

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Legislative Record

OF THE

Eighty-First Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1923

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, March 22, 1923.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Dunnack of Augusta.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

From the Senate.

The following communication:

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor

Augusta, March 20th., 1923.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the 81st Legislature:—

I herewith return to you without my approval.

An Act to create the Kennebec Reservoir Company and define the powers thereof.

My reasons for vetoing this measure have been given to you in detail in a message that I delivered in person this forenoon at a joint session of the Senate and House.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) PERCIVAL P. BAXTER,

Governor of Maine.

Came from the Senate that body passing the Bill notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that this act go along notwithstanding the objections of the Governor, and I desire to express myself briefly upon the matter.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. MAHER: "And I was afraid and went and hid thy talent in the earth. Lo, there thou hast that is thine."

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: To discuss the objections to this measure now pending, one is not confined to the printed message before us, because flowing from that have been certain objections which have been discussed, not necessarily included in the message itself, which we hear from those about us and which, if I understand them, take form as follows.

There has been no objection to the bill itself, no defect pointed out in the measure under consideration, except the inference that it is faulty in

this regard; that there is no time limit in the act itself within which the company formed thereunder must begin operations.

Now, gentlemen, I wish to state at the very outset in that regard—and every member of the joint committees who heard this measure will recall that I am literally giving the exact facts—that the representative from Fairfield, Mr. Weeks of the Judiciary Committee, interrogated the representative of the proponents of this measure as to whether or no he would have any objection to incorporating into the act that very provision. His answer, given immediately, was, "not the slightest." It was then asked him by Mr. Weeks, "Would you be satisfied or have any objection to a two-year limit?" "Not the slightest," was the answer, "but we would want the two-year limit within which the company must begin operations, to date from the time that the act went into effect, making allowance for the 90-day period, subject to referendum. That, then, was the position of the proponents; not the slightest objection, in fact, welcomed the suggestion.

The committee discussed that very phase of it in executive session and it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that either this measure was a meritorious and serious proposition to develop and to help utilize the great natural resources of this Kennebec, or else it was not; either that it was a thing of substance and of value or it was not; and that if it was, it was simply carrying coals to Newcastle to tack on to this thing of great value, this thing of enormous and inestimable worth, to say that it would not be of any worth to them unless they started operations within two years. It was simply considered that it was unnecessary, and there was never an objection on the part of the proponents, or dissention, or any disagreement in that particular. The committee deemed that it was simply an unnecessary addition to the act itself. And furthermore, that the non-use of the franchise granted by this enabling act could be absolutely met by any succeeding Legislature, if there were no disposition to avail themselves of that which we all believe is of substantial worth and which some people say is of enormous value.

The only other objection to the form of the bill that I have heard, flowing from the objection as set

forth by His Excellency, is that there is no control of the rates of this company in the Public Utilities Commission. Now, gentlemen, that is catching on its face if it is sound. Is it sound? This is not a profit-making company nor a profit-making plan. This is the co-operative development by the power users on this river, and it is not conceivable that those power users on the river are going to need the protection of any regulatory commission, the Public Utilities Commission, to regulate themselves, as a corporation created under this act, or overcharging themselves as corporate users and individual users of the power. They do not need to be protected from themselves. They are never going to make rates so exorbitant as to cripple and destroy the very ends of the development.

Ah! Then comes in this objection. Why, a public utility, one of the incorporators here, from the company, might make a contract with itself in the shape of one of the incorporators of this act, it might make an unfair contract with regard to the price which it would pay for power. It might be perfectly willing to quote a price which would be unfair, and that price that it would pay for power to that company, if it was incorporated, would have to be passed on to the consuming public and that would be reflected in the increased cost of electric lights, or of the electric power which is sold in the various communities. Now that objection, if it is sound, is a very serious objection. Let me state that again. It has been seriously urged, as an objection by one who is a leading authority upon the proposition of public development, that this act is faulty in this regard; that it does not provide for the Public Utilities Commission to have authority to regulate the rates, and it is said, why, a public utility company down the river, one of the incorporators here can make a contract with this great Kennebec Reservoir Company for power to be furnished it at a rate that will be unreasonably high and, inasmuch as that corporation the public utility will not have to pay it itself whatever the price is. That will be passed on to the public and thereby they will make indirectly an unfair profit out of the public.

Now, gentlemen, that is serious if sound, but it is unsound, and it is as unsound as the most of the objections

which I have heard bruited to this measure, and here is the reason—and every lawyer in this body, and, I believe, almost every layman in this body, will at once perceive the underlying fallacy, the sophistry of that objection; a public utility, such, we will say, as the Central Maine Power Company, one of the incorporators, in common with every other public utility, is under the direct rate making and control of our Public Utilities Commission and will continue so to be, and that public utility cannot make a contract, either for wages for its president, or for its secretary, or for any of its officers, nor can it make any contract which enters into the basic elements of rates, that is not subject to the revision, control, and direction of the Public Utilities Commission. Why, gentlemen, if that objection were sound a public utility corporation, so minded, could make unfair rates, could vote a salary of \$100,000 a year to its president and a salary of \$50,000 a year to its first vice-president, and so on, and could pass the cost of those outrageous salaries to the consuming public; and would not all of those contracts enter into the basic question of rates; and how long do you think that the Public Utilities Commission would permit such a contract for wages, such a contract for salaries, to stand? That contract would be vitiated, would be non-approved, and the rates would be ordered to be brought to what would be fair with reference to a fair contract for the power that a public utilities company would be getting from this Reservoir Company. So, in the last analysis, the objection that this development company, this Storage Reservoir Company, is not under the control of the Public Utilities Commission, fails. It is not sound.

The Public Utilities Commission has no right now to control the profits of the Lockwood Company, it has no right to control the profits of any private corporation, but it does control absolutely the profits and the contracts and the agreements when it controls the rates of public utility companies, and you need not worry that any private corporation, like the Lockwood Company, or the Shawmut Company, or the Hollingsworth and Whitney Company, you need not worry that any private corporation, is ever going to be charged any undue rates for the contract for the power furnished, because every cent that they charge for power is passed

on to the cost of the finished product, or else it is taken out of labor. There is no getting away from it, and if it is passed on in the shape of excessive prices that they are paying for the cost of the finished product, pray tell me, where do they get off in the matter of competing with any other industry that is not paying excessive rates. That objection vanishes into thin air, gentlemen, if you will bring to it just the plain test of common, ordinary, horse-sense.

Now what is the next objection that we have heard? It has been seriously suggested here that, while the State under this act possess the right, after 50 years, to take over this company for the actual cost of the development, that that provision is meaningless and therefore that this is an irrevocable franchise. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this assembly, I never will stand up in public, nor will I advocate in private, the granting to any company of an irrevocable franchise. I do not think it should be done, and if there is any better way to limit it and to make it revocable than to put into the measure granting approval the specific limitation of fifty years and couched in the very limitations and words of the Federal act, I do not know how you can do it.

"But," comes the answer—let us be fair, gentlemen—"the State cannot take over this company at the end of fifty years without a Constitutional amendment. Now let us see! The State could take over the physical property, it could take over the developed storage reservoir, could it not, without any constitutional amendment. Now one of two things. Either it can or it cannot. Now which will you have it, that you cannot? Well, then gentlemen, they are immediately reduced to what seems to me to be an absurd dilemma. Can this Legislature, representing the State of Maine, in one breath give something that is of enormous value, that is created out of thin air by some mysterious legerdemain, this State, acting through you gentlemen, creates something of enormous value and gives it to this corporation, and yet it cannot take it back.

Now you cannot give what you have not got, can you? Either the State has power to create this company, with the powers that are set forth, or it has not. Now, if it has the power, then it has it now under the Constitution, without any amendment. It has it now.

Otherwise it could not give it. "Oh," someone will say, "that is all right, but the point is this: they could take over the physical property up there, they could take over the storage dam, but it would not give them any power then, except by a Constitutional amendment, they would not have any right, the State would not, as a political entity, have a right to charge rates, to be in the business." That is true, gentlemen. The State would not have any right, under our Constitution today, to tax the power that comes down, and results from, this development. Nor would it have any right to impose a charge, but this State has, gentlemen, the solemn right of contract. This State, made up of the great aggregate of the individuals, possesses exactly that right of contract, and all that this company has after it is created is the right to control with the power users, and every bit of return that this company gets is by virtue of contract. I am sure that the State possesses, without Constitutional amendment, the right of contract, and do you believe that there will ever come a time, whether it be 25, 35 or 50 years from now, when the state of public feeling and public opinion is such that it is decreed that the State desires to take over this development and authorizes, through its Legislature, the Chief Executive to take the initiative in that regard and to consummate the proceedings necessary to take it over and get ready to pay whatever the assessed value or the actual cost value is by assessment, do you believe that there will ever be a Legislature or a Chief Executive so devoid of the elementary principles of business or the elementary instincts of business as to say, "We will pay you the cost of this and we are all ready now, and the State treasurer will draw his check and the State will then own this, and after we have paid for and have got the property, we will then discuss with you whether or not you gentlemen will renew your contract and how much you will pay us?"

Do you believe it? I do not. I am inclined to think that a Legislature acting through a proper agency of government of a Chief Executive who was carrying out the mandates of law, would not so reverse things, would not so get the cart before the horse, but first, before there was a penny paid, before there was a transfer of a thing of value to the State or the payment therefor of a single cent, that he would first ascertain by definite, binding, legal contracts, just what the State was to

get from the power users of the future. Do you not believe it? I do.

Now then, it has been said that the issue right here today is "private or public." I do not think that is an accurate statement of the issue of private or public ownership and development. I think the real issue, gentlemen, is "development or delay." That is what it is, and just for a few moments bear with me until I look at that. Everybody, every adult in this State who has given one instant's thought to this proposition, must have absolutely agreed upon this: That there is imminent need, that there is a great, great demand, for development of our natural resources. Conservation and development are two words that sometimes get mixed up. Conservation! It is a loud-sounding word, and it is a good word. It is all right, provided we take it in its strict sense. If you mean conservation in order to utilize, I am with you. If you mean conservation in the sense that it would have been used by some men during the late period who got a little too much sugar or a little too much flour in accordance with the federal regulations, I would say it was hoarding.

Now what has the State of Maine been doing? We have been conserving for 103 years. This priceless heritage that we have been discussing, has been conserved in the State of Maine in all of its glory, in all of its value, for 103 years. And if this priceless heritage stays up there, as you are asked to leave it, if it possesses all of those elements of such value that you are charged with giving away for nothing to this creature that you are here forming, why, I say, gentlemen, that if it has possessed all of that value, what are we getting for it today? What is the State of Maine realizing out of it? What have we realized out of it for all this long period of a century or more? This thing of incalculable value has been right up there, the two banks of that river, that power site, and the State of Maine, and I do not believe that the State of Maine can build a mile of roads or aid an institution, I do not believe that it is half as practical for immediate purposes, as the \$500,000 in the contingent fund that we have heard so much about. You cannot draw upon it; you cannot pay the door-keeper or the messenger to this House, from the value of it.

In other words, until it is translated from fiction into fact, why, it is a fiction. It is a question of development or delay. We all believe that it should be utilized. Now, what does the prop-

osition, aside from the economic side of it, of public development, mean? Be practical, gentlemen. Aside from any proposition of economies or the wisdom of going into private business, you cannot have development of that proposition, or of any such proposition, in less than six years. How can you? If this Legislature unanimously passed the Constitutional amendment which His Excellency urges, that does not make it a law. It has got to go to a solemn referendum of the people. And let us say that they unanimously adopt it. Then the State has potentially the ability to go into private business. Then what happens? It goes back to the next Legislature which will be here two years from now, and that Legislature would frame some sort of a deal to take advantage of it and would provide for a bond issue in order to get the money. Again, gentlemen, you have got to go to a solemn referendum of the people before you can bond this State, and that is four years more. And then it is referred back to the next Legislature for definite action. And so, gentlemen, look ahead. In six years from now you see the next succeeding Legislature to the one immediately following this, discussing, after we have assumed the passage of the Constitutional amendment,—and how many gentlemen here believe that the Constitutional amendment provided for and urged, will pass this session? Be fair, gentlemen! How many of you believe that the Constitutional amendment suggested will get a two-thirds vote of both branches?

