

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

Friday, March 30, 1923.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Clark of Gardiner.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

The SPEAKER: The Chair at this time would like, not to discuss but to present the possibility of future adjournment and talk over the question of present adjournment. Should we fail to place in the hands of the printers a sufficient amount of work to keep them busy over Saturday, Sunday and Monday, we would be that far behind, of course, in the adjournment which we hope will occur next week. There are two methods of obtaining this end. One is to do the work before us today, and then have a session tomorrow morning. The other is, to do our work this morning, recess until two o'clock this afternoon, and then, if found necessary, recess again until 7.30 this evening, and then finally adjourn until Monday afternoon at 4.30. The Chair is bringing this to the attention of the members, and hopes that there will be no attempt on the part of any member to adjourn until we do take care of the work today.

Mr. GRANVILLE of Parsonfield: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that probably the latter plan might suit more of the members, that is, that we have a session this afternoon, and if necessary, one this evening.

(Thereupon an informal vote was taken, not for the Record.)

The SPEAKER: The method of holding the sessions today and recessing from time to time seems to prevail. Of course this is merely informal.

Report of Committees

Out of Order

Mr. Archibald from the committee on Judiciary, on bill an act to amend Sections 4, 5 and 6 of Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes, relating to foreclosure of chattel mortgages, reporting the same in a new draft, under same title and that it ought to pass.

Report accepted, and the new draft ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. Hale from the committee on

Legal Affairs, on bill, an act to amend Chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, and amendments thereto, relating to the Primary and Caucus Law, reporting the same in new draft, under same title, and that it ought to pass.

The report was accepted.

Mr. CURTIS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, I move that that be tabled for printing in new draft.

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman wish to table the bill, other than for printing? It is the Cummings bill, so-called.

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I might say in reference to that that it applies only to Portland.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Curtis, ask leave to withdraw his motion, both as to tabling and printing?

Mr. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The motion of the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Curtis is withdrawn, and the bill will be printed under the Joint Rules.

Conference Report

Report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches on Resolve appropriating money for the construction and equipment of an industrial building at the State Reformatory for Men, reporting that both Houses adhere to their former action.

The report was accepted.

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

Out of Order

House 487: An Act to amend Section 86 of Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1917, as amended by Chapter 244 of the Public Laws of 1917, and by Chapter 142 of the Public Laws of 1919 and by Chapter 93 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the distribution of money collected under the provisions of the Inland Fish and Game Laws.

(The rules were suspended, and the bill given its three several readings and passed to be engrossed.)

House 490: An Act providing for a tax upon gasoline and other products used in operating internal combustion engines.

(The rules were suspended, and the bill given its three several readings and passed to be engrossed.)

House 488: Resolve appropriating money to aid in the screening of certain lakes and ponds.

(On motion by Mr. Crafts of Greenville, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.)

House 489: Resolve in favor of establishing a feeding station for fish on the outlet and upper Shin pond, in the town of Mt. Chase, in the county of Penobscot.

(The rules were suspended and the resolve given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed.)

On motion by Mr. Crafts of Greenville, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it passed to be engrossed bill relating to the distribution of money collected under the provisions of the Inland Fish and Game laws; and on further motion by the same gentleman, it was tabled pending passage to be engrossed.

**Passed to be Engrossed
Out of Order**

House 464: An Act additional to and amendatory of Chapter 37 of the Private and Special Laws of 1917, as amended, relating to the Police Commission of Lewiston, requiring said Commission to be appointed by the Mayor.

(At this point President Farrington of the Senate was escorted to a seat beside the Speaker by House Messenger Hayes, the members rising and applauding.)

Resolve in favor of the State Department of Health.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move that this resolve be indefinitely postponed. I still object to this as I have found out since yesterday that the building where the fire was is being repaired at an expense of \$3,000, and in thirty days will be all right as I am told by those who ought to know who are making the contract. On top of that they will have new equipment. If they want a fire proof safe or a fire proof vault, it can be put in the cellar of this building as it now is and take care of all their vital statistics at less expense. If they want to build a new building, there is plenty of room in sight of the State House, where the State owns the land, to do it. Therefore it looks to me that to spend \$35,000 on an old garage that has been built for a garage is all wrong. Therefore, I move the indefinite postponement of the resolve.

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: You heard me with patience yesterday, and I hope that we may treat the health of the State with the same generosity that we have treated the Portland Pier, and I sincerely hope that this House will stand as it did yesterday for a proper administration of the Public Health.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Wing) through the Chair, will agree to let this lie on the table for some little time, I think I can get him some things that will satisfy him that they will have as good or better quarters than they will have in that garage for \$35,000, at an expense of less than \$5,000.

Mr. WING: Mr. Speaker, that in the interest of time it might as well be settled now.

Mr. MARTIN of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar particularly with this matter, and I only know the building in question which the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Rounds) refers to as an old garage. I believe that he is somewhat in error in that statement. The building in question was built, I think, only two years ago—it may have been three—an entirely modern building and a splendidly built building and well located near this State House. The price that is being paid I do not understand is \$35,000 for the building, but considerably less, and the building itself cost a great deal more than the State will pay. I do not think the State will make any mistake in the interests of the health of its citizens if this Legislature votes against the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds.

Mr. HAMILTON of Caribou: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it would be good judgment, while we have plenty of time at our recesses, to go and view this building. It is only a short distance from here, and in that way we can make up our minds much better than if we decide on it here and now when we do not know very much about the building. I would suggest that the members take the opportunity to look this building over before they vote.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, that the resolve be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor—

Mr. GRANVILLE of Parsonsfield: Mr. Speaker, I think that we all realize how important and vital the work of this Department is to all of our citizens. I have talked with the doctor having this Department in charge and speaking about this building and how admirably situated it is for the Department and a good investment so far as the value of it is concerned; and I feel that this House would be making no mistake in making this move. Furthermore, Dr. Tyson over to the Insane Hospital, told me that the building that was formerly used, the one damaged by fire, they could use for housing some of the help over there, and that this would tend to relieve the congestion there, so it seems you would be accomplishing two things at one time by doing that. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, that the resolve be indefinitely postponed.

As many as are in favor of its indefinite postponement will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion to indefinitely postpone failed of passage.

Mr. BARWISE of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be laid on the table until the afternoon session.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Barwise, moves that the matter be laid on the table and be especially assigned for this afternoon. The time of assignment is debatable.

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, there is very little time between now and the afternoon session, and the temper of this House is such in its eagerness to follow business that I hope the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Barwise, will not prevail, and that this matter can be moved along for printing. Later, if the gentleman wishes to renew the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, to indefinitely postpone this resolve on its final passage, he would have that opportunity.

Mr. BARWISE of Bangor: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman from Bangor about to debate the assignment?

Mr. BARWISE: I do not lay any

particular emphasis on assigning this for this afternoon. I merely want an opportunity to go and look at the building. I had just as soon put it over until Monday.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Barwise, that this resolve be now tabled and especially assigned for this afternoon. As many as are in favor of this will say aye and those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion to table and specially assign for this afternoon was lost.

Mr. BARWISE: Mr. Speaker, I move that we have it assigned for Monday afternoon, if agreeable to the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing.

Mr. WING: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire through the Chair if the resolve is printed?

The SPEAKER: The resolve is not printed.

Mr. WING: I am sure the gentleman from Bangor (Mr. Barwise) will understand that such an assignment would delay matters still further in the way of printing. If we could have this printed, he could then renew his motion on its final passage, thereby saving some time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that if the resolve is, given its second reading at this time under suspension of the rules, it comes again to the House for final passage, at which time it will be in printed form.

Mr. BARWISE: Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Unanimous consent being given, the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Barwise, was withdrawn.

On motion by Mr. McIlheron of Lewiston, the rules were suspended and the resolve had its second reading and was passed to be engrossed.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Final report of the committee on Banks and Banking.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Resolve appropriating money to pay claims allowed by the committee on claims. (Senate Document 308.)

In the Senate, report read and accepted and the new draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence, and the resolve had its two several readings under suspension of the rules and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill, an act relating to the income and appropriations of the several departments and State Institutions.

This was passed to be engrossed in the House, March 29.

