

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

SENATE

Friday, March 16, 1923.

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. A. F. Walch of Augusta.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

On motion by Mr. Clark of Lincoln, under suspension of the rules, it was ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn they adjourn to meet on Monday, March 19th, at 4.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

Sent down for concurrence.

Papers from the House disposed of in concurrence.

From the House: Report of the committee on interior waters, ought not to pass, on H. D. 61, An Act to provide for a commission to be known as the Peoples' Rights and Water Power Commission of the State of Maine.

In the House the report of the committee was accepted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Cram of Cumberland, tabled pending acceptance of the report in concurrence.

House Bills in First Reading

H. D. 153. An Act to amend Section 36 of Chapter 67 of the Revised Statutes, relating to jury trials in probate appeals.

(On motion by Mr. Hussey of Aroostook, tabled pending first reading).

H. D. 203. An Act to amend Chapter 112 of the Public Laws of 1919, relative to disorderly houses.

H. D. 373. An Act to establish a close time on lobsters from a point in a straight line from Bear Cove on the western side of Petit Manan Point to Little Black Ledge directly north of Moulton's Ledge Spar Buoy to the Schoodic Island Whistling Buoy.

From the House: S. D. 220, An Act to repeal Section 43 of Chapter 19 of the Revised Statutes, relating to local health officers.

This bill was passed to be engrossed by the Senate and in the House was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Hinckley of Cumberland, the Senate voted to insist on

its former action and asked for a committee of conference.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will appoint the committee later.

From the House: H. D. 191, An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 319 Public Laws of 1915, as amended by Chapter 243, Public Laws of 1919, relating to State and county aid in the construction of highway bridges.

The PRESIDENT: In this matter the Senate will remember that House Amendment A originally was adopted and afterwards rejected and the bill passed to be engrossed without the amendment. It now comes from the House that branch insisting on its passage to be engrossed and asking for a committee of conference.

The Speaker of the House appointed as such committee on the part of the House,

Messrs. CHALMERS of Bangor,
ARCHIBALD of Houlton,
HOLMES of Lewiston

On motion by Mr. Hinckley of Cumberland, the Senate voted to insist and join a committee of conference.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will announce the committee later.

From the House: S. D. 194, resolve for the laying of county taxes for the year 1923.

In the House the action was reconsidered whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed and House Amendment A was adopted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Hinckley of Cumberland, the vote was reconsidered whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, House Amendment A was adopted, and the bill as amended by House Amendment A was passed to be engrossed.

Veto Message from the Governor

STATE OF MAINE
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
AUGUSTA

March 14, 1923.

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

I return herewith without my approval.

"RESOLVE Appropriating Money for Rebuilding the Steamship Sheds at the State Pier at Portland."

I have given serious thought to this Resolve and have considered it from every angle. The problem that it presents is one of the most diffi-

cult I have been called upon to face. My reason for declining to approve the Resolve is that at the present time the State cannot afford to spend the \$165,000 called for. On all sides demands for money are pouring into the Legislature and some halt must be called before it is too late. The tax rate is mounting and its progress upward must be arrested. Almost every legislator has a special project in which he is interested and each member will need to make some sacrifice if any limit is to be placed on taxation.

As often happens excuses are now being offered as to why an increased tax rate is unavoidable. Some urge that the rate of the last two years was too low, but with this argument I am not in accord. It may be that if the tax rate for 1921 and 1922 had been larger this Legislature would have more easily excused a high rate of its own making. This argument is based upon political considerations and is not sound. I believe in reducing taxes whenever it is possible to do so, and am glad we were able to effect a considerable saving for the people in 1921 and 1922. I do not approve the position some public men take, that it is not good politics to reduce taxation below a certain point for fear that invidious comparisons between state administrations may be made. If we were able to carry on the State Government at a low tax rate in 1921 and 1922 so much the better for all concerned; the future must care for itself.