We are not discussing academic questions. You are here as practical men. What man opposed to this pending bill, in his heart of hearts and on his judgment as a man, believes that the Constitutional amendment now before this Legislature will pass? And if it does not pass then you have added at least two years more before we can have public development. Now, gentlemen, I say, the issue is development or delay, and that the—not that it was ever intended—but that the absolute and irresistible conclusion of an unanimous support of this veto measure, would be the indefinite postponement of development on this river for a period of six, and, probably, if the most happy auguries in favor of public ownership prevail, I say a delay of at least eight years before there would be a shovelful of earth turned or a move made.

Now, gentlemen, is there anything that is inherently and viciously wrong with private development? Is this some new thing? We are told that

tois is the turning point, the parting of the ways. Let us see, I think we reached the turning point on that a number of years ago. I think that in 1903 when the Ripogenus proposition was endorsed, was nearer a turning point than 1923, because it is from small beginnings that great results entail as oak from acorns grow, and in 1903 exactly this same proposition—except that the interests of the State were not so well safeguarded—was frowned upon in the east; and in 1909— I think 1909—the Azisecos proposition, exactly the same except that the State did not own any lots, was developed. That was nearer the parting of the ways than 1923.

Let us get nearer home. In 1921 we are near enough so that it is within the memory of all of us, and near enough so that it was within the vote of many of us, and near enough so that it was within the veto of some of us, and in 1921 there was passed a proposition parallel in its extent, for the development and utilization of the great Aroostook powers. In 1921, 1909, 1903, there was not found to be anything inherently vicious in private development.

Now, gentlemen, I will take but a moment more. Have you heard any great clamor from this State in your vicinity that the Ripogenus development was not welcomed, and that it has not been giving very great satisfaction? Does anybody believe that the Azisecos on the Androscoggin development has not materially added to the great industrial development of that thriving valley? Have you heard any great criticisms? Has there been any uprising in the Androscoggin valley? Has there been any great repudiation, any stamp of disapproval upon the men who gave away the sacred heritage? Now, then, I think you find nothing in precedent, nothing in performance, that indicates that private development is wrong.

But if you want better authority than that, I ask you not to go back to the dim lights. Let us not go back to the beginning in Ripogenus, or the further one on the Androscoggin, or the later one in 1921. Let us come right down to this Legislature, and let us examine what we have before us. His Excellency, in his veto message upon this pending bill which we seek for the development of the Kennebec, urges the passage of a Constitutional amendment, and I am not aside from the question and I am not discussing anything else than the question, when I refer to the Constitutional amendment,

because it is made a part of this veto message.

Read it. It is Senate Document 107, and I am at this instant simply addressing myself to this proposition, that there is nothing inherently wrong, that there is nothing vicious, that there is nothing that the State of Maine can find fault with in the private development. I have cited you the precedence and I now state you the prophecy, and I refer you to the Constitutional amendment which the Chief Executive urges us to pass, "the conservation, storage and control by the State or by a duly authorized public district or districts thereof or other agency, public or private, of the waters within the State are paramount public uses and for the benefit of the people of the State." The Chief Executive urges the passage of that Constitutional amendment which says that the development and utilization of the waters of this State are paramount public purposes whether done by the State or by private agencies.

Now why blow hot and blow cold regarding the words private agencies in there if there is anything inherently wrong in private development. Let us take some further evidence to the point. Let us take His Excellency's inaugural address. You have it before you. His Excellency's inaugural address, delivered before you here on the floor of this hall upon the fourth day of January, 1923. What did he say? "Shall charters be granted to private companies to develop water storage"—and I quote exactly—"The end to be sought is full utilization of Maine's water resources, for every water horse power developed, whether used for public or private purposes means that our people and industries thereby become less dependent upon the coal supply. We all want development and if the State does not undertake it, private interests should be allowed to do so, with the State's interests fully safeguarded."

You are asked here, gentlemen, right in line with that inaugural, to permit private development on this river, with the State's interest so safeguarded that there has not been a single objection to that measure except that which I referred to at the outset.

I said the issue was development or delay. Take the inaugural I have just referred to and delivered upon the day that I referred to, and note another clause: "If our present financial condition warranted our doing so, I should advocate both a

water storage constitutional amendment and an act supplementing it and conditioned upon its adoption by the people. Knowing what I do about the State's finances, I do not believe that we at present should ask for an appropriation or for a bond issue for water storage." I said the issue was development or delay.

The Chief Executive says that knowing the conditions he would not ask. I ask any opponent of this pending measure what he sees on the horizon to indicate that there is going to be any increase of the State's revenue or any improvement of the State's finances in the next two years, that would warrant the same Chief Executive going before the next Legislature and saying, "The glowing condition of our State's finances make it now advisable, and I think the people are ready and willing to stand an additional bond issue, and I recommend it." Development or delay! The same conditions, gentlemen, that obtain today will obtain two years from now and I doubt not will obtain four years from now, and no man can dispute that.

The people of the State of Maine are groaning under the proposition of taxes, not the fault of anybody, but the result of the conditions of the time, and of general economic conditions, and I do not believe that the State's finances, immediate or prospective, give any hope or promise that those words will not be exactly as sound two, four, or six years from today as they were upon January 4th, 1923.

Now gentlemen, it has been said that the State gets nothing out of this, that it gives away valuable lots and gets nothing in return. I addressed myself to that once before and I will not weary you on another occasion. This bill provides that this company will not get one lot of land or one thing of value until an impartial tribunal has assessed the damages and the value at its exact equivalent in money, and until this company pays therefor dollar for dollar and cent for cent. The State does not get anything? Why, gentlemen, the development of that storage reservoir up there immediately adds to the value of the State of Maine a great taxable property, and they have not asked as some companies have definitely asked, for the exemption of a single bit of property, personal or real, from taxation. The development of this storage reservoir will add taxable property all down this river, and is

the State getting nothing out of that?

Then one thing more. Under the answer of the judges given two years ago, it is possible for this Legislature, under the Constitution, without an amendment, as it exists today, or for any Legislature that wants to, to impose a franchise tax on all of these companies, and I suggest that instead of waiting until there comes a time that the State possibly will want to go into the business of development of power, that this Legislature or those interested in returns for the State, direct their attention to a fair franchise tax and then you are providing something that the State can get. The State of Maine can never get anything after it goes into the business. It cannot get any profit. Every cent,—assuming that the State was ready tomorrow to do work there, the State could not get any money benefit except through charging the users. Now is it going to charge them so as to make a profit and make it easy for some of the other departments of State to realize in taxes a profit that will help them to defray their expense? Why, the moment they increase the prices upon that power that is coming down that river, they destroy the very end that they are seeking, namely, the encouragement of industry. There is no possible objection to this measure that has not been voiced. I think you will agree with me that every objection that could be made to this measure has been made. This bill has been pending before the Legislature for weeks, and from the beginning to the end of the measure there has not been found one single fault with the bill except that the State has not the right to take over the power at the end of fifty years, and I think I have answered that. And the only objection is the basic one that the public wants to go into the development and that the public wants to go into business.

Nothing is wrong about private sources developing this power because the Constitutional amendment provides it and the Governor's inaugural does. In behalf of the industries along this river we do not feel that there is any reason why the precedent set in the east at Ripogenus, followed upon the Androscoggin Valley, and only two years ago given to Aroostook, and in this Legislature with reference to the non-profit, making companies for the potato growers, we do not see why that same principle

should not apply to this great central part of Maine. The central part of this State is eager and anxious for the benefits that the Androscoggin has had and that the Ripogonous has had, and that Arrostook has had, and we do not believe that you are giving away Maine's last great inheritance, because that inheritance as it is now is a fiction and we ask you to translate that fiction into a fact.

Mr. BARTLETT of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, I will not take time to go into the merits of this bill, but I will say that when I read it I read it very carefully and raised objections to one or two of its provisions. In the new draft which came out, those are taken care of and I could not see why the State in every way was not protected under its provisions.

I come from a city on the Kennebec river. I know its industries and I know that those industries, and the city itself, are dependent upon the development of this water power. When you look along the Kennebec Valley, look at your cities: what keeps them? I am informed that if this bill goes through and the power is equalized that in my own city it would mean a development of at least another million dollars in manufacturing and building. And does not the State get a revenue from that? Everything under this bill is taxable. The State gets its revenue. Are we going to leave it, the river, the development of the city, and everything, for a time, to see whether the State as an institution itself is going to enter into the development thereof?

From going over the conditions, from what has happened within the last two years, I, personally, cannot see that the State is going to undertake it, and as the previous speaker has said, it is either (this bill or stay where you are and not go ahead.

Mr. CUMMINGS of Portland: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: Unfortunately I have been in very poor physical condition to participate in this debate, and even if I were in the best of health I do not anticipate that I could prevent the passage of this bill over the veto of the Governor. Nevertheless I should be false to my sense of duty if I did not stand here and in such manner as I am able, voice my opposition.

The gentleman from Augusta (Mr. Maher) has proven himself a most excellent advocate of the parties inter-

ested in this bill, but there is another side to this question and this matter is not as complex as you would be led to believe by the manner in which he has set forth what he considers to be the questions at issue. It is true, and we all realize it, that there are two conflicting opinions in the State with regard to water rights and water development. On the one hand we have those who believe that these purchase powers and these rights should be retained by the people and developed by them. The reason why they feel that way is because where any public utility has been developed by private interests the conditions surrounding their development have been such that they have become burdensome in their charges upon the people of the State of Maine. By various methods of stock issues and methods which they have adopted to increase their charges through overcapitalization those things become a great burden. The people of this country today have no doubt of the wisdom of having acquired the coal power years ago.

Now the next great power in this State and in this nation and in this world is the hydraulic power that is to be developed from water. The time will come when the coal fields are exhausted but the power developed in this other way will continue as long as water runs down hill, and these two schools of thought are divided upon that issue; whether or not this also shall pass into the hands of private interests or whether it shall be retained for public benefit.

However, we are not directly discussing that question today. It is involved in this without question, but the question today in relation to this particular bill is whether it is wise for the State to grant the right which is asked for. I could not help feeling amused, although I am not feeling much like laughing, but I could not help feeling amused when the gentleman from Augusta (Mr. Maher) said that this was not a profit-making concern. I suppose, then, gentlemen, that it must be a charitable institution. I had an idea that it was for profit. I had an idea that they were doing this for profit, and I feel very sure that that is the case, and that he is mistaken. When figures show that the yearly value of this development which they propose to make is \$480,000.00, it seems to me that there is an element of profit-making involved in this question.

Now aside from the policy of public

development, let us consider the wisdom of this from the standpoint of private development. If these people had come to this State and had said, "You own that great right out there on that river; you have the key to the situation at the head of Long Falls; that is where a dam has got to be constructed to develop this; we desire to develop this great storage power for the benefit of ourselves and for the benefit of the State; and we are willing to pay the State an annual rental which is fair and just for this privilege;" if they had come there with that proposition it would have been quite different. But no, they come here with a proposition to take this great right as a gift, for that is what this bill means. The only remuneration which the State would receive is merely what they get out of the land damage per acre for this, and it amounts to nothing. It is not worth considering at all. But it will cost them \$1,200,000 to develop this proposition. That includes, by their own estimate, the entire cost of the dam and of all the damages incident to the development of this proposition.