In the Senate, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. BREWSTER of Dexter: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of this bill.

Mr. ARCHIBALD of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I move that it be tabled, and specially assigned for the afternoon session.

The motion prevailed, the pending question being the motion of the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Brewster, that we recede and concur with the Senate.

From the Senate: Bill, an act to amend Section 93 of Chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes, as affected by Chapter 293 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to settlement of violations of law, and repealing Section 87 of Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to same subject.

This was passed to be enacted in the House March 29, and passed to be engrossed March 27.

In the Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in non-concurrence.

In the House, that body voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be enacted, and further voted to reconsider its action whereby it was passed to be engrossed.

The pending question being on the adoption of Senate Amendment A, the amendment was read by the clerk.

Thereupon, the House voted to adopt Senate Amendment A in concurrence, and the bill as amended by Senate Amendment A was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill, an act to amend Section 116 of Chapter four

of the Revised Statutes, pertaining to the right to kill dogs.

This was passed to be enacted in the House March 29, and passed to be engrossed, March 22.

In the Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in non-concurrence.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Lord of South Portland, that body voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be enacted; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the vote was reconsidered whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed. Thereupon, the same gentleman moved the adoption of Senate Amendment A in concurrence, and the amendment was read by the clerk.

Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as thus amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents out of order.

Report of committee on the Primary Law.

Report A of the committee on Legal Affairs on bill, an act to provide for the nomination of candidates for office by political parties, reporting that the same ought not to pass, report being signed by the following: Senator Brewster of Cumberland and Representatives Siddall of Sanford, Holmes of Lewiston and Clarke of Stonington.

Report B of the same committee on the same bill, reporting the same in new draft and that it ought to pass, the report being signed by the following: Senator Powers of Aroostook, Representatives Hale of Portland, Morrison of Phillips, and Martin of Augusta.

Report C of the same committee on the same bill, reporting the same in new draft, under title of an act to amend Chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes, relating to nominations and that it ought to pass, the report being signed by the following: Senator Cram of Cumberland, and Representative Oakes of Portland.

On motion by Mr. Clarke of Stonington, the various reports were tabled, pending acceptance.

On motion by Mr. Bartlett of Waterville, the new drafts were ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: The first thing under orders of the day to be considered are those especially assigned for today, and the first matter is reports A and B of committees on Public Utilities and Ways and Bridges on resolve relating to Kennebec River Bridge, Senate Document No. 294, tabled by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Hodgkins, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Hodgkins.

Mr. HODGKINS: Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville.

Mr. GRANVILLE of Parsonsfield: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: I move the acceptance of the report, ought not to pass, I think that is a divided report—I do not remember whether it was a majority or a minority report, but I think the reports were divided nine and nine.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Parsonsfield Mr. Granville, moves the acceptance of the report, ought not to pass.

Mr. GRANVILLE: Ought not to pass; and Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I would like to explain my position and the committees' position upon this matter. There is another bill, which was tabled by me March 29, reports A and B of committees of Public Utilities and Ways and Bridges, on bill, an act to provide for building a bridge across the Kennebec River. These two bills are inseparable, because the one on which I have just made the motion is a resolve calling for a Constitutional amendment and for a bond issue of \$3,000,000 put out under the charter, which is this one which I tabled last night. One is a charter and the other a resolve.

The joint committees of Public Utilities and Ways and Bridges had before it this proposition, the proposition of a private toll bridge at Bath, and also a proposition for a private toll bridge at Richmond, and at the same time a bill providing for a Commission to investigate and report to the Legislature. This hearing was very largely attended by a great number of enthusiastic people who demonstrated to the committee, and I think every one here, that there was a great deal of interest in the subject of having a bridge across the river at Bath. The joint committee I think one and all felt that it

was a worthy project and that there should be a bridge there for the development and convenience of all the people living on the coast as far east as Rockland, and to some extent beyond that. But the opinion of some of the committee, I will say one-half of the committee, because I think these reports were signed by nine and nine—that is, there were two reports on the one we have under consideration, two reports on the one tabled last night, and two reports on the privately owned toll bridge, which I think is upon the table in the Senate, pending action upon this measure.

It seemed to us of the committee who signed this report, ought not to pass, that, although the people in those localities were very enthusiastic for a bridge, it was rather a bridge than the bridge. They wanted some convenience for getting across the river, and the original bill as presented by the Senator from Sagadahoc called for a free, State-owned bridge. Now later he reconsidered that matter and in the committee brought out a new draft, which is the one we have before us, and which is for a State-owned toll bridge, and, as I have previously stated, calling for a bond issue of \$3,000,000 for its construction, presenting at the same time a plan in some detail as to the cost, a plan of the structure and estimated income. There is also an added provision to this from the original bill stating that these bonds shall be issued at such time as the Governor and Council are satisfied that the construction can be carried through for \$3,000,000. I am of the personal opinion from some inquiries that I have made that the bridge cannot be constructed for that; and I suppose that the proponents of this measure will say that this is cared for by this provision. But before the Governor and Council can be satisfied that a bridge can be constructed for this sum, they must necessarily have a very accurate and minute survey, plans and estimates made, on a scale definite enough so that a contract may be let. That would call for a considerable sum of money for which this bill does not provide. I think that the estimated income was very conservative, but those of us who signed this report thought that it was best, rather than to have an additional bond issue before the people calling for \$3,000,000, that it should be built by a privately owned com-

pany and be a toll bridge. This measure is for a toll bridge and the privately owned company would also be a toll bridge. It seemed to us that there were two things that the people of the locality were seeking to avoid. One was delay in getting across the Kennebec River, and the other getting rid of toll. Now the toll proposition has been eliminated from both propositions, and we thought there was a good deal more liability of their getting a bridge and getting it by a privately owned company, which I am satisfied intends to build the bridge; so we have drawn a new draft which is signed "ought to pass" by nine of this committee, and is on the table in the Senate, in which we have safeguarded in every way that any member of the committee could suggest, and others with whom we could advise,—safeguarded the interests of the people. And I am satisfied this will make it more certain than the proposition before you now.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Lamoine: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that this should come up this morning, and am unprepared in a way to defend, perhaps, a part of my feelings toward the bridge I believe that it is in the line of progress that a bridge should be built there, but whether it should be a toll bridge or a free bridge should be for this House to decide. But anyone who has been there and waited for a chance to get across that ferry, with 180 or 200 cars ahead of him, must feel and know that a bridge of some kind is absolutely necessary. If it can be built as we understand it by simply loaning the credit of the State, the income from the railroad would pay the interest and finally pay the bonds, and I feel that perhaps that would be as good a way out of it as any. I sincerely hope that the minority report, so-called, ought not to pass, will not prevail.

Mr. GARDINER of Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, will the Chair state the action of the Senate?

The SPEAKER: Report A, which was ought to pass in new draft, accepted by the Senate, and the new draft of that bill was passed to be engrossed, after acceptance, of course.

Mr. GARDINER: And the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield is—

The SPEAKER: That the report, ought not to pass, be accepted, their being two reports, the Chair will

state, one ought not to pass and one ought to pass in new draft, in the Senate being accepted and being passed to be engrossed.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville, will not prevail so that we may eventually agree with the Senate in their action on this matter. There are two bills here which go together, one proposition, an amendment to the Constitution, allowing the bond issue, and the other Senate Document 302, which is the resolve providing for the construction of the bridge in the event the bond issue is authorized by the people.

Now it is not necessary to discuss the matter of lack of development of a large portion of the State that comes from the difficulty of crossing the Kennebec river in this region. That is an admitted fact. If we pass this resolve, the matter is referred to the people for their consideration, and only upon their acceptance does the measure go through.

You will note that Senate Document 302, which is the resolve authorizing the construction of the bridge in case the constitutional amendment is passed, is very carefully drawn and guards the interests of the State. You will note also that it authorizes the directors of the bridge to apply to Congress for Federal assistance; and in the past we have received substantial assistance from the Federal government on such matters.