Many legislators are comforting themselves by saying that the State should not practice "false" economy, and that it must not neglect to care for its property. It is alleged that the people at home will understand the high tax rate if the matter is thoroughly explained to them. This reasoning seems to be making some headway about legislative halls and I have reason to believe it is not altogether unselfish. The fact is the people who pay the bills will brush aside all excuses, for their particular concern is the tax rate that we impose upon them. Any arguments to the contrary are misleading and confuse the issue. All agree that the State should not allow its property to deteriorate but the question is; just what is necessary to keep the State's property in proper condition? As to this no

doubt there is an honest difference of opinion when any particular case is concerned. It is not well, however, to offer excuses for increasing the tax rate, for excuses are not reasons.

It has been agreed that the State is in the pier "business" and consequently must continue in it; that it must keep up what it has started, even though a large expense is involved. No doubt certain sections of the west side of the pier need strengthening; ultimately that side must be rebuilt. I have weighed these arguments, and am of the opinion that the State should complete the easterly side of the pier before it undertakes new construction. The wharf should be put in safe condition so that for the next few years it will serve the purposes for which it is now being used. Future legislatures can decide the future of the pier.

At first I felt that there was but one course to pursue and that was to approve the Resolve. The more I have considered the situation the more reluctant am I to take affirmative action. I decide this question just as though I myself owned the pier and personally was charged with its management. In such case my first desire would be to retain as a tenant the Eastern Steamship Company so that its service would continue. If I owned the wharf I should strengthen it where needed, but would not expend \$165,000 at the present time in rebuilding it along modern lines. I myself am directly responsible for two privately owned wharfs in Portland and I am treating the State Pier as though it were one of them. This is the only way to approach the question. Just at the present moment the piling is covered with ice and it is difficult to make an accurate survey.

In a letter addressed to me by one of the pier directors the statement is made that unless the wharf is rebuilt this summer the directors will not allow it to be used after next August. If the directors consider it safe to use the wharf between now and August next it cannot be in immediate danger of collapsing. I fully appreciate the valuable public service that has been rendered by the pier directors; they have devoted themselves unselfishly to their work and merit the thanks of their fellow citizens.

In my opinion it is unfortunate that the westerly side of the pier was not rebuilt before all the funds amounting to \$1,150,000 were spent on the new sheds on the easterly side. Had this been done the New York, Boston and Eastport boats would have been taken care of and the sheds for foreign and Pacific coast steamers might have been reduced somewhat in size, and both sides of the pier then would have been made reasonably satisfactory without overdrawing the original appropriation. The construction of the grain conveyors might have been postponed for the money now being spent on this portion of the pier would have been almost sufficient to have entirely rebuilt the westerly side.

The condition of the westerly side, if as bad as represented, must have been apparent to the engineers a year ago when they began their construction work, and it may be that an error in judgment was made in not attending to this section of the pier at the very outset. Had this been done there would have been no question about the safety of the pier.

The position in which the Chief Executive now is placed is difficult. Regardless of an individual's opinion as to the wisdom of the State's having embarked in the pier business, the property now is held by the State and must be managed in a business-like way. An ultimatum is presented to the Governor to the effect that unless \$165,000 is immediately made available the westerly side of the wharf is likely to be closed. I do not think that either horn of this dilemma need be chosen for I believe the pier can be made safe for the next two years by a comparatively small outlay and the directors no doubt will be able to make a short term contract with the Eastern Steamship Company. If concessions are made in the Company's rental probably arrangements can be perfected so that it will continue its Portland-Boston service. If this veto is sustained the directors no doubt will do their best to make the premises safe and the responsibility for doing so rests upon them. Later after the present new construction on the east side is completed the directors can come to the next legislature and give an accounting of their stewardship.