Now, you can allow them \$60,000 yearly interest on the cost of this development and you have got \$240,000 left. Suppose they had come to the State and had said, "We will lease this from you for 50 years and we will pay you an annual revenue of \$200,000 per year. That will give us \$200,000 per year and that will give us in the 50 years which is covered by this bill, \$10,000,000 net and it will give the State \$10,000,000 net in that 50 years." That would have been a fair proposition. Why, gentlemen, you know that the old saying is that half is fair even among hogs, and that would have given them all the profit they are entitled to.

I want to ask the members of this House, before they permit this bill to become a law, to think of what the State could do if this were put up as a fair proposition, if the State were to have \$200,000 a year rental for this, representing to the parties that develop this thing a very great income, very great indeed, notwithstanding the fact that the gentleman says that this is not a profit-making concern. I want to ask them to consider if it would not be worth while to have that income to reduce the taxation of the State. I want to ask the farmers here who use the third-class roads, if they do not think that \$200,000 a year derived from that source and appropriated to the prob-

lems of the third-class roads of Maine, would be worth while. Ten millions of dollars in fifty years; it is hard for me to believe that the members of this House will vote to absolutely give away a thing of so great value, and it is absolutely unfair for those people to come here with any such proposition as this.

Kill this bill, gentlemen. Then in two years if they come here with a fair proposition, something that has some merit of equality in it, something that will give the people of this State a fair and equal part, something that will give them some element of justice in the taking over and development of this great privilege, then we will consider it.

Mr. BARWISE of Bangor: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I have listened with very close attention to the gentleman, from Portland (Mr. Cummings) and I have admired the beauty of his fanciful painting of all of those wonderful values that he has built up, but let us now get down from these rose-tinted clouds to the face of the earth and look at this thing in its real light.

We cannot get into the business as a State until we have had a Constitutional amendment adopted, and I believe that I know something about the temper of the people of the State of Maine with regard to passing Constitutional amendments to go into business, into a Socialistic scheme. I do not believe that the State of Maine will go into any sort of business as a political entity. We on the Penobscot know something of this sort of proposition. The people of the Andro-coggin region know something of this proposition. Has anybody who is opposed to this measure pointed out in any way where the State was injured either by the Aziscoos development or the Ripogenus development? Has anybody put their finger on one single spot where the State as a whole was injured by these developments?

On the other hand, have they not immensely increased our manufacturing possibilities, has not our manufacturing output increased by the development from twenty to thirty per cent on account of this standardized flow of water? This measure is not a profit-making measure in the usual sense that these people are going to develop the power and sell it to the citizens of the State of Maine. This is a profit-

making measure, if you want to term it in that way, for the people of the Kennebec Valley, for all of the manufacturing interests in the Kennebec Valley. It is a method of aiding nature to control the water during the springtime and hold it over until the drouth. That is all there is to it. Everybody up and down the Kennebec river, whether they are these varied interests that have already put their money in and helped the State of Maine in their business development, or not, will benefit. I am not one of those who are afraid of big business development. I wish we had a little more of it in the State of Maine. Not only these big firms, but everybody up and down the Kennebec river, all along this river property, who owns a foot of land, up and down the river, will participate in the rights of this development. Whether they come into this company or not, makes not the slightest difference.

All of us attorneys know, and I think you laymen know, that any man who owns land on the bank of the Kennebec river, has an inalienable right to take full advantage of that water power, to the use of that water in any power he may develop. Now, the value at the present time to the State of Maine of this water privilege is absolutely nil. The real value to the State of Maine is absolutely nothing, and as to the prospective value, after the State goes into this business after a Constitutional amendment comes up, which is extremely doubtful, after we do get into business, which is the theory of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Cummings) nobody has pointed out how we can make any money.

The very able and closely reasoned argument of the Chief Executive, which I enjoyed very much, was a fine piece of work, but it rested upon a fundamental fallacy. The fallacy was that this proposition was now worth millions of dollars. The fact is that it is not worth a cent until developed, not worth one cent until developed. Now if the State should develop it, in this long-drawn out and distant plan, what more can the State do with it than this private company is going to do. What more can Nature do, through a dam erected by the State than she can do through a dam erected by this Company? Will not the State of Maine get the same ad-

vantages no matter who builds the dam?

It seems to me that this is an utterly fanciful picture that the opponents of this bill are putting up. The practical situation, as it has actually worked out on the Ripogonus and the Androscoggin, is that it is a great aid to the public development of the State of Maine and I hope this measure will pass notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

Mr. HOBBS of Hope: Mr. Speaker: I would like to know if there are any members here who are not lawyers who can talk in favor of this measure. All we have heard so far has been from lawyers and I should like to hear from somebody other than a lawyer on this matter.

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker: I resent the implications cast upon the great profession of which I am a member. I am a lawyer and I am proud of it. I am the son of a lawyer and I am proud of it. I have been in the courts ever since I was a lad and I cannot sit here and hear a man cast aspersions on the profession of which I am a member.

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I propose to say a few words on this question relating to Androscoggin Valley. It is well to consider facts before you consider fancies. I think it is a fair proposition to consider the question over a period of ten years, and the reports of the census will show that agriculture in the State of Maine has declined, its population has decreased, its tax rate has more than doubled, and its taxable wealth has not increased in proportion with its tax rate. I think that is a sound proposition, that is susceptible of proof. The farmers of Aroostook are here at this Legislature saying that they are practically bankrupt. The greatest industry in this State upon which the prosperity of everyone of us rests, faces bankruptcy. Its shares sell for less than forty cents on the dollar. They are owned by the people of Maine. They are in every savings bank in Maine. Every depositor in every savings bank has an interest in them.

Now then, the only bright spots in the State of Maine are the two communities—and I wish to give credit to the city of Lewiston—are the communities of Lewiston and Auburn, and upon what does their prosperity depend? It depends upon a great

storage dam, built at the headwaters of that river, and we are happy and prosperous, and at work, earning wages, doing our best and willing to do more, and that is what the storage dam at the headquarters of the Androscoggin has done for the cities of Lewiston and Auburn. You can go up and down its valley and the people are prosperous and that is about the only prosperous place in the State of Maine, as near as I can find out.

Now, then, I am perfectly willing that the Kennebec Valley shall be developed; that the cities of Augusta and Waterville and the town of Skowhegan shall have more power, and I say, gentlemen, that you might as well come down to facts. We are in a position here now where we are either going to advance with our natural resources or we are going to let them flow idly, gently, down to the sea through the mists, and back again to the woods, and down to the sea again. Wealth is only produced by the labor of men and I sincerely hope that this measure will receive practical, common sense treatment.

Mr. GAGNE of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not a lawyer but I am a great friend to the lawyers when those lawyers are working for the benefit of the people of this State. We need something like my friend from Auburn, Mr. Wing, said, in Androscoggin Valley. The gentleman from Portland (Mr. Cummings) said that the State of Maine depends on the farmers. Well, the farmers in Androscoggin Valley are getting their living from the people of the cities and when the people of the cities have to pay their bills they have got to get the money from the mills and factories, and if those factories have to shut down half of the year, those people are cut down in their earnings and are unable to pay their bills and by their not paying their bills the farmer would not be able to sell their crops. I would like to see the people of Kennebec get what the people of Androscoggin have got, and all over the State the same.

Mr. PIPER of Jackman: Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Pinkham and Gentlemen of the House: I want to say I am not a lawyer, I am a lumber-jack. (Applause.) I wish to say a few words in favor of Senate Bill No. 146, also known as the Kennebec Reservoir Company, as I feel that it is my duty, knowing the matter under consideration to be of

great importance to the constituency which I represent, and to the industries of the Kennebec river.

Similar reservoirs have been constructed on the other great rivers of the State, proving to be a greater success even than those who constructed them considered they would. There are reservoir dams on the Penobscot and Androscoggin rivers, and those who know say that they have been of great value to the various industries on the same.

The men named as incorporators in this bill are men of the highest standing in this State, men whose ability and standing cannot be questioned. Can anyone in this House say that these men and the companies represented by them, have not kept faith with the State and with the people in the history of Maine's industrial activities? These companies represent all the water power development on the Kennebec river so far as I know.

Section two gives the company the power to issue stock, not to exceed \$2,000,000. Section three gives the company power to build dams and construct booms, side dams and other necessary things for the economical driving of logs.

I think it will be well for me to explain at this time the matter of log driving. Perhaps there are a few in the House who have driven logs, and know about log driving; but there are many who do not. I have driven logs in various streams and rivers for several years, and perhaps my experience will be of some benefit to members of this House who have never driven logs. I want to say at the start that log driving is wholly a matter of judgment, and, if this company did not have the power to drive logs this charter would be of little benefit to the incorporators. If this storage dam was constructed and every firm or corporation had the right to use that water as it liked it would be of very little use to anyone. I have seen men who have had charge of a drive use five times as much water as was needed, which would leave the storage dam empty before the drive was half out, while other men, with good judgment, would drive a large amount of logs on very little water. I presume that is the reason why this charter called for log driving, and it is absolutely necessary to have log driving rights connected with this dam for the economical use of the water. Presumably Mr. Cummings

believes there is something wrong because this charter called for log driving; but I want to say from my experience, that it is absolutely necessary that this company have these log driving rights in order to conserve the water for future use.

Section four gives the company the right to store water and hold it, except what is necessary for log driving, for the benefit of the incorporators. It also gives them the right to trade with future developments which is a fair proposition, and something they should have because of the great investment of money needed to construct this storage dam.

Section five gives the Company the power to purchase the dams, booms and piers and other apparatus which the Kennebec Log Driving Company now have, which is necessary for this Company to be able to drive logs in an economical way, as two companies could not operate on this river and economically use the water, which is to be conserved for the benefit of the water powers down the river, and necessary to make this storage dam a success.

Section six is simply a continuation of Section five, and gives the Company the right to drive logs and so forth after they have purchased the rights on said river of the present log driving company.

Section seven states the manner and time in which drives shall be made.

Section eight states the price this Reservoir Company shall charge for the driving of logs, and I want to state that the men who have logs and timberland in this area which will be driven down this Dead River, and by this Reservoir Company, came before our committee and stated that they were satisfied with the price and conditions, and not all of those who are incorporators of this Reservoir Company are the ones who have logs and timberland in this area. When the lumbermen on the Kennebec River are satisfied with the price they must be very near right.

Section nine simply states the manner and time of payment for log driving.

Section ten is the question of scale, stating that those who have logs to drive shall make a return to the Company of the amount they have.

Section eleven states that and gives the Company the right to pur-

chase, gives the other companies who drive logs the right.

Section twelve gives the right to purchase, or take by the laws of eminent domain, such land and flowage as is necessary for the construction of this dam, and to carry out its purposes as a log driving and storage proposition; it also gives them the right to change the present highway and build a new highway, and also to remove bodies from cemeteries which will be flowed out by this reservoir dam. I would like to say that the town of Flagstaff will be wholly flowed out if this dam is constructed, and the agents of the proposed company have now taken options on all the property which will be flowed out, satisfactory to the owners. I mailed copies of this bill and notified my constituents of the time of hearing and not one came down here to oppose it. I have talked with several who live in that section of the country, and they say they are well satisfied, and that the prices given in the option are satisfactory.

Section thirteen states the manner of assessing damages on Public Lots and places, the matter being largely up to the Governor and Council. I do not feel that the State's rights will be neglected by our present Governor and Council, or that it could be placed in better hands.

Section fourteen states the manner, etc., of removing the bodies from the present cemetery to a new one outside of the flowage area.

Section fifteen states the manner of its stock issuing and so forth.

Section sixteen states the manner and also the kind of stock and bonds it may issue for the building and development of the storage dam.

Section seventeen gives the State the right to purchase the storage dam and its rights after fifty years without any payment being required for the franchise.

Section eighteen states the Company shall not generate any electricity or dispose of its property or franchise to any corporation without authority to do so.