I hope that this House will not take any action that will retard the development of that large section of the State, but will allow the people of the State as a whole to vote on the matter. The development of any section of the State is of concern to all of us, and I trust that the motion as made will not prevail.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Orrington: Mr. Speaker, As I understand it, we are now discussing Senate Document 294, and this relates specifically to the issuance of bonds and calls for a referendum to the people on the bond issue. Now, as one living far removed from the proposed location of this bridge, I do not want to be misunderstood. I am fully convinced of the necessity of this bridge, but I do not think that the action of the upper body as stated by the gentleman from Gardiner (Mr. Gardiner)

would influence me regarding this bond issue. It seems to me that with the proposed bond issue which we are about to put before the people for highways, and another proposed bond issue for this bridge, it seems to me that there might be a possibility—and quite a possibility—of both falling to the ground. Of course there are people in the State—we do not know what number—who are opposed to the issuance of bonds. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield (Mr. Granville) will prevail.

Mr. ROGERS of Rockland. Mr. Speaker, I could hardly go home and face my constituents without saying a word in favor of this bridge matter. We who live in that section of the country all know that we have been handicapped in many ways, and this question of a bridge across the Kennebec has been agitated for years. Now we have a proposition before us whereby the State can build that bridge with practically no expense to the State, the interest and the sinking fund being secured before the money is expended. It seems to me that we have voted for bond issues for other things this winter, and that the eastern part of this State should not be discriminated against.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I realize full well that this is not the time to go into any extended analysis of the merits of this measure. That seems to have been very competently passed upon and a discussion of it at this time would not be met, nor would it be necessary, nor would it accomplish anything. It does seem to me that the necessity of a bridge must be perfectly obvious to all. The expediency of this particular proposition has been favorably passed upon by the committee, and favorably passed upon by the upper branch. The only thing that we are asked to do here is to submit the proposition by a bond resolve to the people. Now can we not safely trust the people of the State of Maine to pass upon this? They are going to pass on bond issues for highways and they are going to be asked to pass liberally. We need our roads developed; we want our highways developed. We want our farm-to-market roads developed. I am not one of those who have always been convinced of the wisdom of spending a large part of the people's substance in the development of highways that are exclusively for

the benefit,—I will not say that, but the major part for the benefit of those who are riders for pleasure. I believe that the highways of this State belong to the people. And I have always believed in, emphatically urged, and do now, such a wise distribution of the people's money that will make our highways available for the joint agricultural needs of our State, as well as for the mere pleasure vehicles,—those within or those without.

Now this is essentially a business proposition. You cannot have anything that is more essential to the farm-to-market roads than that bridge across the Kennebec, and you are asked here to simply submit the question to the people for their decision. It would seem to me to be an injustice to a great section of the State of Maine that is ready for development along the coast, and that is now held up and retarded, not to give them the same opportunity to take advantage of their chances as they get in other parts of the State; and I hope that this measure will receive favorable consideration.

Mr. HOBBS of Hope: Mr. Speaker, I cannot express myself in the way I would like in regard to this matter; I cannot find words to do it. I am not capable of saying the things I would like to say, but I think I would not be doing my duty here to my constituents if I did not say a few words in favor of this proposition. I cannot see why the people here, members of the Legislature, should not be willing to give us a start and give us a chance to have a bridge across there. The people who travel there will pay the biggest part of the expense, and it will not be a great burden to the State in the long run. I think the Legislature ought to give us a chance to have this question submitted to the people and let them decide. I think we ought to have that privilege.

Mr. BARWISE of Bangor: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: I wish to add a word to this discussion, and that is to say that I think this is the only proposition of a similar nature that we have had in recent years where it looked as though it were a sound business proposition, where there was sufficient income to take care of the sinking fund so that eventually it will cost the State practically nothing. I believe it is for the development of the whole eastern part of the State to have this bridge and I hope that this proposition will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville, that report B, which is "ought not to pass," be accepted.

A division of the House being had, Sixty-eight voted in the affirmative and 64 in the negative.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Maher, calls for a yeas and nay vote. It requires the consent of one-fifth of the House, under the rules. As many as are in favor of the yeas and nay vote being taken will stand.

A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER: Is the question plain to everyone? If not, the Chair will again state it. Is there any member who does not understand the question?

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, does the motion pertain to Senate Document No. 294?

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville, that report B, which is "ought not to pass," on the Carlton Bill, so-called, the old draft being Senate Document No. 30, be accepted. The Chair thinks that all the members understand that this is a report on the Carlton Bill, so-called, the report being "ought not to pass" and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville, that the report "ought not to pass" be accepted.

Mr. WING: Mr. Speaker, is the report "ought not to pass," on Senate Document No. 30?

The SPEAKER: The report is on Senate Document No. 30.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I want to vote for a Carlton Bridge across the Kennebec River.

The SPEAKER: Then you will vote not to accept this report.

Mr. CUMMINGS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, am I correct in assuming that in voting on Senate Bill No. 30, we are also voting on Senate Bill No. 302, the new draft of this bill?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will—

Mr. CLARKE of Stonington: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Chair explain the parliamentary situation with reference to the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has endeavored to do so, and will again state that the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville, is that report B, which is "ought not to pass," on the Carlton Bridge Resolve, be accepted. Is the matter now plain?

Mr. WING: Mr. Speaker, it is not plain. I understood Mr. Granville to speak on Senate No. 294 as it appears on the calendar.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has endeavored to explain, but perhaps the best course would be to have the Clerk read the two reports again, and the Chair will instruct the Clerk to do so. (Thereupon the Clerk read Reports A and B referred to.)

The SPEAKER: Those who wish to accept report B, which is "ought not to pass," on the Carlton Bridge Bill, so-called, will answer "yes" when their names are called. Those who are opposed to the acceptance of the report "ought not to pass" will answer "no" when their names are called.

Mr. GRANVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a further statement: that there is coming before this House soon a bill which is in the Senate providing for a privately owned and controlled bridge.

The SPEAKER: The clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Adams of Liberty, Ayer, Baker, Bartlett of Hanover, Blaisdell, Brown, Chalmers, Conant, Curtis, Dilling, Downing, Dudley, Dunbar, Edwards, Farley, Fickett, Gordon, Granville, Hale, Hamilton, Hayes of Chelsea, Hayes of Gorham, Hayford, Heal, Hodgkins, Jordan of Cape Elizabeth, Jordan of Westbrook, Keef, Keene, Leathers, Lord of Wells, Ludgate, Macomber, McDonald, Melcher, Moody, Morrison, Nevins, Newcomb, Nickerson, Palmer, Pendleton, Phillips, Plummer, Ramsdell, Ranney, Ray, Reed, Sanders, Saunders, Siddall, Small, Smith, Sparrow, Staples, Stevens, Storm, Stratton, Sturgis, Thomas of Chesterville, Thomas of Leeds, Towne, Weeks, Whitney, Willis, Wing, Wood.—67.

NAY—Adams of Litchfield, Archibald, Atwood, Bartlett of Waterville, Barwise Beckett, Belliveau, Benoit, Bickford, Bisbee, Boman, Boulter, Bradbury, Brett, Brewster, Burns, Cates, Cherry, Clarke, Crafts, Crowley, Cummings, Dain, Douglas, Drake, Dunn, Finnell, Foss, Gagne, Gagnon, Gamage, Gardiner, Gauvin,

Gillespie, Gilmour, Goldthwaite, Greenleaf, Hallett, Hammond, Hobbs, Holmes, Houghton, Hutchinson, Jacobs, Jewett, Jones, Kitchen, Knight, Lamson, Leland, Littlefield, Lord of South Portland, Maher, Martin, McIlheron, Morse of Bath, Nadeau, Nichols, Oakes, O'Connell, Perkins, Perry, Pierce, Pinkham, Piper, Rogers, Rounds, Rowell, Sayward, Stitham, Tarr, Tilden, White, Williams, Winn, Winslow.—76.

ABSENT—Gile, Johnson, Morse of Greene, Overlock, Owens, Story Teague.—7.

Yes—67.

No—76.

Absent—7.

Sixty-seven having voted in the affirmative and 76 in the negative, the motion failed of passage.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Maher of Augusta, the House voted to accept Report A, of Committees on Public Utilities and Ways and Bridges on Resolve relating to Kennebec River Bridge, Senate Document No. 294 and the Resolve received its second reading and was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Granville of Parsonsfield, under suspension of the rules, Reports A and B of committees on Public Utilities, and Ways and Bridges on bill, An Act to provide for building a bridge across the Kennebec river, between the city of Bath and the town of Woolwich, tabled by that gentleman March 29th, pending acceptance of either report, were taken from the table.