The whole economy program of the

81st Legislature hinges upon this appropriation. I shall not hesitate to take a decided stand against unwarranted expenditures, even though by doing so I shall disappoint some of the public spirited citizens of my native city. I hope the members of this Legislature will take this situation to heart for legislators, as well as Governors, should have a State-wide vision, and should not unduly urge appropriations for any particular section or community. If such a spirit prevails this Legislature will have done much to relieve the burdens of taxation.

For the reasons above stated I decline to approve the Pier Resolve.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) PERCIVAL P. BAXTER
Governor of Maine.

The message was read by the secretary.

Mr. BEMIS of Somerset: Mr. President, I move that this resolve with the accompanying message be tabled and specially assigned for next Wednesday.

A viva voce vote being had and the same being doubted a rising vote was had and eight senators voting in favor of the motion and nineteen opposed the motion was lost.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would state that in the House the vote having been taken under the Constitution on the usual question 123 voted in the affirmative, that the resolve become law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor, and 20 in the negative.

The question now before the Senate is whether or not this resolve shall be finally passed and become law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

The secretary will call the roll.

Mr. BUZZELL of Waldo: Mr. President, members of the Senate: It was not my intention to say anything on this resolve, but this is the first time that this Senate has refused to table anything after a motion being put to the Senate.

This resolve calls for the expenditure at the hands of the State of 165,000,—and what I say in connection with this resolve, I say, thinking of the entire Portland delegation, the Cumberland county delegation and their interest—no better representation in the halls of this Legislature than they, but the Gov-

ernor of this State, who comes from Portland, has disapproved of this measure. I am going to follow along in the same footsteps that I made two years ago. Well do I remember the remarks of Representative Davis from Freeport, and well do I remember the reception that he received in the House. At that time I believed he was absolutely right, and today I believe he is right. I am willing for the Governor of this State, who lives in that city of Portland, to take the responsibility of the action that he has taken in this matter, and furthermore, for one member of this Legislature, I do not want him to shoulder that responsibility altogether. I believe while the people of this State were very much interested and voted for this proposition when they did, I do not believe that they thought that this proposition was to be followed up with a hundred thousand now and then in support of this pier. Our Chief Executive says it is a very difficult matter and bothers him. It will bother us all. It will bother us all in two years from now. If this Legislature keeps on appropriating a hundred thousand dollars, and some of us who have interests join those interests and merge our interests with the interests of others, we will have an unheard of tax-rate in this State.

Now I am saying this and saying it advisedly. I know when we get into the corridors somebody will say "You are carrying this economy proposition too far." I have never seen reasonable economy carried too far in State or Nation. And particularly at this time, talk about carrying economy too far! Right here I am going to pay my respects once more to the State pier. I feel that I am consistent in it. I did not believe in the State of Maine—I never believed in the State of Maine going into business, with the Governor and all others that didn't believe in the State of Maine going into business extensively. I never believed in the State of Maine going into business in the water power proposition. I never believed in their going into business in the State pier proposition. They tell about the great benefit of the pier! I have no doubt it is of some benefit, but I am going to say this, that the ordinary fellow throughout the length and breadth of the State of Maine, if he should take a piece of paper and a pencil

and sit down and figure the benefit of that State pier to him, I am afraid he would sit there some little time before he could estimate the real benefit to him. Therefore I want to say now—I know the efforts of the Cumberland county boys, they have done their best, no one can blame them, they have worked early and late—others are interested in it because they have measures of their own—it is not good business to take one measure and work that along with other measures. As I said the other day, I am perfectly willing to act upon each measure as I come to it regardless of the result. I believe that is the way. I was in favor of tabling this measure, and I am going to vote against the passage of it today.

Mr. EATON of Oxford: Mr. President, I desire to state briefly the position of the committee on appropriations and financial affairs to which this resolve was referred. The committee gave the matter very full consideration. The whole committee visited the pier, spent a whole afternoon in inspecting it, and then after mature consideration and without a dissenting vote, un-animously reported the bill ought to pass. We believe that it is business economy for the State of Maine to take care of this property now.