Section nineteen states the manner of calling meetings, etc.

Members of the House, can you see anything wrong in granting this charter? Previous legislatures have granted similar charters to others, and I feel that it should grant this charter for the benefit of the pres-

ent industries on the Kennebec River, and not only to the industries alone, but for the benefit of the men and women who work. If this charter is granted it will mean steady work the year around, while now they are laid off a great deal of the time on account of the lack of power caused by low water.

The people who will be flowed out are satisfied; the log driving interests are satisfied; the incorporators are willing to make this large expense for the benefit to themselves.

The working people on the Kennebec river will receive at least \$200,000 a year in additional wages and do you see any reason why this bill should not pass? I think we should put it over.

Mr. HALE of Portland: I call for the previous question.

Mr. CUMMINGS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word before you put that.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman, Mr. Cummings, will speak to the motion of the previous question.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: I trust the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Hale) will temporarily withdraw his motion in order that the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Cummings) may again speak.

Mr. HALE: If the Chair will allow me the privilege, I will be glad to withdraw my motion in order that Mr. Cummings may again have the floor.

Mr. Cummings of Portland having been granted the privilege of the floor spoke as follows:

Mr. CUMMINGS: Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to say a few words. I did not want it to be left in the minds of the members of this House that those who are opposed to this bill are opposed to a storage development. We are interested in all these things and to have these valleys prosper and blossom as a rose; but tell me why this should be bestowed upon this corporation as a gift? If a fair and just annual rental should be paid for the use of this great privilege it would accomplish all of these great and desirable purposes that the proponents of this measure have set forth. It will not lessen them one iota, and I see no reason why, giving these people this opportunity to make this development, they should not pay to the State, the people of the State who own this privilege a fair and just compensation.

Mr. MARTIN of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I only wish to say a few words, and I feel that I should, coming from the district that is affected greatly by this proposed thing. I want to assure the gentleman from Hope (Mr. Hobbs) that, while I am a lawyer, I speak not from the legal aspect upon this matter. I speak for the people of this city and of this county. I feel that a steady flow of water throughout the year means a great deal to the citizenship of this central part of the State. During the dry season and the flood season many workers in the different mills are out of work and depression comes over this territory; and, when depression comes, it effects the whole State, for what benefits one section of the State, benefits every section, and what hurts one section hurts every section. And speaking, not for any industry or corporation, but for each man and each woman who works in the numerous mills along this Kennebec, and speaking for the merchants who benefit because of the steady work that those mill operatives will receive, and speaking for the farmers who also are benefitted, I urge and I trust that this bill will receive passage. (Applause.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Brownville: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: We live in a time when we either go backward or forward. We have a world outside of us that seems to be going forward at quite a rapid pace. We not only travel in teams, we travel by automobile; we have the telephone, the wireless and many other things that are an advancement, and the State of Maine has got a man who can veto more bills than any Governor we ever had; but we have a question here before us today that has to do with the development of the State of Maine. We have something that, if it is passed, will give employment to thousands of men who will build homes and make our communities more prosperous. So far as I am concerned, I do not live anywhere in the vicinity of this river, but I am just as anxious for the development of the State of Maine as though I lived there, and I know the sentiment of the people of the county I live in. They are for it and we hope that this Legislature, and I believe they are in the right mood, not to allow anyone to trig the wheels of progress as we go along. (Applause.)

The SPEAKER: The question shall

this bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? It is a Constitutional question and requires a ye and nay vote. As many as are in favor of this bill becoming a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor will answer yes when their names are called. Those who wish to sustain the veto of the Governor will answer no when their names are called. Is the House ready for the question?

The question being called for, the Clerk called the roll.

YEA—Adams of Litchfield, Archibald, Atwood, Ayer, Baker, Bartlett of Hanover, Bartlett of Waterville, Barwise, Belliveau, Benoit, Bickford, Blaisdell, Boman, Boulter, Bradbury, Brett, Brown, Burns, Cates, Chalmers, Cherry, Clarke, Conant, Crafts, Curtis, Pain, Dilling, Douglas, Downing, Dudley, Dunbar, Edwards, Farley, Fickett, Finnell, Foss, Gagne, Gagnon, Gamage, Gardiner, Gauvin, Gile, Gillespie, Goldthwaite, Gordon, Granville, Greenleaf, Hale, Hallett, Hamilton, Hammond, Hayford, Heal, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Holmes, Houghton, Hutchinson, Jacobs, Jewett, Johnson, Jones, Jordan of Cap, Elizabeth, Jordan of Westbrook, Keef, Kitchen, Knight, Lamson, Leathers, Leland, Lord of So. Portland, Lord of Wells, Ludgate, Macomber, Maher, Martin, McDonald, McIlheron, Melc, Moody, Morrison, Nadeau, Nevins, Newcomb, Nichols, Oakes, O'Connell, Overlock, Owens, Palmer, Pendleton, Perkins, Phillips, Pinkham, Piper, Plummer, Ramsdell, Ranney, Ray, Reed, Rounds, Rowell, Sanders, Saunders, Sayward, Siddall, Smith, Staples, Stevens, Stitham, Stratton, Thomas of Chesterfield, Thomas of Leeds, Tilden, Townie, Weeks, White, Whitney, Willis, Wing, Wood—121.

NAY—Adams of Liberty, Beckett, Bisbee, Brewster, Crowley, Cummings, Dunn, Gilmour, Hayes, of Chelsea, Hayes of Gorham, Keene, Littlefield, Morse of Bath, Nickerson, Perry, Pierce, Rogers, Small, Sparrow, Storm, Sturris, Tarr, Williams, Winn, Winslow—25.

ABSENT—Drake, Morse of Greene, Story, Teague—4.

The **SPEAKER**: One hundred and twenty-one having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed notwithstanding the objections of the Governor and becomes a law.

From the Senate: Final reports of the committees on commerce, counties, Federal relations and manufactures.

In the House, reports were accepted in concurrence.

Papers from the Senate were disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Public Utilities on Bill, An Act relating to the registration and inspection of vessels on inland waters, reporting that same ought not to pass as the subject matter is covered by another bill.

In the Senate, the report was read and accepted.

In the House the report was read and accepted in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Crafts of Greenville, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it accepted in concurrence the report, ought not to pass; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was tabled, pending acceptance of the report in concurrence.

Senate Bills In First Reading

Senate 164: An Act relating to the expenditures of the Department of Public Schools.

Senate 217: An Act to amend the purpose of the Maine Institution for the Blind.

From the Senate: Bill, An Act to amend Section 51 of Chapter 82 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapters 73, 211 and 227 of the Public Laws of 1917, as amended by Section 51, Chapter 181 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to trial terms of the Supreme Judicial Court.

This was passed to be engrossed in the House, March 19.

In the Senate, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Lubec: **Mr. Speaker**, I move that we insist and that a committee of conference be appointed; and with your permission I would like to speak to the members on just what this bill is.

The **SPEAKER**: The gentleman (Mr. Saunders) may address himself to the motion.

Mr. SAUNDERS: **Mr. Speaker**, I have not been very noisy in this session, but there are a few men here who, whenever a lawyer gets up and speaks, they raise their voices, their hands, their eyes, and their hair in holy horror and look askance at whatever we say.

I want to say that House Bill 382 is a Washington county measure. It is a bill that concerns only the people of Washington county, and it is to reestablish the term of our Supreme Judicial Court which was taken away without notice to the Washington County Bar, or without any notice so far as I am able to learn to anybody except one attorney, and he was a member of the judiciary committee at that session. That term was taken away and there was not a member of the Bar knew about it. The county commissioners did not know about it, neither did the clerk of courts; and the lawyers kept on drawing their writs, returnable at the January term of that court and we discovered after the writs were drawn that our court had been abolished. Now the reason why we did not know it was on account of the ambiguous title. The title is this: "An Act to amend Section 51 of Chapter 82 of the Revised Statutes, relating to trial terms of the supreme judicial court." Now then, I ask you gentlemen if you had been an attorney in Washington county, or a citizen in Washington county, if you would have expected to have had that term taken away, especially when there had never been any demand for it. We have always had the three terms before. Now what position do we find ourselves in? We find our jail with five prisoners in it, one at least was there the last of October, and he must remain there until May; and I have no question but that when these five prisoners come before the grand jury there will be no indictment found against them, though under our Constitution they are entitled to a speedy trial.

Furthermore than that, in civil matters there is great danger that material witnesses may die; and I would move, Mr. Speaker, that we insist on our former action and that a committee of conference be appointed. I believe that this has come out of the Senate like a bolt from a clear sky, and I do not feel that the Senators knew when they voted to postpone this, with the exception of one who I will say is a layman, and who appeared before our Washington county delegation.

The SPEAKER: The motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Saunders, is that the House insist on its former action and that a committee of conference be appointed. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed, and the Chair appointed as such conferees, Messrs. Saunders of Lubec, Weeks of Fairfield, and Wing of Auburn.

On motion by Mr. Granville of Parsonsfield, which was received out of order, it was voted that the clerk of the House read the notices at this time.

(The Clerk read the notices.)

Message from the Governor

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents veto from the Governor.

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor

Augusta, March 22, 1923.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the 81st Legislature:-

I return herewith without my approval

An ACT to Accept the Provisions of the Congress of the United States Approved November 23, 1921, Entitled "An Act for the Promotion of the Welfare and Hygiene of Maternity and Infancy and for Other Purposes."

My views on the Sheppard-Towner Bill are well known. I reaffirm the position that I took when on July 17, 1922 I issued a formal proclamation in which I declined to accept Federal Aid for maternity and child welfare work in the State of Maine.

I protest against the passage of this Resolve:-

Because it is an unwarranted invasion by the Federal Government of the sovereign rights of the State of Maine;

Because it establishes in Washington a Federal bureaucracy that is not likely to be in sympathy with the government of this State and the citizens thereof;

Because it invades the privacy of our homes;

Because it infers that the State of Maine cannot and will not properly care for those of its mothers and children who need assistance.

Because it pauperizes our State.

If the State of Maine refuses Federal Aid and sends forth a strong protest against the expansion of this dangerous and undermining doctrine, all lovers of liberty throughout the nation will take heart. The State of Maine then will be hailed as the leader in the movement to return to the fundamental doctrine of our forefathers, that a state is sovereign and

will brook no interference in its own internal affairs.

If the State's activities are to be handled by officials in Washington I warn our citizens that when they have complaints to make or grievances to be heard they will have small chance of obtaining redress at the hands of Federal office holders.

I want the people of Maine clearly to understand that our State Department of Health is now engaged in the very work called for by the Sheppard-Towner Bill, and that I am in favor of continuing this work under direction of State authorities unhampered by Federal interference. I make the prediction that the day is not far distant when the people of this country will overturn many Federal bureaus and that the States once again will take unto themselves the management of their own affairs.

Maine will not sell its birthright for a mess of pottage.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) PERCIVAL P. BAXTER,
Governor of Maine.

On motion by Mrs. Pinkham of Ft. Kent, the veto message and accompanying papers were tabled, and specially assigned for Tuesday, March 27.

On motion by Mr. Wing of Auburn, 500 copies of the veto message were ordered printed.

The Chair presents veto from the Governor.

STATE OF MAINE
Office of the Governor
Augusta, March 22, 1923.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the 81st Legislature:-

I return herewith without my approval

RESOLVE, in Favor of the Erection of a State of Maine Building on the Grounds of the Eastern States Agricultural and Industrial Exposition Incorporated at West Springfield, Massachusetts.

This Resolve is similar to one passed by the Legislature two years ago and which I disapproved, the Legislature at that time having sustained my veto. The principal difference between this Resolve and the one of 1921 is that this contains a provision whereby certain private interests are to aid the State in the erection of the proposed building.