Mr. GRANVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if Report A is ought to pass.

The SPEAKER: Report A is ought to pass.

Mr. GRANVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of Report A.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of information.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Maher, may state his question.

Mr. MAHER: Will the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville, inform me through the Chair if Report A is ought to pass on the Private Bridge bill, so-called?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville, may answer the question if he wishes.

Mr. GRANVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I will answer by stating that I do not know. I understand that this is the Charter for the Carlton bridge so-called, which should accompany Senate document 294 on which we have just accepted Report A, and I simply made my motion to expedite business because the two should go together, and if we accept one, we should accept the other.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Parsonsfield, Mr. Granville that Report A of the committees on Public Utilities and Ways and Bridges, on bill, An Act to provide for building a bridge across the Kennebec river, be accepted. Is the House ready for the question?

The question being called for, the motion to accept Report A prevailed, and the bill received its two several readings.

Mr. MORSE of Bath: Mr. Speaker, I offer House amendment A to Senate document No. 302.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. Morse, offers House amendment A to Senate document No. 302, An Act to provide for building a bridge across the Kennebec river between the city of Bath and the town of Woolwich.

House Amendment A to Senate Document No. 302

Amend said bill by striking out, in Section 2, Line 2, the word "Woolwich" and substituting the word "Bath"; further amend Section 2 by striking out Lines 3, 4, 5 and 6, as far as the word "they" in the 6th line, and substituting in place of said lines the following: "to be determined by the Governor and Council after consultation with competent engineers".

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I trust that will be voted down because it will destroy, as I take it, the effect of the action which we have just previously taken. I hope that this amendment will be decidedly rejected.

Mr. MORSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not see how that can possibly destroy any action at all. Practically all our highways and bridges, the Governor and Council, after consultation with the highway commission decide where they are to be located. Three million dollars is a large sum of money and this bill states specifically

where that will be located, and I am willing to wager that a majority of the people here do not know where that location is. It seems to me only fair and just that the Governor and his Council should say where it should go. It is simply a matter of location, to see that it goes in the best place for the best interests of the State, that is all. There is nothing tricky about it.

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker, I ask, through the Chair, if I understood the amendment correctly that it struck out the word "Woolwich" and left in the word "Bath".

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Maher, wish to have the amendment read again?

Mr. MAHER: I would like to have it read again, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read again House amendment A to Senate document No. 302.

Thereupon the Clerk read a second time House amendment A to Senate document No. 302.

Mr. MORSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not see that that amendment hurts the bill in any way, but if the gentleman from Augusta, (Mr. Maher) insists, I am willing to allow the word "Woolwich" to remain there. The only thing I am interested in is to have the Governor, in consultation with his Council and competent engineers, decide where the bridge shall be located.

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the matter be tabled in order that the document may be examined.

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: Under Orders of the Day, the next matter today assigned is Senate document No. 228, An Act to incorporate the towns of South Thomaston and Owl's Head into a single town, tabled March 29th by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, pending further consideration. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing.

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Clarke.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Clarke of Stonington, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The next matter is Senate Document No. 300, An Act to provide for the reading of the Bible in the public schools, tabled March 29th by the gentleman from

Biddeford, Mr. Goldthwaite, pending assignment for third reading, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Goldthwaite.

Mr. GOLDTHWAITE: Mr. Speaker and members of the 81st Legislature: I will not attempt in any way to try to influence any member of this Legislature as to how they shall vote with regard to this matter, but I simply want to say how I stand and feel with regard to it.

My mind goes back fifty years ago, when as a boy of some thirteen or fourteen years of age, that best and most well known of all books, the Holy Bible, which I respect as much and more than anything else ever printed, was read in the public schools. It was compulsory at the time I attended school. I remember at that time of the different discussions caused by the reading of that Bible between the different denominations, the Congregationalists, the Methodists, Baptists, and others. It was my good or ill fortune, I will not say which, to have a father of one denominational belief, and a mother of another denominational belief. While I do not recollect of anything that ever happened in my happy home of any discussion over the matter, it did occur in various houses in that locality, and caused strife and dissention amongst children as well as amongst the grown people.

Now, I believe I can come down to this present time and see where this bill, if passed, would be the means of causing more strife and dissention at this present time, when there is so much that is already stirring up the people in this country with regard to creeds and sects. I believe that the people of fifty years ago were as Puritanical in their ideas as they are today, but they eventually cut out the reading of the Bible in the public schools.

I do not ask, as I said before, that any member be influenced by what I have said, and I am going to make this motion, that this bill have its third reading at this time.

Mr. BARWISE of Bangor: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: Perhaps a word or two from the viewpoint of the committee on Education may be of interest to the House. You will observe that we reported that this bill ought not to pass. Let me say to you that I think nobody on the committee of

Education felt that this bill would do the slightest bit of harm if it did pass. Our report was based on the proposition that it might further inflame the sectarian question in this Legislature, that it might be misunderstood by one wing or the other of our committee.

And in the interests of decent harmony and brotherly love, etc., we reported that this bill ought not to pass. But let me assure you on the other hand that if you decide to concur with the Senate and pass this bill, it will not do the slightest bit of harm. The last section of the bill safeguards the proposition from any sectarian or denominational standpoint. It distinctly states that no comment, no teaching, no explanation shall accompany the reading of the Bible in the public schools. The Bible is to be read as a classic. It is to be read in the same way that Homer or Virgil is read. It is to be read without sectarian comment, without any attempt to draw any doctrine from it. The children are to read it just as they read the stories of the Odessey or the Iliad or the wanderings of Aeneas. As a classic, there is probably none superior to our St. James—that would probably be the version generally adopted—but any version, it does not matter what version it is, some knowledge of this book is necessary to the education of any modern boy or girl. Literature, all literature, is teeming with references to the Bible, illustrating different points. Probably there are more references to the Bible in the various books of the world in the way of explaining certain things, than to any other sources, even than to all the classical sources.

The purpose of this bill, let me say, I believe to be just this: to make the young people acquainted with the Bible as a classic and it distinctly says that no denominational teachings shall be drawn from it. No teacher would have a right to teach transubstantiation, or regeneration, or as to the third person of the Trinity. No person would have the right to bring up any of the question as to the origin of the Trinity or any of the changes which that doctrine has had down through the ages. All those things are to be excluded and it is to be read merely as a classic. I can see no harm in it.

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker, I think

perhaps I did not hear correctly or did the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Barwise, refer to the St. James version?

Mr. BARWISE: I said probably that would be the one used, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if he perhaps does not mean the King James version?

Mr. BARWISE: Mr. Speaker, I should have said King James version.

Mr. BECKETT of Calais: Mr. Speaker I am most heartily in favor of the passage of this bill and of restoring to our public schools the reading of the Bible. One of the things that some years ago made the greatest impression upon my mind was the report of a friend of mine on his return from Arkansas. He was not a particularly religious man but the thing that made the greatest impression upon him was the absence in the western part of the United States of anything that resembled the New England Sunday.

We have all of us heard of the positions that men and women from our state, who have left it, have taken wherever they have settled. I believe in a large measure that the reason they were able to take those positions is the character that they formed here in this Sunday observing community of the state of Maine, and I have regretted most heartily and have had brought up to me many times, the removal of the reading of the Bible in our public schools. We put upon our coins "In God We Trust" and yet we take from our schools the opportunity to read His Word.

I am glad that the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Barwise, is in favor of the reading of the Word but I do not think that this goes back, if it does go back, merely as we read the Odessey or some other classic. It goes back as the interpretation of the Word of the Supreme Creator. I am glad that it goes back without comment and I trust, gentlemen, that it will go back. (Applause.)

Mr. LAMSON of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, the Bible or the reading thereof needs no defense, as we all know.

Might I just quote the latter part of this bill: "Reading the Ten Commandments, the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon, the Sermon on

the Mount, and the Lord's Prayer." Now if there is anything in that that will cause discussion or will cause dissension, I have nothing more to say, and I hope this motion will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not understand that there has been any motion made. The question is on the motion that the bill receive its third reading. Is the House ready for the question?