Mr. WADSWORTH of Kennebec: Mr. President, I will not attempt to make a speech in regard to this matter, but just to bring the facts before the senators I would like to read the vote on the Constitutional amendment relating to the State pier. I will give it by counties. Androscoggin, 1675 yes, 512 no; Aroostook, 1396 yes, 506 no; Cumberland, 7087 yes, 711 no; Franklin, 372 yes, 270 no; Hancock, 624 yes, 334 no; Kennebec, 1771 yes, 826 no; Knox, 787 yes, 203 no; Lincoln 419 yes, 283 no; Oxford 1032 yes, 302 no; Penobscot, 1954 yes, 829 no; Piscataquis, 613 yes, 188 no; Sagadahoc, 627 yes, 226 no; Somerset, 801, yes, 348 no; Waldo, 470 yes, 325 no; Washington, 838 yes, 345 no; York, 2173 yes, 489 no.

That is the vote by which the State of Maine went into the Pier business. We are not voting on that proposition. That has been settled for us. We issued bonds, as has been stated, \$1,150,000 to build the pier. They built the pier proposed, the part of it proposed, within the appropriation, within the estimate. This part of the pier

called the Franklin wharf is another part which was not included in that estimate. It was turned over to the State for nothing by the city of Portland and South Portland. We didn't pay for it.

Now as you remember or know, the piles under this wharf have been eaten away by insects until it is in very dangerous condition. One senator in this room who is an engineer and a constructor and builder made an examination of it and found it in even a more dangerous condition than our committee when they were there.

I will say further in regard to the business part of this, that in my town there are three concerns using these lines practically every day of the year. I will state further that this winter the coast-wise lines have been a great advantage to the State of Maine. As you all know, the traffic on the railroads has increased very materially. You also know the severe winter we have had and the congestion in traffic on that account and the amount of goods that those companies haul. As far as I am concerned, I will say that our plant, small as it is, would have been shut down this winter if it had not been for the boat lines, and there are a great many others in the same position.

We cannot afford to lose the Eastern Steamship line which runs between Portland and Boston—the State of Maine cannot afford to lose it. The manufacturers throughout the whole State, or to quite an extent in the western part of the State, the western half and extending into the eastern half, use these lines all the time.

We need the line between Portland and Boston. The railroads are not in a position to take care of all the traffic.

We need the line between Portland and New York. It is possible that we may in some future time—in the near future—secure the Merchant and Miners Line, on account of the facilities offered at that pier, which would carry goods from the State of Maine to the Middle South, to Norfolk and to Philadelphia. At the present time railroad shipments to those points are very difficult and very expensive.

In the middle South the State of Maine comes in competition with manufacturers of the South, of Pennsylv-

ania and through all the Central West. With the railroad line facilities only we would be at a great disadvantage, but with the water lines we are placed on a better basis. At Norway and up in that section they are shipping goods at the present time to California in competition with goods made in St. Louis. They can do it on account of the reduced freight rates which they secure by lines which use this pier.

I do not think the State of Maine should take a chance on this pier going down. I wish I had the letter to read that the engineer who investigated the case wrote to the Governor. It was read in the House yesterday morning. Perhaps he would be willing to read it. That would bring the situation in regard to the danger of the condition there forcibly to our attention. I think we should vote this money.

Mr. BREWSTER of Cumberland: Mr. President, in view of what the senator from Waldo has said regarding the possible geographical prejudice that we may entertain in favor of this matter, I shall not give you my own opinion in regard to this matter, or at least support it by reasons which have moved me, other than to say that I do feel very strongly that it is for the benefit not only of the State but of the whole State.

But I do think that the senators should have before them in deciding this matter certain impartial evidence that has been given on it. In the first place, an opinion which might be charged with prejudice inasmuch as it is the opinion of the engineers of the commission, although they are the employees of the State in this work and they have their professional standing and reputation at stake in any opinion which they render, and they are men of very high standing in their profession. This was a part of the evidence which the committee had to go upon, the opinion of the engineers of the commission in regard to conditions at Franklin wharf.