This does not in any way remove the objections which I advanced in 1921; it but adds to their force for the more elaborate and costly the building the more it will cost the State of Maine to maintain it. This resolve is but the beginning of a great, unwarranted and continuing outlay of the taxpayers' money.

Our State Government is overwhelmed with appeals for funds with which to construct buildings at the State Prison at Thomaston, at the Men's Reformatory at South Windham, at the State Reformatory for Women, at both the Augusta and Bangor Insane Hospitals, at the Home for Feeble Minded, and at practically every institution that the State is supporting. We are struggling along under heavy burdens. It seems to me the height of folly for the State to put \$25,000, or in fact any sum of money whatsoever into a building in Springfield, Mass., or anywhere else outside the borders of the State. The expenses involved in this project are endless, and the sum called for by this Resolve will be but the beginning of an annual outlay that is certain to mount to many thousands of dollars. I cannot think that this Legislature on sober second thought will pass this measure.

I have visited practically every large exposition that has been given in this country since the Chicago Exposition in 1893. My experience has been that if I really want to see the principal worth-while exhibits I invariably have gone through the large buildings where the exhibits are grouped together by hundreds. The smaller state buildings at these great expositions are frequented by a few hundred persons a day, whereas the main buildings are frequented by tens of thousands daily. If an exhibitor desires to properly display his wares in the most favorable location he never goes to a state building to do so. This is the experience of all who have attended and exhibited at the principal expositions of the past 30 years.

State buildings usually become a loafing place for a few state officials and their friends and I can foresee just what will occur at Springfield, Mass., if this Resolve is passed. Our officials will be entertained by those of other states and will entertain in return. The taxpayers will pay the bills. For several years our Department of Agriculture has carried a very creditable exhibit to Springfield. In

fact it has been one of the best state exhibits at that exposition. This has been taken care of out of the regular departmental appropriation. It is now proposed not only to build this building but in addition thereto to pass a special appropriation of several thousand dollars to cover the expenses of the State's exhibits. This is a rapid and undue expansion of what at first was a proper and modest undertaking.

We have about 50 fairs within the State of Maine and every one of them must struggle to keep its head above water. These fairs are managed by patriotic citizens who devote their time to, and put their money into, them for the upbuilding of their respective communities. The State appropriated approximately \$15,000 a year to aid these fairs and the pitifully small stipends they thus receive help tide them over the hard places. You now are urged to make an initial outlay of \$25,000 to erect a State Building in Springfield, Mass., hundreds of miles away from Lome.

There is no reason why Maine should pay tribute to Massachusetts. The invitation extended to us is not unselfish. We are to furnish another attraction to boom Springfield and its exposition. It is strange that the management of the Eastern States Exposition should incur the expense of maintaining a representative at Augusta throughout this session. My only explanation is that they are of the opinion that once the State of Maine is committed to this project, it will continue to pour large sums of money into the coffers of their exposition.

I stood before the people of Maine in 1922 on a platform of economy, and I am consistently endeavoring to live up to that platform. In an attempt to bring the various groups of this Legislature together a fortnight ago I invited into the Council Chamber the members of the appropriation committee, and the Senate and House chairmen of practically every committee that appropriates money. The whole question of the State's finances was discussed, as were the dangers of extravagant appropriations. The conference lasted two hours and adjourned until the day following. We all came together again and an arrangement was made that every committee making appropriations was to keep in touch with the appropriations and financial affairs committee. It was understood that if committees were in disagreement a serious effort would be made to harmonize differences of opinion. It

was the opinion of most of those present that the State tax rate should not exceed 7 mills. It is unfortunate that these conferences were not productive of better results. From what recently has occurred it is apparent, that the Legislature has adopted a platform of its own. Of course it is not difficult to override Executive disapproval, if those interested in different measures join together, but whatever happens the people themselves will decide upon the merits of the case.

It has been alleged that the Executive has interfered with the legislative prerogatives. As a matter of fact there is no such thing as "Executive interference." This is but a phrase of those who fear for their particular projects. It is as much the right of the Executive to veto a bill, as it is the right of a legislator to vote for it. It is for each to do what he believes to be right and for the public interest.

It should not be overlooked that the Legislature is in session only for about three months. The members then return to their homes and leave the government of the State to the Chief Executive for a year and nine months. The administration is known as the Governor's administration, and he must bear the blame or take the credit for it, as the case may be.

In my opinion there is no valid reason for an excessive tax rate and the taxpayers of the State will hold us all responsible for what is done here during the next few days. You already have passed measures over the Executive veto that have added approximately 1-3 of a mill to the tax rate. In doing this you must account to the people not to the Governor. The Governor also must account to the people, not to the Legislature. If the present situation continues, I fear that public disapproval will accumulate throughout the State, that it will not be possible to hold it in check, and that it will overwhelm those who are responsible for unwarranted appropriations.

In closing I desire to say that if the Legislature continues on its present course the tax rate of the State for 1924 and 1925, when our country is at peace, will certainly exceed the tax rate we had during the years of the recent war. I fear it will be embarrassing for those who in 1924 are to appeal to the voters of Maine for their suffrage to account for the condition in which the State will find itself.

No Resolve pending before this Legislature has as little merit in it as, or has greater possibilities for extravagance than, the one I am returning to you.

Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) PERCIVAL P. BAXTER,
Governor of Maine.

Mrs. PINKHAM of Fort Kent: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I introduced this bill, and I am not in the least ashamed of my relationship with it. It has been on a long, rocky road, but I believe it will get there just the same. A bill like this marks the beginning of cooperation between agriculture and the industries, a thing which should mean much to the future of the State. In my humble opinion, it is one of the best means of publicity suggested, inasmuch as it gives an equal chance to all sections and all interests in the State. The only question then is, do we need advertising? It seems there is no doubt of this for, with our great natural advantages which I do not need to enumerate, we should be one of the most prosperous states in the East. But we cannot even hold our own population now. One authority states that we lose an average of 3,000 persons a year. It seems to me it is time to shake off some of the moss of conservatism and tell the world about ourselves, and our State.

In conclusion, I wish to read some facts about the boys' and girls' farm clubs.

"Most people know in a general way that boys and girls of rural communities are interested in club movements, but few persons not intimately associated with these movements realize their scope.

There are in the United States today not less than 500,000 farm boys and girls who are club members and the number increases steadily. Last year these young people raised farm products to the value of \$7,000,000. They raised 301,000 acres of corn, 2,000 acres of potatoes, 31,000 pigs, 3,700 beees, 6,000 dairy animals and 556,000 chickens. They put up 2,600,000 quarts of canned fruits, vegetables and meats. They made 347,000 articles of clothing and 370,000 loaves of fine, light, nutritious bread.

People who have looked upon this movement as a mild way to keep farm children amused have failed to

grasp its importance. The members of these clubs are acquiring specific, practical knowledge of the various branches of the greatest of industries. They are learning to put farming on a better basis, and they like it. Yearly increasing numbers of them go into agricultural and domestic science schools to fit themselves more fully for farm life. They will not labor under the handicaps which made farm life a burden to their parents."

Now do we want the children of this State to receive this great added stimulus in this great work, or do we wish to be left behind in the procession?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Lamoine: Mr. Speaker and members of the 81st Legislature: It seems after all that has been said that it is not necessary for anyone to say more in regard to this bill. It seems as though His Excellency paid the representative from Fort Kent a wonderful compliment when he went into such a long recital against her bill, and I will simply take up one particular matter in regard to this building.

I have before me here genuine orders, and a list of them, that have been given to the Maine Sheep and Wool Growers' Association since they exhibited there last year, an organization of Maine farmers who are trying the best they know how to revive one of the greatest industries of this State. To do that they exhibited at the Springfield Exposition—not a fair—and took orders for thousand of dollars' worth of goods, and since that time, since September 21, 1922, they have had orders from Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Missouri, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Ohio, Maryland, Georgia, Washington, D. C., Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and they claim they never would have received those orders from those different states had they not had a chance to exhibit their wares. There were blankets, suits, cloth, and all of the things that the Maine Sheep and Wool Growers' Association manufacture. This is simply one of the results of advertising outside of Maine what our agricultural and our industrial associations can do.

I just simply wish to say in rebuttal to some things that have been said, or that we have heard read, that the permanent investment, as I call it, of a building, say in four years, will

pay for itself: that at that time the State of Maine will own the land on which the building sets and own the building free, and can get an annual rental out of it which will return to this State money that can be used for any purposes desired; that it is not a permanent expenditure; that it is a permanent investment. And I hope that those within the sound of my voice will realize that a bill endorsed by every associated industry or every association in this State, by the Boards of Trade and the Chambers of Commerce, by every organization that we know,—I hope that that bill will have a passage notwithstanding the objections of His Excellency, the Governor.

Mr. GRANVILLE of Parsonsfield: Mr. Speaker, I move you that this bill go along notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Orrington: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I have already spoken at some length for me in opposition to the enactment of this measure: and I think I made it clear to all of you that my opposition is not on account of any personal reason of my own, but that I am only trying to consider this matter as a purely business proposition and for the interests of the State of Maine at large. I only want to say just a few words at this time. I am not going to talk any more in regard to our pledges to economy nor the hard and seemingly unbearable condition of our taxpayers. If the members of this House feel that our house here in Maine is in order, if they feel that we are properly taking care of our business institutions, including also our University of Maine, if they feel that those institutions are being properly cared for, and that we have the means at our disposal, I would be heartily in accord with this building in Springfield. Personally, I do not think so.

There are one or two things that have not been brought out regarding this bill. I have heard and know of great expositions sometimes going by the boards, although this is probably a remote possibility; but supposing that this institution should at some time fail, of what great advantage would this building be at Springfield?

I have listened with interest to the remarks regarding our boys and girls. I have three boys of my own. I have attended and do attend most of our own agricultural fairs that are within reasonable reach of my home. I see there

their exhibit, and they are doing without question remarkable work. I favor our boys and girls attending our own fairs, exhibiting there first, and that we should expend our money for our own institutions,—fairs of our own,—rather than to go abroad and embark on this Springfield proposition.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, that this measure will be considered on its merits, and I sincerely hope that the veto of the Governor will be sustained.

Mr. LELAND of Sangerville: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to second the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville, and to go on record very briefly in favor of this resolve. I fully believe that our agricultural organizations are unanimously in favor of this resolve, that our farmers generally are in favor of it, and that its value has been fully demonstrated. I believe that the building will afford greater advantages for an exhibition of our products than is now afforded, or can be afforded, in any general building; and I sincerely hope that this resolve will become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

Mr. MORRISON of Phillips: Mr. Speaker and members of this House: I am heartily in favor of this bill becoming a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. I think that in matters of this kind we all want to see the State of Maine that we are all so proud of represented and on the map. The State of Maine, with its surface sprinkled with beautiful lakes, rivers and ponds, its expensive forests and its magnificent mountain scenery, has well been termed the **playground** of the nation. Such matters as these not only affect and promote and benefit the sporting interests of the State, but, as has been said, they benefit the industrial and agricultural interests. We have been content in the past to sit back and let the State of Maine boom itself. Very little time has been spent and very little money along this line; but I have noticed that the people in other states have taken a great interest and spent a great deal of money in booming their native states. I know what booming and advertising and "hollering" has done for the state of California. There are whole colonies from my own Franklin county now living in the state of California, and I think that we should all stand up and boom the State of Maine, and I believe that the benefits that we will receive if this resolve has a passage will be

paid back to the State of Maine many times over. I hope that the resolve will receive a passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Brownville: Mr. Speaker, if private interests in the State are willing to contribute \$25,000 to this proposition, I think the State should do its part. It seems to me that it would be foolish for us to turn down as good a proposition as this. It is not going to be an expense to the State, and it will be self-sustaining and would tend to advertise and develop our State and let people outside know that we are alive.