The motion prevailed and the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: Is there anything that any member feels that he can take from the table before we recess?

On motion by Mr. Cummings of Portland, Senate document No. 283, An Act to amend Sections twenty, twenty-seven and twenty-eight of Chapter one hundred and twenty-seven, Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter two hundred and ninety-one, Public Laws of nineteen hundred and seventeen, relating to intoxicating liquors, tabled by that gentleman March 28th, pending assignment for third reading, was taken from the table.

Mr. CUMMINGS: Mr. Speaker I now offer House amendment A to Senate document No. 283, and move its adoption.

House Amendment A to Senate Document No. 283

Amend Senate document 283 by inserting after the word "person" in the first line of Section 27, the words "except a physician or bonded druggist dispensing same under the provision of the Federal law".

Mr. CUMMINGS of Portland: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: It was not the purpose of the committee to exceed the provisions of the Federal law in bills reported. The constitution of the State of Maine permits the use of liquor for medicinal purposes under certain restrictions. The Federal law does the same. There are a great many cases where it is believed by many men and many women that liquor has its use. Today, of course, all poisons are regulated, the dispensing of them is regulated, and I see no reason why it should not be so, why the dispensing of liquor for medicinal purposes under the safeguards of the provisions of the Federal law should not be done.

Take, for example a case where a man who is old and feeble, his circulation is poor, his heart is weak, and the doctor says that he needs a stimulant, just the same as the physician would prescribe any other remedy whether it were poisonous or not, and the only way that he can obtain it for that man is an illegal way.

There is a gentleman in this State whom every member of this House knows and they know him as an honorable man. He is a man who had a very serious operation within a year and came very near dying. He is a man past middle age and he told me personally that he believes it is very wrong that there is no way whereby, in a case like that, through a physician or through a bonded druggist it can be obtained legally. After he had recovered from his operation he was weak and very low. His physician believed that he must have a stimulant. He procured a portion of a bottle of whiskey which had been in a certain man's possession for quite a number of years, and he believed that it was of great benefit to him. But he could get no more except by somebody in some way violating the law.

Now it does not seem to me that that situation is right. It does not seem to me that it contributes to the welfare of the people or to the cause of temperance. I believe that that condition causes violation of the law, and that is why I presented the amendment to this bill. I believe it is a wise thing to do and in harmony with the constitution of Maine and with the laws of the United States. I move its adoption.

Mr. OAKES of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I arose yesterday to object to the passage of a law because I believed it would not be advisable to pass a law that would and could not be enforced. I rise now to object to this amendment, introduced by my colleague from Portland, Mr. Cummings, because that amendment introduces the loophole for the breach in the liquor law in the State of Maine.

Science, regardless, perhaps, of the desires of many of us, has proven that it is not necessary to have liquor to cure disease because other drugs and other means are provided to meet the same requirements. To introduce this law will allow the State of Maine to get into the same disrepute that many other states are in at this present

time where fictitious prescriptions are constantly being used, where druggists and other agencies are employed to distribute intoxicating liquors and the enforcement officers are at a loss to know where the line is to start and to stop. I hope that this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. CUMMINGS: Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is familiar with the Federal law he knows that under it a druggist, in order to dispense liquor for medicinal use, has to file a bond and come under very strict regulations, at least as strict as he does in dispensing any of the poisons which he does dispense.

Now I do not believe that this amendment is opening an avenue to the violation of the law. I believe it is closing an opening which is constantly being used to violate the law and will be increasingly used as time goes on. There is reason in all things. There is absolutely nothing but what you can go to extremes in and when you do go to that great extreme you always hurt the cause you want to help. I believe that this is the situation today.

Mr. GILMOUR of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, I have had some little experience with using liquor as a medicine and I have never objected to using it when necessary. It is a well known fact that if a person has got a weak heart some people have administered strychnine to stimulate the working of the heart. Now I leave it to every one of you gentlemen here if a little good whiskey, mixed with warm water and sugar, is not far better to take than that deadly poison strychnine. (Applause)

My brother Oakes of Portland says that it will leave a loophole for the bootleggers to sell it. Now have we not got temperance laws enough in this state already in force to guard against that? It can be guarded against. There is law enough now to take care of that, and when you make so many different laws, that can be interpreted in so many different ways, it brings those laws into contempt, and who is there here now in this Legislature, who has read the newspapers who does not believe that the liquor laws of this country and of this state are in contempt and violated by a great many, because they are not enforced? We have the power to do it. There is no question about that. I fully agree with my brother, Mr. Cummings of

Portland on this amendment and I hope it will pass.

Mr. OAKES of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I like to speak after Mr. Gilmour because he says things so well it makes you feel funny, but in answer to his suggestion, and the suggestion of Mr. Cummings, that we do not want more laws, I would simply say that this amendment of Mr. Cummings' merely aids the condition that has existed in the past and will continue to exist if we do not adopt the law as it exists at the present time.

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker. the distinguished gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Gilmour) left out one important ingredient, and that was a lemon. It seems to me that this amendment is a perfect lemon and I hope it will fail of passage.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the adoption of House Amendment A on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Cummings.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, may we have the amendment read again.

The SPEAKER: The clerk will read again House Amendment A to Senate Document No. 283.

The amendment was read by the clerk.

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

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-one having voted in the affirmative and 54 in the negative the amendment failed of adoption.

The SPEAKER: The question is now on the assignment for third reading of the bill.

On motion by Mr. Cummings of Portland the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed, under suspension of the rules.

On motion by Mr. Melcher of Rumford, House Document No. 482, An Act to amend Section Thirty-eight of Chapter Two Hundred Nineteen of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Seventeen, as amended by Chapter Thirty-seven of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Nineteen and as amended by Chapter One Hundred Seventeen of the Public Laws of Nineteen Twenty-one, relating to the protection of deer,

tabled by that gentleman March 29th pending passage to be engrossed, was taken from the table.

On motion by Mr. Bartlett of Hanover the bill was retabled pending passage to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Sanders of Portland, House Amendment A to Resolve for charitable and benevolent institutions, for the care, support and medical or surgical treatment of certain persons, tabled by that gentleman March 29th pending adoption, was taken from the table.

Mr. SANDERS: Mr. Speaker, I would now like to inquire if that amendment was adopted yesterday.

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

Mr. SANDERS: Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Ray.

Mr. RAY of Old Town: Mr. Speaker, this is a resolve for charitable and benevolent institutions, and it is with regard to the hospital section of that document. Now I hold in my hand a list of the hospitals that received aid during the last two years and after very careful checking over, I find that the Old Town Hospital was the only one that was left out from that list, and as this hospital has received the aid since 1911, I presume that the committee left that out by a clerical error. So I have brought in this amendment to correct that error.

I think that each member of this House present will see the position that I am in on this matter. When I go home I would be questioned with regard to why our hospital in Old Town was left out of that list. It seems to me as though the fair thing to do would be, if they did not want to spend the extra thousand dollars a year, would be to take it out pro rata through the whole list.

Now I feel that as this was evidently a clerical error I need say nothing further at this time.

Mr. SANDERS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, that the hospital in Old Town was not left out of the list through a clerical error. It was left out by vote of the entire committee. The committee has endeavored to be

very fair with all the institutions who have received aid in the past and in this particular case, we gave it a hearing as we did all the others and we found, as a result of the hearing, that in our opinion we did not feel that that institution was one that should receive aid. There is absolutely no politics or anything of that kind in this proposition. There was another hospital from Old Town there seeking aid which we did not vote to recommend, and so with this one. It was done because we felt that the institution did not warrant receiving this aid.

This report is the unanimous report of the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, and it seems to me, gentlemen, that if we were to start now opening up this report that we cannot know just where we will land in connection with these appropriation matters, and for that reason I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. PERKINS of Orono: Mr. Speaker and members of the 81st Legislature: In behalf of that very excellent gentleman who represents the people of Old Town and in behalf of the very excellent people of the city of Old Town, I sincerely hope that you will over-ride the objections of the committee and grant to them that paltry sum of one thousand dollars a year, because I wish to assure you, gentlemen, as a man who lives in that vicinity, that the Old Town Hospital is doing very good work, and when we get to the stage where we must transport every person requiring assistance of that kind to the Bangor Hospital, twelve miles away, I think we are retarding progress and endangering human health.