The seriousness of the situation at the old Franklin wharf was brought home most forcibly a few weeks ago when a large section of the pile wharf at shed No. 7 at the Grand Trunk terminal, adjoining the State pier, collapsed and fell into the water almost without warning. About 150 men were employed at the time in handling freight in this Grand Trunk shed and it was little short of a miracle that no lives were lost. The collapse was due to the destruction of the piles by ma-

rine worms. I personally examined a number of the piles removed after the accident; many of these had been almost entirely eaten away at points just above the harbor bottom. A similar condition exists at the old Franklin wharf portion of the State pier. There, in addition to rotten timbers and decayed piles, we find that already the piles have been extensively eaten by marine worms and that this destruction is steadily proceeding. Franklin wharf is a much older structure than the Grand Trunk wharf which failed, and its condition has become extremely serious. Franklin wharf is used for passenger traffic as well as for freight business. Hundreds of passengers daily make use of the wharf in addition to the freight handlers who are constantly employed in handling freight. The danger is imminent. At any time in the normal course of business, the wharf may fall in just the way that the Grand Trunk wharf failed. In the event of such a disaster it is highly probable that loss of life will occur, especially as the passenger business brings many more people on the wharf, and women and children are less likely to save themselves than are husky longshoremen."

That is the official opinion of the engineers employed in this matter. In addition to that, and before giving one other engineering opinion which has been rendered on this matter of a far more impartial nature, I want to speak for a moment of the veto message in which a reference is made to a letter from one member of the State pier commission in which it had been said that the use of the wharf might continue through August, from which the inference in the veto message was made that the situation could not be so serious since one member of the commission had indicated that that use might continue for that period. I think in justice to the member of the commission who wrote the letter to which reference was made, it is due you that you should hear the remaining portion of the paragraph referring to that matter, on which apparently some portion of the Executive action was based. After saying that the Eastern Steamship Company "have advised us that in no event will they agree to continue the service longer than through this present season which would be probably about the end of August," this member of the commission goes on to say—and this member of the commission is not from Cumberland county or from western Maine,

but is a representative of eastern Maine upon this commission—this is what he goes on to say to the Executive: "Whether the directors would see fit to even lease this to them during the coming season I question. As far as my personal opinion is concerned at the present time, I would not vote to do so. The danger of loss of life is to me beyond any monied consideration." That is the opinion of the representative of eastern Maine upon that commission.

But coming down more nearly to this body, we have first this matter carefully and seriously considered and investigated by repeated personal visits to these premises by three members of this honorable body of the Senate on the committee considering this matter. You have heard their opinions here expressed. Not one of those members is from this section of the State which the senator from Waldo intimated might be concerned in this matter. Every one of those senators brings to it solely the position of the State as a whole, and they have come to a unanimous, a very clear and firm conclusion.

But beyond that, beyond whatever weight you may attach to their recommendation in this matter, from their thoroughly impersonal position, you have one other bit of evidence which seems to have very great weight. While the Executive was considering his action upon this matter, he had first the letter from the engineers on the commission to which I have referred. Not feeling sure of his ground he then asked,—and I think I am free to state these facts—he then asked his own personal employee, familiar with these structures and thoroughly qualified, to make an investigation of this wharf, owning as he does other wharves in that section, and as he stated that investigation was very carefully made by going under the structure there and investigating the entire condition, and the report from that personal employee was that the condition was very serious and that he could not accept responsibility for what might transpire on that wharf. But, with the care, which we must all admire, that he shows in the investigation of these matters, the Executive went still one step farther beyond that, and he asked a member of this body in whose judgment he, and I think we also, have great confidence because of the long experience which he has had in this very class of work with which we are here concerned, to

make a personal investigation of the conditions there in behalf of the Executive.