Mr. HOBBS of Hope: Mr. Speaker, I have always practiced economy in my own affairs and practiced economy in farms affairs, and I favor practicing economy in State affairs; but it does not seem to me that we are going to make any great sacrifice if this bill goes along because it will cost each taxpayer in the State about ten cents apiece and every inhabitant somewhere between three and four cents. I think that the most of the taxpayers in the State of Maine, farmers and everybody concerned, are willing to make this sacrifice. Let them get along without a cigar or a plug of tobacco or a box of cigarettes if they have to in order to do this. I am in favor of its passage.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I did not calculate to speak on this subject; but one thing the Governor has told us in his message, and that is that the State officials will be entertained. Now you all know and everybody knows that the Governor of the State of Maine, with his Council, have to approve every bill that is paid by a State official, and therefore, why should he come in here and tell this Honorable Body that they do not know that he is the one who approves the bills, when everybody knows that they cannot be paid until the Governor and Council have approved them. I am in favor of the passage of this resolve.

(Applause.)

Mr. MORSE of Bath: I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question is, shall this resolve become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? It is a Constitutional question and requires the yea and nay vote. As many as are in favor of its passage notwithstanding the objections of the Governor will answer when their names are called.

Those who wish to sustain the veto of the Governor, will answer no when their names are called. Is the House ready for the question?

The question being called for, the clerk called the roll.

YEA—Adams of Liberty, Adams of Litchfield, Archibald, Atwood, Ayer, Baker, Bartlett of Hanover, Bartlett of Waterville, Barwise, Beckett, Bellevue, Benoit, Bickford, Blaisdell, Boulter, Bradbury, Brett, Brown, Burns, Cates, Cherry, Clarke, Conant, Crafts, Crowley, Curtis, Dilling, Douglas, Dunbar, Dunn, Edwards, Farley, Fickett, Finnell, Foss, Gagne, Gagnon, Gamage, Gardiner, Gauvin, Gilc, Gillespie, Gilmour, Goldthwaite, Granville, Greenleaf, Hale, Hallett, Hamilton, Hammond, Hayes of Gorham, Hayford, Hobbs, Holmes, Houghton, Hutchinson, Jacobs, Johnson, Jones, Jordan of Cape Elizabeth, Keene, Kitchen, Lamson, Leathers, Leland, Littlefield, Lord of South Portland, Lord of Wells, Ludgate, Macomber, Maher, Martin, McDonald, Melcher, Moody, Morrison, Nadeau, Newcomb, Oakes, O'Connell, Overlock, Perkins, Perry, Pierce, Pinkham, Piper, Plummer, Ramsdell, Ranney, Ray, Rounds, Rowell, Sanders, Sayward, Siddall, Small, Stevens, Storm, Thomas of Chesterville, Thomas of Leeds, Towne, Weeks, White, Willis, Wing, Winn, Winslow, Wood—108.

NAY—Bisbee, Brewster, Chalmers, Cummings, Dain, Downing, Gordon, Hayes of Chelsea, Heal, Hodgkins, Jewett, Jordan of Westbrook, Knight, McIlheron, Morse of Bath, Nevins, Nichols, Nickerson, Owens, Palmer, Pendleton, Phillips, Reed, Rogers, Saunders, Smith, Sparrow, Staples, Stitham, Stratton, Sturgis, Tarr, Tilden—33.

ABSENT—Boman, Drake, Dudley, Keef, Morse of Greene, Story, Teague, Whitney, Williams—9.

Affirmative—108.

Negative—33.

Absent—9.

The SPEAKER: One hundred and eight having voted in the affirmative and 33 in the negative, the objections of the Governor are not sustained.

The following resolves were presented, and upon recommendation of the committee on reference of bills were referred to the following committee:

Appropriations and Financial Affairs

Br. Mr. Baker of Steuben: Resolve in favor of Esther M. Sylvester, clerk to the House committee on engrossed bills.

By Mr. Gile of Fayette: Resolve in favor of Roy S. Bacon for services as clerk to the committee on agriculture of the 81st Legislature.

By Mr. Hamilton of Caribou: Resolve in favor of the State Armory at Lewiston.

By Mr. Morse of Bath: Resolve in favor of Louise Stratton, stenographer to the committee on military affairs.

By Mr. Wood of Bluehill: Resolve in favor of Dorothy Hewins, clerk to the committee on education.

By Mr. Barwise of Bangor: Resolve in favor of J. F. Wood, secretary of committee on education, for expense incurred by committee visiting the University of Maine.

By Mr. Wood of Bluehill: Resolve in favor of Bernice Parker, clerk to the committee on pensions.

Reports of Committees

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 19 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to Registration of Undertakers."

Report was signed by the following:

Messrs. BREWSTER of Cumberland,
POWERS of Aroostook,
CRAM of Cumberland,
—of the Senate.

HALE of Portland,
MORRISON of Phillips,
CLARKE of Stonington,
OAKES of Portland,
SIDDALL of Sanford,
HOLMES of Lewiston,
—of the House.

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following:

Mr. MARTIN of Augusta,
—of the House.

On motion by Mr. Hale of Portland, the majority report was accepted, and sent up **for concurrence**.

Mr. Maher from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 269, Public Laws of 1917, and Chapter 219, Private and Special Laws of 1903, relating to Judges of

Municipal Courts being Attorneys at Law and exempting the Eastport Municipal Court from its provisions" reported that legislation thereon is inexpedient.

Mr. Oakes from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to confer certain Additional Powers upon the Municipal Officers of Cities and Towns" reported that same be referred to the next Legislature.

Mr. Siddall from same Committee on Bill "An Act to re-enact Section 24 of Chapter 69 of the Revised Statutes, relating to when no Succession Tax shall be assessed on the Stock, Bonds and Evidences of Debt of Maine Corporations," reported that legislation thereon is inexpedient.

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Piper from Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes, relative to Maine Forestry District by adding thereto a Section."

Report read and accepted.

On motion by Mr. Burns of Eagle Lake, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it accepted the report "ought not to pass"; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the matter was tabled pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. White from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve for the Publication of the Reports of the Attorney General and making Appropriation therefor.

Mr. Gardiner from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill "An Act to provide for a Full Time State Highway Commission, amending Chapter 25 of the Revised Statutes relative to State Highways."

Mr. Wing from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to the Registration of Motor Vehicles."

Mr. Saunders from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relative to the Taxation of Motor Vehicles."

Mr. Archibald from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Section 53, Chapter 211, Public Laws of 1921, relating to Motor Vehicles."

Mr. Weeks from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to amend the Public Laws of 1919,

Chapter 238, as amended by Chapter 222 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to Employer's Insurance Policies."

Mr. Archibald from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 238 of the Public Laws of 1919, as amended by Chapter 222 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to Employer's Insurance Policies."

Mr. Nichols from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to regulate the practice of the System, Method or Science of Healing Known as Naturopathy, creating a Board of Examination and Registration for those desiring to practice the same, and providing Penalties for violation of this Act."

Mr. Archibald from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act creating the State Board of Podiatry."

Mr. Wing from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act in regard to Discharge of Mortgages."

Mr. Morrison from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the North Orrington Cemetery Improvement Association," as the subject matter is covered in another bill.

Mr. Oakes from same committee reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to amend Section 21 of Chapter 24 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the Laying Out of Public Landings."

Mr. Morrison from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to the Manufacture and Sale of Mattresses, Pillows, Cushions, Quilts, or similar articles."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Regulate the Width of Tires on Animal-Drawn Vehicles Used for carrying Heavy Loads on Ways and Bridges."

Mr. Martin from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Section 23 of Chapter 26 of the Revised Statutes relating to Registration of Automobiles."

Mr. Morse from the Committee on Military Affairs reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Section 3 of Chapter 158, Public Laws of 1919, relating to Use of Flag."

Mr. Gardiner from same Committee reported same as the subject matter is covered in another bill on

Bill "An Act to Control the Possession, Sale and Use of Pistols and Revolvers, to provide Penalties and for other purposes."

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Houghton from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Resolve appropriating money for the Repair of the Historic Block House at the junction of the St. John River and the Fish River at Fort Kent, reported same in a new draft under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Maher from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act amending Section 35 of Chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes, relating to Reduction of Bail by Bail Commissioners" reported same in a new draft under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Nichols from same Committee on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the Union Ferry Company" reported same in a new draft under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Hale from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to amend the Charter of the city of Lowell, relative to the Appointment of the City Marshal and Street Commissioner" reported same in a new draft under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Siddall from same Committee on Bill "An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 22 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the Purchase of Sewers by Towns" reported same in a new draft under title of "An Act to enable the town of Kennebunk to purchase an Existing Private Sewer or Drain" and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Martin from same Committee on Bill An Act to authorize the city of Lewiston to issue bonds for the construction of school houses in said city, reported same in a new draft under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Siddall from same Committee on Bill An Act additional to and amendatory of Chapter 211 of the Public Laws of Maine for 1921, relating to lights on motor vehicles, reported same in a new draft under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Clarke from same Committee on Bill An Act relating to the incorporation of the Androscoggin and

Kennebec Railway Company, and the issue of stock by it, reported same in a new draft under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

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

Mr. Boulter from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, reported "Ought to pass" on Bill An Act to amend Section 67 of Chapter 82 of the Public Laws of 1919 in relation to the attorney general.

Mr. Bisbee from same Committee reported same on Resolve authorizing the attorney general to procure pictures of former attorney generals and appropriating money therefor.

Mr. Maher from Committee on Judiciary reported same on Bill An Act to amend Section 30 of Chapter 64 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the issuing of burial and transportation permits by sub-registrars.

Mr. Morrison from the Committee on Legal Affairs, reported same on Bill An Act to incorporate the North Orrington Cemetery Improvement Association.

Mr. Curtis from the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation, reported same on Bill An Act to amend Sections 6, 9 and 17 of Chapter 78 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to Auxiliary State Forests.

Mr. Keene from the Committee on Ways and Bridges, reported same on Bill An Act for expediting highway and bridge construction work under legislative appropriations.

Reports read and accepted and the Bills ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

House 433: An Act to incorporate the North Village Water Company.

House 434: An Act to provide for the preservation of archaeological objects and sites, and for the appointment of a commission of archaeology.

House 435: An Act to amend Section 7 of Chapter 293 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to the director of the sea and shore fisheries.

House 432: Resolve in favor of several academies, institutes, seminaries and colleges for maintenance, repairs and improvements.

Passed to be Engrossed

Senate 155: An Act making it unlawful for any person to have intoxicating liquors in his possession in any public place.

(On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, tabled pending third reading.)

Senate 228: An Act to incorporate the towns of South Thomaston and Owl's Head, in the county of Knox, into a single town.

(On motion by Mr. Rogers of Rockland, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.)

Senate 249: An Act to amend Sections 1 and 5 of Chapter 169 of the Public Laws of 1919, as amended by Chapter 183 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the support and dependents of soldiers, sailors, and marines.

House 381: An Act to amend Section 116 of Chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes pertaining to the right to kill dogs.

House 420: An Act to amend Section 29 of Chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapters 219 and 244 of the Public Laws of 1917, and Chapter 196 of the Public Laws of 1919, relating to transportation of fish under tag without the owner accompanying same.

House 425: An Act to amend Section 15 of Chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes, relating to public utilities.

(Tabled by Mr. Gamage of South Bristol, pending passage to be engrossed.)

House 426: An Act to amend Section 10 of Chapter 118 of the Revised Statutes relating to costs to be taxed for parties and attorneys.

House 427: An Act to amend Section 30 of Chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes relating to preference or rebate as to rates for service.

House 428: An Act to amend Section 63 of Chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1917, and Chapter 196 of the Public Laws of 1919, relating to the employment of guides by non-residents in certain cases.

House 429: An Act to constitute Ganneston Park, in the cities of Augusta and Hallowell, in Kennebec County, a game sanctuary.