I have not heard any insinuations here this morning that make me think it is a political matter. I simply feel that the people of Old Town are deserving of one thousand dollars a year to be used in that hospital, and I feel that we can do no more charitable deed here today than to assent to the amendment of my Brother Ray.

Mr. HOUGHTON of Fort Fairfield: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the remarks of Brother Sanders of Portland. The hearing was had and the unanimous report of the committee was that this hospital should not receive aid, and I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. RAY of Old Town: Mr. Speaker and fellow members: Perhaps I can say two or three words more. As you all know, the hospital only gets the amount of money for the amount of work that they do. If the appropriation is \$1,000 and they could do \$250 worth of work they would only receive \$250. They have to give a certificate of some kind, I do not know just what it is, with regard to the work they do. Now it hardly seems fair to me if a new hospital starts in the town, if that hospital comes here to the State Capitol and wants aid, to throw out one that has had aid for the last ten or twelve years and throw them both out so that the citizens of Old Town that have met with hard luck and become a charity charge would either have to go to Bangor, twelve or thirteen miles away when we have hospitals in the city of Old Town that can take care of them, or else become a town charge and for the rest of their lives be stigmatized as a pauper with a poor charge against them. That is the point I wish to make. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the adoption of the amendment on the motion of the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Ray. It the House ready for the question?

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and 37 in the negative, the amendment was adopted, and the resolve as amended, was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Maher of Augusta, majority and minority reports of the committee on Judiciary, on bill, An Act relating to jury trials in probate appeals, tabled by that gentleman on March 29th, pending the acceptance of either report, were taken from the table.

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: I, being one of the signers of the minority report, and feeling that the time of this House would be needlessly taken up at this juncture in attempting to pass the majority report, I move the acceptance of the majority report.

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents out of order, House Report.

Mr. Drake from the committee on Ways and Bridges, on bill, An Act to enable the towns of Turner and Leeds, in the County of Androscoggin, to make free the North Turner Toll Bridge, and appropriating five thousand dollars therefor, reports same in new draft under title of, bill, An Act to enable the towns of Turner and Leeds in the county of Androscoggin to make free the North Turner Toll Bridge, and that it ought to pass.

Report read and accepted and the bill ordered printed under the joint rules.

The SPEAKER: Is there any other business to come before the House at this time?

On motion of Mr. Lamson of South Portland,

Recessed until two o'clock this afternoon.

AFTER RECESS

The following Resolves were recessed out of order, and upon recommendation of the committee on reference of bills were referred to the committee on appropriations and financial affairs.

Appropriations and Financial Affairs

By Mr. Wing of Auburn: Resolve on the payroll of the House of Representatives of the eighty-first Legislature.

By Mr. Phillips of Orrington: Resolve in favor of chaplains of the House of the eighty-first Legislature.

The SPEAKER: We will now proceed under orders of the day.

On motion by Mr. Archibald of Houlton, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it voted this morning to pass to be engrossed Senate document No. 292, as amended, Resolve for charitable and benevolent institutions for the care, support and medical or surgical treatment of certain persons; and on further motion by the same gentleman the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it adopted House amendment A, the amendment which was adopted being for the purpose of giving to the Old Town hospital one thousand dollars each year.

The SPEAKER: Did the gentleman (Mr. Archibald) vote for the acceptance of House amendment A?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: I did, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is in order.

On further motion by Mr. Archibald of Houlton, the Resolve was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Archibald of Houlton, it was voted to take from the table motion of the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Brewster, to recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of House document No. 466, An Act relating to the income and appropriations of the several departments and State institutions, tabled by Mr. Archibald at this morning's session.

The SPEAKER: The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Brewster, that we recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the bill.

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

On motion by Mr. Rowell of South Thomaston it was voted to take from the table report of the committee on Claims on Resolve appropriating money for South Thomaston for free high school, tabled by that gentleman March 28, pending acceptance of report, the report being ought not to pass.

Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thomas having assured me that the list on file in the Legislature had been changed to read "South Thomaston" instead of "Thomaston", I move you that the report be accepted.

The motion prevailed, and was sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Crafts of Greenville, it was voted to take from the table House Document No. 488, Resolve appropriating money to aid in the screening of certain lakes and ponds, tabled by that gentleman this morning.

Mr. CRAFTS: I now offer House Amendment A.

House Amendment A to House Document 488

Amend House Document 488 by striking out the word "six" in the first line thereof, and by substituting therefor the word "seven," and by inserting at the end of said document

after the paragraph relating to appropriations for screening Cobbosseecontee Lake, the following:

"And for screening the outlet of Unity Pond or Winnecook Lake, in Waldo county, one thousand dollars."

The amendment was adopted, and the resolve having had its two several readings was passed to be engrossed, as amended by House Amendment A.

On motion by Mr. Archibald of Houlton, it was voted to take from the table House Document 327, An Act providing for state and county aid in construction of highway bridges, tabled by that gentleman March 29, pending its second reading.

The bill then had its second reading and Mr. Archibald offered House Amendment A, and moved its passage, as follows:

House Amendment A to House Document No. 327.

House Document No. 327 is hereby amended by striking out the word "approve" in line eight in the second paragraph of Section one, and inserting in place thereof the word "determine."

The amendment was adopted, and the bill as amended received its third reading under suspension of the rules and was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Lamoine: Mr. Speaker, this morning in some way the gasoline bill got by me and I wanted a chance to say something on it. Therefore, I now move that we reconsider the vote whereby it was passed to be engrossed.

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby House Document No. 490, An Act providing for a tax upon gasoline and other products used in operating internal combustion engines was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: Firstly, I believe in direct taxation. In the next place, I believe that if we are going to tax, it should not tend toward class legislation. The farmers of our State say that they are willing to accept the one cent tax with no exemptions. I represent perhaps more miles of fishermen and lobstermen than any one member of the

House. Those fishermen and lobstermen use gasoline three hundred days in the year; they do not use the roads. And I notice as I say "lobstermen" that there is a sort of a smile comes on someone's face, and that should not be so. Those lobstermen and fishermen along our coast, and especially in the county from which I come, have always been men of the very first water; and I consider it an honor to represent that class of men here. They are not ignoramuses, they are intelligent human beings, and they believe that if they are taxed for gasoline to use in their boats, and we build roads for the farmers, if it were possible to build roads for them to go to their work in the morning, they would accept one cent with no exemptions. But it is impossible, and I will picture it just for a moment. They get out at two o'clock in the morning, stumble down over the rocks, get into their dingy and go off to their boat and start for their day's work. In storm or sunshine they are obliged to go to get a living that they may intelligently educate their children, and there is no class of people in the State of Maine who are any more anxious for education than those same island fishermen. In 1812, the men who manned our naval vessels were from the coast of Maine, to a large degree those same fishermen. From 1861 to 1865, they furnished the men for the navy to a large degree, and among the names that come down to us is that of Preble, and many others who have been honored in the annals of our Navy. When we wanted to bring home the cup from Lipton, the men who sailed the American boats were fishermen from Hancock county,—those same islands a part of which I represent. In the late war they responded to the call.

Now, they are only asking this much that to get to their work they should be allowed to use gasoline without paying a tax, 300 days in the year. They have not the opportunity to travel the roads for which we want this money. They claim that if it were direct taxation, they would willingly pay their share, as they always have, of the taxes of this State, and they feel that the money which they might pay in the form of a gasoline tax would enable them to get their children ashore to the mainland to a high school or academy or college education. And while I am speaking of education, I have this one fact to re-

mind you of which I am very proud, and that is, that Hancock county, comprised as it is in a great measure of fishermen, is the lowest county in the State in percentage of illiterates, and those fishermen want to keep up that record. They want to get the rights of education granted to them without any exemption or any spending of their hard earnings to go on the roads, unless each class pays its same percentage and its same pro rata of the direct taxes of the State of Maine. And I wish to go on record as protesting against the one cent tax without exemption, and I do this in consideration of the feelings of that great class of fishermen that sometimes you smile at, those lobstermen, who are as much entitled to consideration as any other class in the State of Maine.

