arrostook State Normal School at Presque Isle, for repairs.

Senate 127: Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal School for Construction and equipment of a suitable building for the Household Arts Department.

Senate 128: Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal School for completing the furnishings of the new dormitory.

House 270: An Act to amend Section nine of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the taking of suckers, eels, hornpouts and yellow perch with eel pots, traps, spears or nets.

House 295: Resolve in favor of Frank Francis, representative of the Passamaquoddy Tribe of Indians.

House 296: Resolve in favor of Edgar S. Fossett, secretary of the committee on state prison.

House 297. Resolve in favor of the clerk, assistant clerk, messenger, assistant messenger, mail carrier, first folder, doorkeeper and pages of the 76th Legislature for attendance at the organization at the 77th Legislature.

House 298. Resolve in favor of the Board of Dental Examiners. (Tabled pending its second reading for filing of statement of facts on motion by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon.)

House 299. Resolve in favor of Leonard A. Pierce, chairman of the House committee on elections.

Passed to Be Enacted.

An Act authorizing the town of Richmond to change its burying ground

An Act to amend Section 30 of Chapter 359 of Private and Special Laws of the State of Maine for the year 1897, relating to support of certain paupers and minors in the towns of Stonington and Deer Isle.

An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of

1913, relating to fishing in Otter Pond in the town of Bridgton in the county of Cumberland.

Finally Passed.

Resolve in favor of the People's Ferry Company for maintenance.

Resolve providing an increase of State pension for Cynthia S. Andrews.

Resolve appropriating money for the reconstruction of Lord Bridge over Marsh Stream in the town of Frankfort. (Tabled pending its final passage, and specially assigned for consideration on Thursday of next week on motion of Mr. Plummer of Lisbon.)

Resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing highway in the town of Otisfield, and providing for the future maintenance thereof.

Resolve appropriating money to aid in the construction of a bridge across the easterly part of the west channel of Sebec river in the town of Milo. (Tabled pending its final passage, and specially assigned for consideration on Thursday of next week on motion of Mr. Plummer of Lisbon.)

Resolve appropriating money to aid in the construction of a bridge in the town of Montville. (Tabled pending its final passage, and specially assigned for consideration on Thursday of next week on motion of Mr. Plummer of Lisbon.)

Orders of the Day.

Mr. Colcord of Portland presented out of order the following order, which was objected to by Mr. Higgins of Brewer:

"Ordered, that no bill or resolve carrying an appropriation of money shall be finally passed prior to the 16th day of March next."

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that this order is now out of order, and can be received only by unanimous consent.

The order being objected to, failed of passage.

Mr. LAWRENCE of Fairfield: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition at this time.

Mr. THOMBS of Lincoln: I would like to inquire of the gentleman to what the petition relates?

Mr. LAWRENCE: It is the petition of Helen M. Merrill of Gardiner, Maine, and all the other patients in the sanatorium for tuberculosis at Fairfield, and is addressed to the Honorable Governor, the Senate and House of Representatives.

The petition was received, and on further motion by Mr. Lawrence the same was sent to the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Report A and Report B from the Committee on Legal Affairs, on bill, an Act to repeal Chapter 221 of the Public Laws of the year 1913, "An Act to provide for the nomination of candidates of political parties by primary election," and amendments thereto. This was placed on the table by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, pending the acceptance of either report, and Feb. 25 was specially assigned for its consideration.

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Higgins, by agreement with him, I originally tabled this matter; and in view of the lateness of the hour, I would move that it be re-tabled and assigned for such day as the gentleman from Brewer would like.

And the motion prevailed.

On further motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton, March 4th was assigned for the consideration of these reports.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, resolve in favor of the town of Bridgton, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, pending its second reading, and specially assigned for today. (Re-tabled by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon pending receipt of statement of facts in accordance with Rule 50 of the House Rules.)

Mr. SANBORN of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire the present status of House bill No. 328, which is the so-called 54-hour bill, as reported by the committee. I supposed it would be in order for its first reading this morning.

The SPEAKER: I am informed by the Clerk that it was left off the calendar inadvertently. It was tabled yesterday by Mr. Fay for printing of the new draft pending acceptance of the report of the committee. It is here printed.

Mr. SANBORN: Mr. Speaker, if I may call the attention of the Chair and the House to that document as it appears on our desks. It will be found that in section 8 the printer has made errors which render that section entirely unintelligible. This is a document for which there is a large call, and I believe that before we can give it consideration we should have the bill in such form that we can know what those provisions are. I am in some doubt as to the proper method of getting at the situation; but it occurs to me that it might be treated as though it had not yet been returned from the printer, it not having been returned in proper form; and it might be enough if the Clerk were instructed to return the document to the printer and have the printing properly done. I think this should be done before we consider the bill.

The SPEAKER: Without objection, the Chair will instruct the Clerk to return this to the printer for correction.

There being no objection, the Clerk was so instructed.

Mr. DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, I understood yesterday that this matter was to be taken up today; and I would like to know why it is not to be.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will inform the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Descoteaux, that the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Sanborn, states to the House that there is an error in printing the bill; that the printed bill on the desks of the members is not correctly printed; and at the suggestion of the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Sanborn), without objection on the part of the House, the Clerk has been instructed to return the bill to the printer for correction. In the ordinary course

the bill would be returned to the House again tomorrow morning, I assume. The bill was tabled by the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Fay, and, under the usual courtesies of the House, it would be subject to his control. I think the understanding was that the bill was to be considered as soon as possible after it was returned.

Mr. DESCOTEAUX: I want it taken from the table and assigned as soon as possible, and I supposed it would be done today.

Mr. SANBORN: Mr. Speaker, I may say that I have had conversation with the gentleman from Dexter, and understand it was his purpose, if I got him correctly, to assign next Wednesday for its consideration, which can be done very readily when it comes back from the printer, which will probably be tomorrow morning.

On motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer,

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.