House 431: An Act relating to the duties of the Superintendent of Public Buildings.

House 421: Resolve in favor of the Penobscot Tribe of Indians for re-drafting plan book.

House 422: Resolve in favor of the State Park Commission.

House 423: Resolve in favor of the State School for Boys for maintenance and other purposes.

House 424: Resolve appropriating money for the construction and equipment of an industrial building at the State Reformatory for Men.

House 430: Resolve in favor of the State Reformatory for Men for maintenance.

Passed to be Enacted

(Emergency Measure)

An act authorizing the formation of non-profit, co-operative associations, with or without capital stock, for the purpose of encouraging the orderly marketing of agricultural products through co-operation.

The SPEAKER: This being an emergency measure, and requiring under the Constitution the affirmative vote of two-thirds the entire membership of this House on its passage to be enacted, all those who are in favor of the passage of the bill to be enacted will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors will return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred twenty-three voted, and all in the affirmative, so the bill was passed to be enacted.

(Emergency Measure)

An act to provide for an issue of State highway and bridge bonds.

(On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

Mr. WINN of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, what number is that last bill?

The SPEAKER: Senate 198. The Chair will state for the information of the gentleman (Mr. Winn) that there was an amendment on the bill.

Mr. WINN: Is the amendment printed?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment was not printed, but was very much discussed the other day.

Finally Passed

(Emergency Measure)

Resolve for the laying of the county taxes for the year 1923.

The SPEAKER: This being an emer-

gency measure and requiring under the Constitution the affirmative vote of two-thirds the entire membership of this House on its final passage, all those who are in favor of its final passage will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors will return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty-six voted, and all in the affirmative, so the resolve was finally passed.

Passed to be Enacted

Act relating to the distribution of the assets of an insolvent estate.

An act to amend Section 51 of Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes, relating to change of name of a corporation.

An act to authorize the city of Lewiston to issue its bonds to the amount of two hundred thousand dollars to construct an armory in the city of Lewiston.

An act to authorize the town of Southport to construct a bridge over the tide-waters to Joe Island Gut.

An act to amend Section 10 of Chapter 172 of the Public Laws of 1919, relating to local health officers.

(Tabled by Mr. McIlheron of Lewiston, pending passage to be enacted.)

An act to amend Section 25 of Chapter 124 of the Revised Statutes, relating to penalty for falsely assuming to be an officer.

(Tabled by Mr. Nichols of Portland, pending passage to be enacted.)

An act to amend Chapter 173 of the Public Laws of 1919, relating to the registration of resident hunters and to provide for the registration of resident inland fishermen.

(Tabled by Mr. Bartlett of Hanover, pending passage to be enacted.)

An act to establish close time on lobsters from a point in a straight line from Bear Cove on the western side of Petit Manan Point to Little Black Ledge directly north of Moulton's Ledge Spar Buoy to the Schoodie Island Whistling Buoy.

An act to incorporate the Fall Brook Improvement Company.

Finally Passed

Resolve appropriating money for the Maine School for the Deaf.

Resolve in favor of H. G. Smallidge for services at the organization of the House of the 81st Legislature.

Resolve in favor of W. M. Stuart.

postmaster of the Senate of the 81st Legislature.

Resolve in favor of George A. Dow, postmaster of the House of the 81st Legislature.

Resolve in favor of William A. Heal, secretary of committee on sanatoriums.

Resolve in favor of Warren Prouty.

Resolve authorizing the Treasurer of State to accept from the executors of the will of John Prescott, two five hundred dollar United States Liberty Bonds in lieu of the legacy of one thousand dollars left by said Prescott to the Western Maine Sanatorium at Hebron.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that under Orders of the Day the first matters to be dealt with by this House are those which were left over, the unfinished business so to speak of yesterday, and under that the Chair presents House Document No. 117, an act relating to marriage of persons infected with syphilis, tabled by the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Brewster, March 16, pending first reading.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, this bill is one that has been before the Legislature for the last two sessions to my knowledge before this, and there are some things in it that I would not wish my daughter to have to go through, and that I would not wish my son to have to go through.

Section four of this bill provides in substance that the clerk of every city, town or plantation shall deliver to every applicant for a certificate for a license to marry a blank form, printed in duplicate, in which each party to an intended marriage shall make affirmation, or oath, before a person qualified to receive the same, that he or she is free from disease.

I move the indefinite postponement of this bill at the present time.

Mr. FICKETT of Naples: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: There seems to be a little confusion as to the objects of this bill. This bill is already on the Statute book and it lies there unknown and almost unheard of. Any person who starts out today to be married may break the law unknowingly, and this bill was amended so that a person starting out to get married would know the effect of certain consequences if they did marry illegally. The present law is a little drastic, inasmuch as if a person were about to die and had acquired a dis-

ease innocently, he would be barred from a marriage that he might like to consummate before death. Also sometimes it would be necessary to legitimize a child, and the present law does not allow it, because the present law says "no syphilitic person shall marry." That means under any and all conditions: so that while that may be true about marrying, there are certain conditions where it seems advisable that they should have the privilege of marrying, but only under certain conditions such as that they shall not cohabit after marriage, so that the offspring of that marriage may not be infected or perhaps be still-born or worse. Now there is nothing in this bill that I introduced that compels compulsory examination before marriage. I might say here that a good many of you have received letters, and it seems a curious coincidence that about half a dozen people have probably written 50 letters apiece and it has made quite a showing. If you members will compare your letters, you will see that they all come from the same source.

Now this bill is designed to prevent the spread of an infectious disease by those people who are infected with a venereal disease and who are about to marry. In this 20th century, when the times are no longer puritanical, as shown by the character of our moving pictures and our popular magazines, there is no reason why measures to prevent the spread of these destructive diseases should be avoided. This bill is important because it is shown by statistics that in the cities a large percentage, perhaps more than 50 per cent of people who remain unmarried at the age of 25 years have been infected at some time. These diseases are helping to fill with poor unfortunates our homes for the feeble minded, our insane hospitals and our charitable institutions; and at every session of the Legislature you are called upon to provide increasingly large sums of money to support these institutions to house this human wreckage, and if you want to diminish this venereal scrap heap, you have got to pass laws to assail the venereal problem and educate the ignorant.

This bill came out of the public health committee with a unanimous report and that is the place where it should be discussed properly. This is no place, before a mixed audience, to go into detail in regard to this bill. It was discussed there thoroughly and freely and came out with a unanimous

report, and I ask that the several readings of this bill be given, and that it be passed to be engrossed.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise to say a few words more on this bill. Any young lady or gentleman who wants to go into the State of New Hampshire and get married, or the State of Massachusetts can do so and come back here. We have bills before our claims committee at the present time that were made in that way that these doctors have let go through.

I want to say here that the states of New Jersey, South Carolina, Tennessee, Indiana, Idaho and Nebraska have had this law before them and they have turned it down. The Governor of Wyoming has given a veto message on this subject, and in Oregon a proposed law of this kind was defeated by popular vote. We have known that this bill has been before the House four years and has been turned down, and now at this time they are coming here and trying to revive this same law again; and I want to say with all due respect to the doctors of this State—we like to have them when we are sick, but at the same time we do not want to be examined, or have our children examined for every little "ism" or "asim" of that kind that may come up, and I say it is time that we put a stop to all this kind of funny business, so that the doctors may have a few dollars in their pockets when they get through.

Mr. CATES of Machiasport: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to have anything to say on this subject when I came in here this morning, but I think it may be wise to say something in regard to the viewpoint of the young unmarried men of the State. I have talked with 19 or 20 unmarried men in this State and have talked with a good many unmarried members of this House, and I have failed yet to find any objection on their part on this measure.

We have in our insane asylums and schools for feeble minded a good many young people who are there, not because of any fault of their own, but because of the fault of their parents in their younger days, and it seems a shame that we cannot get some measure to prevent the marriage of people who are infected with venereal disease. I do not see anything in this bill here that is very drastic. Section four simply says that "the clerk of every city, town or plantation shall deliver

to every applicant for a certificate for a license to marry, a blank form, printed in duplicate, in which each party to an intended marriage shall make affirmation, or oath before a person qualified to receive the same, that he or she, is free from infection with syphilis" and the other diseases of a venereal nature. "The original shall be kept on file by said clerk, together with the records of marriage," and so on. There is nothing there that calls for physical examination unless the person has been infected. The only thing required is that if a person is infected, he shall go at once to the local health officer and be treated until cured. A good many are treated until they think they are cured and then contract marriage, and we get the ill results, I submit, for years.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Lubec: Mr. Speaker, I suppose this is one bill that a lawyer could support, but I am opposed to it and to any law that requires that a record like this shall be kept with great secrecy in the town clerk's hands. I think that would be about enough unless you want some law suits.

Mr. NICHOLS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I happen to belong to that much discussed profession, and sometimes the "dis" is left off from the word discussed. But lawyers are sometimes useful in advising people not to get into difficulty, but to get them out of difficulty after they are there, and I want to read to the members Section five of this bill:

"When residents of this State with intent to evade the provisions of the preceding sections of this chapter, and to return and reside, here, go into another State or country, and there have their marriage solemnized and afterwards return and reside here such marriage is void in this State."

Now when a couple go from here to New Hampshire, is it prima facie evidence that they are going to avoid the provisions of this section? How do you know that they are going with the intent to avoid the provisions of the section, if they do not go with the intent to avoid the provisions of the section and return here, their marriage is valid. If they do go, and return here, avoiding the provisions, their marriage is void. How many marriages would be void, and how many valid is a question that never can be determined; and if their marriages are

void, then their children are illegitimate. I say, members of this body, that this bill should be indefinitely postponed on the ground of that section five.

Mr. PERKINS of Orono: Mr. Speaker and members of this House: I believe that the time has arrived when we should call an ace an ace and a spade a spade. I believe that the time has arrived when we owe it to the unborn children of the State of Maine that they should have some protection in this line, and I, for one, as a married man and a father, would welcome any investigation before any of my children became a husband or a wife, because I believe that it is the innocent ones who are unfortunately the subject of the humiliation incident to this matter; and I sincerely hope at this time that this House will consider before they turn down this bill the true merits of the case.

Mr. FICKETT of Naples: Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen: I want to say that this bill two years ago, amendments to the present law, Chapter 41, did pass this House. It went to the Senate and was returned to the House and the House insisted on its former action and it died in the committee of conference. I also wish to say that the mere fact that this bill, or a similar bill, has appeared before so many Legislatures in other States is a thing in its favor, because it shows that there is a demand all over the country for that kind of legislation, due to the great increase in venereal diseases.

In regard to Section five, and going into another State, I will say that that is a part of the old marriage laws that are on the Statute books at the present time, and the deductions of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Nichols, would be the same in regard to that law which has been on the Statute books, I know not for how many years, that is, relating to polygamy, idiocy, and relationship,—that no person shall marry and go into another State to evade those three things, where the marriage is null and void for the same reasons.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, that this bill be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of its indefinite post-

ponement will rise and stand in their places until counted.

A division of the House being had,

Eighty-eight voted in the negative and 42 in the affirmative, and the motion to indefinitely postpone was lost.

Thereupon the bill had its first and second readings, and tomorrow assigned for its third.

The SPEAKER: The next matter under orders of the day is House Document No. 374, resolve in favor of the Bath Military and Naval Orphan Asylum, tabled by the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Morse, March 15, pending assignment for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Morse of Bath, re-tabled until tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The next matter is Senate Document No. 199, An Act to revise and consolidate the banking laws, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Nichols, March 16, pending its third reading.

Mr. NICHOLS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A.

House Amendment A to Senate Document 199

Paragraph V of Section 6 of Senate Document No. 199 is hereby amended by striking out all of said section after the word "provided."