Mr. BAKER of Steuben: Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost regard for the gentleman from Lamoine, Mr. Douglas; and I, too, represent a large class of fishermen, and I want to talk with you just a moment or two and give you the views of the class of fishermen whom I have the privilege to represent. I suppose it may be a fact which my good friend, brother Douglas would not dispute that the fishermen as a class own more automobiles according to the numbers engaged in business than any other class of people in the State of Maine. In my section three-quarters of the fishermen own automobiles. I too, have been in touch with some of those fishermen. They say that they use the roads and they would not mind the tax if it were used on first-class roads on which they live along the mainland. The president of the Fisheries Protective Association comes from that immediate section of which my brother Douglas speaks, and he appeared before our committee recently. I suppose that probably he, too, represents the fishermen, being the president of that association. He said before our committee that he would be glad to join in this because it would be a thing that would advance and help the rural roads. I do not know whether he has communicated with his constituents or not, but I take it for granted that he too knew what he was talking about, else he would not have said what he did before our committee.

When it is known by our people in the rural communities of the added

benefits from this tax to third-class roads, I doubt if there will be but very few who will raise a voice in protest in regard to the one cent tax, and I believe that the fishermen in my section,—and I am pretty closely in touch with them—will be big enough and broad enough to see this in the light of helping the rural communities in which they live.

I feel sorry to take any different view from my good friend from Lamoine, but I want you people to know that it is not all one way. I know that the fishermen have taken up a great deal of time in this Legislature with fishery matters, but when the president of their association comes here and speaks for the fishermen, as I suppose he undoubtedly did, I feel that his word ought to have weight. I speak for a part of the fishermen, I have not communicated with them all, but I speak for a part of the fishermen in my section, and I feel that they are big enough to see this in the broad light, and that they will be willing to pay their proportionate share of the tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Lamoine: Mr. Speaker, I do not want my good brother Baker to misunderstand me. He is speaking for the fishermen of Washington county. I am speaking for the island fishermen of Hancock county.

Mr. CHERRY of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, and members of the House: I wish to simply enter a protest against the passage of the gasoline bill and the tax of one cent per gallon. I do not feel that it is necessary to take up any time other than to say that we feel in our community that this is an injustice; and I would point out to you the fact that it is estimated that 500,000 gallons of gasoline are used for motor boats out of Eastport and Lubec. Without taking up a moment more of your time, which I do not feel is necessary, in support of my position. I have a remonstrance from the Eastport city government, signed by the mayor and the aldermen, and another remonstrance from the sardine packers of Eastport, signed by all the packers. I thank you.

Mr. LELAND of Sangerville: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I have listened with a good deal of interest to my distinguished friend from Lamoine (Mr. Douglas) in his argument, and I am sorry to say that I cannot equal his eloquence in any

argument, but I feel that his line of reasoning might be questioned. It seems to me an evident fact that there is no class of people in the State of Maine who do not directly benefit by the improvement of our roads. There may, of course, be individual cases scattered over the State that might possibly suffer some hardship through a tax of one cent on a gallon of gasoline without exemptions; but it seems to me that in view of the small amount of the tax, and in view of the fact that there is no considerable class or group of people who do not benefit from the improvement of our roads, there can be no logical reason for opposing this measure. It must be evident to any one who has ever visited our coast during the summer season, and our summer resorts there, that there is no class of people which has directly benefitted more in their business through the improvement of good roads and the increase in our summer travel than those same fishermen; and it seems to me in view of the fact that the maintaining of our roads is a very essential thing, and the funds therefore are at present inadequate, that this is indeed a reasonable and fair and logical manner in which to raise that revenue.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. ROUNDS: Are the Standard Oil Company, the Gulf Refining Company and the Valvoline Company exempt from this tax? They are using our roads a good deal, and can anybody tell me, through the Chair, whether there is any such exemption?

Mr. CHERRY of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, answering the question as I understand it, the Standard Oil Company would not be obliged to pay the tax. It may not seem just equitable, but it is a fact as I understand it.

Mr. LAMSON of South Portland: Gentlemen, I want to say right here that I am against this tax anyhow. I think there are taxes enough, and if we start in on this thing no man knows where it will end. But if it is a foregone conclusion that we must have a gasoline tax, then in Heaven's name let everyone take his medicine. I see no reason for any one class to be exempted more than another.

Mr. ROGERS of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter my protest against this gasoline tax without exemption in behalf of the fishermen of Knox county. I think there is more gasoline sold in Rockland to the motor boats than there is to the automobile users. The people in my section live on the islands. It is not like Washington county where each one of them owns an automobile. If it were, they would be perfectly willing to pay a gasoline tax on what they used in the automobiles; but they do not have automobiles.

It is not human nature that a man living on an island and using gasoline in a motor boat would be willing to pay a tax to help keep up the roads in the back part of the State. It has been stated that the fishermen are willing to pay that tax. I do not think that is so; they are not in my section of the country.

My brother from Lamoine (Mr. Douglas) spoke of the intelligence of the fishermen. I would like to remind the House that two years ago we passed a certain law in this House, it went through the Senate, the Governor signed it, the attorney general pronounced it all right, and it remained for a fisherman out on one of the islands in Knox county to declare that that law was unconstitutional, and it was amended by our attorney general.

Mr. CUMMINGS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, it is embarrassing to me to get up here and speak on this matter. Nevertheless, I want to say that, as I understand it, the oil companies who bring this oil into the State, when they sell it they keep a record of it. They are put to the expense of doing that themselves, and they remit the tax to the State officials without charge. The only remuneration that they do get is apparently owing to the fact that they do not in any way pay a tax on what they themselves use.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Orrington: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: It seems to me that if there is one question that is apparent to all of us here in this Legislature, it is the need of money. Now we have got to maintain our roads, and we have got to build roads and we have got to take care of them; and if we impose a tax on gasoline, that will work similarly to all taxes, there will be injustice to some. You cannot impose a tax without its working some injustice. I sympathize with

the fishermen and also with the farmers. A lot of the farmers are opposed to the tax. They do not want to be taxed on gasoline for their threshing machines, their tractors, their wood-sawing outfits, and the various things they use; and if we are going to have a tax on gasoline, it seems to me that the only wise and proper way is to put it through straight without any exemptions. Exemptions, to my mind, are a bad thing in taxation.

Mr. SANDERS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, the matter under consideration is House bill No. 490 in new draft. Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, that a tax on gasoline is a very fair and proper tax. All of us who use cars help to wear out the roads, and the maintenance of our highway system is of great importance to all of the taxpayers of the State, and a tax on gasoline is a very fair tax. A man who drives a large heavy car wears out the roads faster than a man who drives a small car. That car takes more gasoline, and therefore his tax would be heavier than the man with the smaller car. The same is true of the man who drives his car a great deal in comparison with the man who drives his car only a little. The man driving his car a lot wears out the roads faster than a man who drives his car only a few thousand miles each year, and his tax would be greater.

Then another feature of this gasoline tax which appeals to me as being a very fair proposition is that the out of the state people who come here, I understand a great many of them already have this gasoline tax,—come here and help wear out our roads, and should be made to spend a fair proportional part of the cost of the wear and tear upon those roads, and when they buy they will pay their one cent per gallon tax the same as do the residents of the State.

Now this provides for exempting kerosene and crude oil. My understanding of the situation is that a great many of our fishermen along the coast burn kerosene, some of them, and a great many of them burn crude oil in their motors. This is especially true of the larger boats, and it seems to me that it would be a very unfair proposition to say that good roads do not benefit the fishermen.

We all know that good roads bring a great many people into the State and in that way the fishermen are benefited, also in getting their product to market, a great deal of which goes over the State highways; and, if the State highways are kept in proper condition, they benefit as a result of it.