Mr. NICHOLS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may know just what the provisions of this amendment are I read Section V:

"To receive money on deposit, to invest the same, to own, maintain and let safe deposit boxes and vaults, and further to transact the business of a savings bank, as hereinafter provided." The part stricken out is this: "But no savings bank shall be liable for any loss of property deposited in said boxes or vaults for safe keeping, beyond the sum paid for rental thereof for the term within which such loss is discovered."

In other words, it means that if the savings bank go into the safe deposit business, they are not liable for any loss beyond the amount paid for one year's rental, from three to five dollars. The amendment puts the savings bank on an equal basis with the trust company. The trust companies of this State are under the common law—bailee law—and are liable only according to the risk assumed, and this amendment places the savings banks in the same class as the trust com-

panies. Now I hold no brief for the trust companies. I am interested in no trust company, but it seems to me that if the savings banks go into the safe deposit business, they should assume the same liabilities as the trust companies because if any of the savings banks in our country towns—we will take Gorham, Buxton or Bridgton or any of the towns of that size—should go into the safe deposit business and let boxes, why should not you men from the rural sections have the same degree of protection that you would have if you were in trust companies?

Now I have taken the trouble to look up the charters of the different trust companies of this State, and they are practically the same. Take, for instance, the charter of our leading trust company, the Fidelity Trust Company of Portland. Nothing in the entire charter releases the trust company from liability in case of negligence. Now this amendment merely places the savings banks in the same class as trust companies if they go into the safe deposit business; and I move the adoption of the amendment.

On motion by Mr. Tilden of Hallowell, the amendment and papers were tabled, pending consideration.

The SPEAKER: The next matter before the House is report of committee on salaries and fees on bill. An Act to increase salary of the clerk of courts of Franklin county, tabled by the gentleman from Phillips, Mr. Morrison, March 16, pending acceptance of the report.

On motion by Mr. Morrison of Phillips, the report was accepted.

Mr. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be given its first and second reading.

Mr. EDWARDS of Bethel: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill.

The SPEAKER: The motion is in order. The question before the House is the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker and Members of this House: This matter has come up once before and I said a few words in behalf of the resolve. The report of the committee in this case provides for an increase in the salary of the clerk of courts of Franklin county of \$100. The clerk of courts in our county is receiving at the present time the magnificent salary of \$1400 a year. He is a lawyer and he puts in all of his time in that office.

He also is the clerk of the county commissioners, where he has to do considerable work, for which he receives no additional pay; so that for the whole year's work he is receiving but \$1400. I think it is but fair and right that his salary should be increased. The delegation from Franklin county, with four representatives and one senator, are all in favor of this increase, and I sincerely hope that the motion made by the gentleman from Bethel (Mr. Edwards) will not prevail.

I will add further that, as you all know, this is a matter which concerns Franklin county alone and the salary and any increase that is granted will be paid by the taxpayers of that county and will not affect the taxpayers in the remainder of the State.

Mr. EDWARDS of Bethel: Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of this committee when we met and outlined our policy one or two members of that committee two years ago said that they went over the county estimates very carefully and granted an increase to about all of them at that time and we decided that we should not make any increases in county offices this year. Everything went along smoothly for two or three meetings. Then the logging commenced and about every one wanted an increase, among them this Franklin county matter came up, and we turned it down. One of the county officers from Franklin county wrote an insulting letter to a member of the committee, and they made him write a letter of apology, which he did. When we got the letter of apology, he got the one hundred dollar raise. The same thing occurred in Androscoggin county, and we all know that the county officers of that county are not paid in proportion to the other counties. That is my reason for objecting to this and for moving its indefinite postponement.

Mr. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, through the Chair, of the gentleman from Bethel (Mr. Edwards) if his committee has adhered all the way through to the rules which were laid down that they would not report favorably on increasing the salaries of any of the other offices of the other counties?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bethel may answer the question, if he wishes, though the Chair.

Mr. EDWARDS: I simply will say

that where clerk hire was concerned, we did vote some increases, but I object to increasing the officers. They knew when they took out their papers last June what they were going to receive and there were half a dozen candidates for most of the offices. If they did not want the positions they did not have to take out the papers. There were plenty of men who did want them.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, as one of that committee on Salaries and Fees, when we first started in we did agree not to raise salaries unless in very particular cases; but as time went on we did increase salaries and the delegation from Franklin county spoke to us individually. I will not say that they came before the committee as a whole, but they were all in favor of raising this particular salary, and, as it comes out of that county, we did vote an increase of \$100 a year. In Androscoggin county I kept my hands off as a member of the committee on Salaries and Fees. But, in this case, as Franklin county has got to pay the whole of it, I think it no more than fair that they should have the right to do it if they see fit.

The question being on the motion of the gentleman from Bethel, Mr. Edwards, that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion to indefinitely postpone failed of passage.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Phillips, Mr. Morrison, wish to move a suspension of the rules that the bill may have its readings at this time, it being an unprinted bill?

Mr. MORRISON: I do, Mr. Speaker. On motion by Mr. Morrison, the rules were suspended and the bill had its two readings at this time, and tomorrow assigned.

On further motion by the same gentleman, the House reconsidered its action whereby this bill was assigned for its third reading tomorrow morning; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the bill was tabled, pending its third reading.

The SPEAKER: The next matter to be presented to the House is, report of the committee on Salaries and Fees on bill, An Act relating to salaries of Chief of Police and Police

Captains of the city of Lewiston, being House Document, No. 74, tabled by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Gagne, March 16, pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. GAGNE: I move, Mr. Speaker, that we table that matter and that it be specially assigned for Tuesday next.

Mr. HOLMES of Lewiston: Is the motion debatable, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The motion to table is not debatable. The motion for assignment is debatable. Does the gentleman (Mr. Holmes) wish to address himself to the latter motion?

Mr. HOLMES: Yes, Mr. Speaker; not that I have any objection to Tuesday next, but in behalf of the Lewiston delegation, as I understood it, the Chairman of the Salaries and Fees committee proposed to me an agreement which he said the Salaries and Fees committee would stand behind, that the bill be left unassigned on the table, pending the reporting in from the Legal Affairs committee of another bill which affects the Police Commission of Lewiston, and which on that account would make it important that it remain unassigned.

Mr. GAGNE: I will withdraw my motion.

The motion for the assignment of the bill having been withdrawn, the matter was tabled unassigned on motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Gagne.

The SPEAKER: The next matter is House Document 380, An Act to provide for licensing hotels and lodging houses, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Nichols, March 16, pending third reading.

Mr. NICHOLS: Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale.

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present House Amendment A and move its adoption.

House Amendment A to House Document 380.

Section three of House Document 380 is hereby amended by adding after the word "available" in the fourteenth line of Section three, the words "for a period of two years." Also further amend said Section three by adding after the word "who"

in the sixteenth line of said Section the word "wilfully." Also amend Section 5 to House Document 380 by striking out the third sentence of said section and inserting in place thereof the following:

"The revocation and suspension shall not be made until after investigation and hearing, nor until the licensee have been given opportunity to hear the evidence in support of the charge against him and to cross examine, himself or through counsel, the witnesses, nor until the licensee shall have been given an opportunity to be heard. Notice of hearing shall be served on the licensee, or left at the premises of the licensee, not less than three days before the time set for the hearing."

Also further amend said Section five of said House No. 380 by adding thereto an additional sentence as follows:

"Appeal from the decision of the licensing authority may be had to the Supreme Judicial Court or to the Superior Court in and for the county in which the licensing authority is located, in the usual manner provided for appeals from Municipal Courts, courts of competent jurisdiction for due cause shown, may issue temporary orders returning the enforcement of such revocations and suspensions, and after full hearing may vacate such temporary orders and make same permanent."

The SPEAKER: The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that these amendments are considered to be necessary by lodging house keepers in order to protect their interests. The first, after two years, simply states the time after which they may destroy their registers and records. The second amendment, by inserting the word 'wilfully' between the word 'who' and the word "violates," makes it clear that they shall not be liable for inadvertent errors, and the last amendment simply provides protection for the lodging house keeper so that he may be heard when any accusations are made against him. I think there can be no possible objection to the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

A viva voce vote being taken, the amendment was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, the amendment and bill were tabled, pending third reading, and the amendment was ordered printed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now presents, out of order, veto message from the Governor:

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor

Augusta, March 22, 1923.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the 81st Legislature:

I return herewith without my approval.

AN ACT to Amend Section Twenty-one of Chapter Nine of the Revised Statutes as Amended by Section One of Chapter Seventy-one of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Twenty-one, Relating to Time of Payments of Excise Tax on Railroads.

Under the existing law the railroads operating within the State are required to pay their taxes on the 15th day of June of each year. That is the period when the State's expenses are unusually heavy and it would disturb our financial program considerably if two-thirds of the large tax payments of the railroads were deferred for three and six months, or until September and December of each year as provided in the bill.

The taxpayers in general throughout the State are obliged to make payments in full on tax day, and failing to do so interest is charged on overdue tax accounts. The item of interest which the State would lose on the proposed change in the railroad tax law is considerable and would amount to a good many thousand dollars per year. I am of the opinion that all taxpayers should be treated alike.

The recent reports issued by the railroads operating within the State are encouraging and give promise for better times. I do not think it is any more of a hardship for the railroads to pay their taxes as the law now requires than it is for the ordinary tax payers to do so, and therefore I am returning this Act without my approval.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) PERCIVAL P. BAXTER,
Governor of Maine

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, this House has been in session now for more than three and a half hours. It is my experience that when we come to a thing fresh and rested we are apt to give it better consideration. There are some gentlemen in this House who stay here and do business, while others go out and seek their own pleasure and convenience. I therefore, move, Mr. Speaker, that the further consideration of this veto message be taken up tomorrow morning, and that this House now adjourn to 9:30 A. M.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would ask the privilege of stating to the House that we have another veto message here.

Mr. WING: That can be heard also at 9.30 tomorrow morning, or I am perfectly willing to hear it now.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman (Mr. Wing) withdraw his motion to adjourn?

Mr. WING: Yes sir.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, moves that the veto message of the Governor just read lie on the table and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents, out of order, veto message from Governor.

Mr. HAMILTON of Caribou: Mr. Speaker, if it is in order, I move that that veto message be tabled until tomorrow morning at 9.30.

The SPEAKER: The motion to table is not debatable. Does the gentleman (Mr. Hamilton) wish to withdraw his motion until the veto message is read?

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Thereupon Mr. Hamilton of Caribou was granted leave to withdraw his motion to table, and the Clerk read the veto message as follows:

STATE OF MAINE
Office of the Governor

Augusta, March 22, 1923.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval—

RESOLVE Making an Appropriation for the Maine Seed Improvement Ass'n.

This Resolve calls for an appropriation of \$2,000. Under the general laws of our State a special fund is created the proceeds of which are used to aid societies and organizations that promote the agricultural interests of our State. This Fund totals \$15,360.28. It is distributed among 42 different associations connected with the farming interests of the State. In my opinion the Seed Improvement Association should be treated just like all the others and any aid granted it should be taken from the fund referred to. It is not wise to pass special appropriations for these various organizations or give one of them special favors.

I call attention to the fact that the present Legislature has been unusually liberal in its appropriations to help our agricultural interests. The former appropriation of \$3,000 per year for seed and other work already has been doubled by this Legislature and made \$6,000 and a new item of \$15,000 per year for Seed Inspection has been passed and approved by the Governor.

In my opinion the various agricultural fairs and improvement associations that are doing good work should be treated alike, and to discriminate in favor of one at the expense of others is not desirable. If it is desirable to increase our State Stipend to our various fairs it would be well to raise the present assessment and give an increase to each of the organizations now struggling to maintain themselves.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) PERCIVAL P. BAXTER,
Governor of Maine.

On motion by Mr. Hamilton of Caribou, the above veto message was tabled until tomorrow morning at 9.30.

On motion by Mr. Wing of Auburn,
Adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9.30.