In order to make it absolutely fair for all sections of the State, this bill provides that "all moneys received through the provisions of this act by the treasurer of State shall be appropriated and used in the following, namely,—50 per cent thereof for the maintenance of State and State-aid highways, interstate, intrastate and international bridges, and the balance is to be added to the fund for the construction of third-class highways." Now that is a very fair proposition up to that point, and then the act goes on to say: "Provided, however, that when an amendment of the Constitution of this State as proposed by this Legislature providing additional moneys by bond issue for the construction of State and State-aid highways, interstate, intrastate and international bridges, shall have been adopted by the legal voters of this State and become effective, then and thereafter all moneys received from the tax herein provided shall be appropriated and used for the maintenance of State and State-aid highways." Now it seems to me, gentlemen, that that is absolutely a fair proposition to all sections of the State. If we are going to have a tax upon gasoline, it seemed to the committee that the one cent tax with no exemptions would be by far the better proposition. If we had the two cent tax with exemptions, the cost of taking care of those exemptions would be quite an item; but in this bill as proposed the cost of collecting the tax will be kept down to a minimum. As has been stated, blanks will be furnished by the treasury department through the distributors of gasoline; and by distributor is not meant the dealer, but the larger distributors who import gasoline into the State. These blanks are furnished to these distributors, they fill out the blanks, and pay the tax directly to the State; so under this form there is a very small minimum cost for collecting the tax. It seemed to the committee that this bill was an absolutely fair and square proposition to all sections of the State.

Mr. TOWNE of Norway: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature: There is another class that has not

been mentioned in this discussion who would be entitled to exemption if there was any exemption at all, and that would be the manufacturers of the State. The manufacturers of the State use a large amount of gasoline. There are many portable mills throughout the State that use gasoline. Now so far in the history of this bill in the Legislature there have been no demands from the manufacturers or from portable mills for exemptions from paying this gasoline tax. So far there has been no protest among the farmers. They are willing to pay this tax in order to have better roads; and coming down to the point and those who protest against the payment of this tax, we find that it simmers down to a part of the fishermen along the coast. I move that this bill have passage without any exemption at all.

Mr. HAYES of Chelsea: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Lamoine, Mr. Douglas, says that the fishermen do not use the roads at all. Now what matters it whether they use the roads to bring us their product, or whether we use them to go to their place and get it. If we go down to Brother Douglas' summer hotel next summer and buy a lobster, who is going to pay the tax? I submit that we are, and I fail to see where the lobsterman is going to pay directly any of that tax. Furthermore, they receive their mail over the roads, and they are benefited by that, and I think they will not suffer any more than the farmer who has to pay for running his tractor and his stationary engine, or the portable sawmill man. I hope the matter will go through.

Mr. ROGERS of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that instead of the lobster fisherman having to get his product over the road, it goes by rail. I think fully 90 per cent of the lobsters caught off this coast go out of the State either by rail or boat.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

The question was called for.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the reconsideration of the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Lamoine, Mr. Douglas, whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed. As many as favor its reconsideration will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion to reconsider was lost.

Mr. OAKES of Portland: Mr. Speaker, on account of a bill that is

being investigated, I move that the matter lie on the table.

Mr. SANDERS of Portland: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Sanders, will understand that a motion to table is not debatable. As many as are in favor of tabling the matter will say aye, those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken.

The motion to table was lost.

The SPEAKER: The Chair presents out of order bills on their passage to be enacted.

Passed to be Enacted

An Act for the better protection of clams in the limits of the town of Kennebunkport in the county of York.

An Act to provide for the licensing, inspection and regulation of hotels and private lodging houses.

An Act to incorporate the Union Ferry Company.

An Act to amend the Charter of the city of Hallowell, relating to the appointment of the city marshal and street commissioner.

An Act to amend Sections 6, 9 and 17 of Chapter 78 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to auxiliary State forests.

An Act to incorporate the Columbia Falls Water Company.

An Act to incorporate the North Village Water Company.

An Act to amend Section 122 of Chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes, relating to license for building fish weir or trap.

An Act for the control and suppression of the European corn borer.

An Act to amend Section 9 of Chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, relating to real estate where taxed.

An Act to incorporate the North Orrington cemetery improvement association.

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.

An Act to amend Section 67 of Chapter 82 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 210 of the Public Laws of 1919, relating to the Attorney-General.

An Act relating to the incorporation

of the Androscoggin and Kennebec Railway Company and the issue of stock by it.

An Act to enable the town of Kennebunk to purchase an existing private sewer or drain.

An Act to amend Section 24 of Chapter 70 of the Revised Statutes, relating to deposits in the county treasury of certain sums of money derived from estates in the probate court.

Papers from the Senate received out of order and disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Final report of the committee on pensions.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on appropriations and financial affairs on bill, An Act to require the investment in permanent securities of school funds and other trust funds held by city, town and State officers, and amending Section 72 of Chapter two, Section 54 of Chapter 17, and Section 14 of Chapter 21 of the Revised Statutes, reporting the same in new draft under the same title and that it ought to pass.

In the Senate report read and accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence and the bill had its three readings under suspension of the rules and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on appropriations and financial affairs on Resolve appropriating money for the establishment of a test laboratory at Bangor, in the county of Penobscot, reporting same in new draft, under same title and that it ought to pass.

In the Senate, report read and accepted, and the Resolve passed to be engrossed.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence, the rules were suspended and the Resolve had its two several readings and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on appropriations and financial affairs on Resolve in favor of L. Mae Richmond for special and ex-

tra work for aiding the members of the 81st Legislature, reporting that the same ought to pass.

In the Senate, report read and accepted and the Resolve passed to be engrossed.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence, the rules were suspended and the Resolve had its two several readings and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on appropriations and financial affairs on Resolve in favor of hospital trustees for per diem, travelling and other expenses, reporting that the same ought to pass.

In the Senate, report read and accepted, and the Resolve passed to be engrossed.

In the House report read and accepted in concurrence the rules were suspended, and the Resolve had its two several readings and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on judiciary on bill, An Act to provide for the supervision, regulation and conduct of the transportation of persons over the public highways of the State of Maine by automobiles, jitney busses and auto stages by the Public Utilities Commission.

In the Senate, report read and accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence, the rules were suspended, and the bill had its three several readings and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill, An Act to regulate the sale of vinegar.

This was passed to be enacted in the House and passed to be engrossed in the House.

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

In the House, that body voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be enacted. It also voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the adoption of Senate

Amendment A which the Clerk will read.

(Senate Amendment read by the Clerk.)

Thereupon the House voted to adopt Senate Amendment A in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Report of Committee

Out of order

Mr. Archibald from the committee appointed to consider the Cole Report on bill, An Act in relation to the several examining boards, reporting that the same ought to pass, and in addition thereto an additional bill entitled, "An Act in relation to the fees to be charged by the Board of Registration of Medicine, and that that also should pass.

The report read and accepted and the bills ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. McDONALD of Eact Machias: Mr. Speaker, I move that the matter be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday, April 3.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion to table and specially assign was lost.

The SPEAKER: The bills will be printed under the joint rules.

On motion by Mr. Crafts of Greenville, it was voted to take from the table House Document No. 487, An Act to amend Section 86 of Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1917, as amended by Chapter 244 of the Public Laws of 1917, and by Chapter 142 of the Public Laws of 1919, and by Chapter 93 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the disposition of money collected under the provisions of the Inland Fish and Game laws; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: Is there any other business before the House? Is there anything on the printed calendar that any member feels he can take off at this time? If not the House may recess and respond at the sound of the gavel and the horn.

After Recess

From the Senate: Ordered, the House concurring, that when the Sen-

ate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet again Monday, April 2nd, at four-thirty o'clock P. M.

In the Senate, read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

Senate Papers out of Order

From the Senate: House Document 460, bill, An Act to amend chapter two hundred seventeen of the Public Laws of nineteen hundred nineteen, relating to appropriation for normal schools and Madawaska Training School.

This was passed to be engrossed in the House, March 27th.

In the Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in non-concurrence.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, is that one of those bills

that was gone over with the Appropriations Committee?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state, in answer to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, that this fund is to be taken from the three and one-half mill school tax fund, and is not concerned with that committee.

In the House, that body voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed and that body voted to adopt Senate Amendment A in concurrence, and and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in concurrence

On motion by Mrs Pinkham of Fort Kent,

Adjourned until Monday April 2nd at 4.30 o'clock P. M.