He made that report. He brought to that task his experience and his knowledge of such conditions. And he went at it without any preliminary prejudice of bias. I have here his report as submitted to his Excellency, which we are free here to consider, in formulating our own opinion upon this matter, and I think that should be in our Senate records as a basis for our consideration.

Under date of March 7, the senator from Sagadahoc, Mr. Carlton, made this report to the Hon. Percival P. Baxter, Governor of Maine.
"Dear Governor:

At your request I went to Portland and made a careful examination of this old portion of State Pier now leased and occupied by the Eastern Steamship Co., it being winter time I could not get under the wharf as well as in summer, but enough to satisfy me that the building is old and delapidated, many places rotten and weak, but really the most dangerous part is that of this 570 ft. in length from 20 ft. to 30 ft. in width, which is out over the water and supported on piling which have been there on the inner end of wharf forty years, and on outer end fifty years. With the manner in which worms eat off piling in this locality, this is certainly long enough for a structure of this kind to go.

In looking around under this wharf I found two caps 30 ft. long supporting the wharf with the piles all gone from under them except one under each end where there should be a piling every six or seven feet."

Thirty feet, gentlemen, without any support except at each end, when there should be piling every six or seven feet!

"This was near the passenger gangway where the crowd usually assembles when the boats are landing or leaving, at such a time if the boat should hit this part of the wharf with the support so weakened, the whole crowd might be thrown into the water. It seems to be a most dangerous situation and no one with any regard for the safety of the people would be warranted in allowing this condition to exist longer.

I was one of the bidders on the Portland Pier when it was built and was there several times while the old piling adjacent to this same structure was being removed, and many of them

were eaten almost entirely off, and I understand the wharf was no older than the one you are meditating rebuilding. Representative F. E. Rounds has pictures which anyone can see, showing these pilings after they were pulled up.

For many years I have built and repaired wharves for this same Eastern Steamship Co., who are leasing this property and known very well their requirements, and they are not in the habit of allowing such conditions as this to exist.

The State owns this property, and I do not hesitate to say that anyone with any regard for safety has any right to take chances on it any longer."—And that is significant in view of the suggestions that have been made—"And there seems to be no way but to rebuild the entire structure, as there is no place to commence to repair or leave off, as it is completely worn out.

Very respectfully submitted."
And signed by the honorable senator from Sagadahoc, Mr. Carlton.

There is his opinion after that careful investigation, and it seems to me that with that before this body, at least we can advocate that either that wharf must be reconstructed or the use of the structure must be abandoned. And in connection with the abandonment of its use you have not merely the Boston service, 75% of which goes to all sections of Maine so far as the traffic from that section is concerned,—you have not merely that, but you have further the re-establishment of the international line as contemplated if this reconstruction is carried out. Those are the propositions which you have before you in making up your minds as to what you shall do in relation to this pending resolve.

The question of the conditions at that pier are familiar, not merely from these reports, but from the personal investigation which many of you made, and while you would not come to a conclusion as a result of such investigation as you made, I do not think that your own personal observation would lead you to question the sincerity and the accuracy of these opinions which you have before you from experts in this matter.

Mr. HINCKLEY of Cumberland: Mr. President, I am glad to join hands with my colleague from Cumberland in this matter. Every bit of evidence we have before us is to the

effect that this structure is extremely dangerous. The Governor of the State of Maine may, if he desires,—and he evidently does desire to—take the responsibility of the lives of the citizens of the State in his hands on property owned by the State of Maine. If any senator wishes to take that responsibility and take upon himself the chance of causing the death of some, or perhaps hundreds, of the citizens of the State, in a catastrophe similar to that at Bar Harbor a few years ago, he is welcome to that responsibility. I do not believe that the citizens of the State of Maine expect him to take it, and I am sure that the citizens of the State of Maine will not take that responsibility themselves.

I think that is sufficient, Mr. President.

Mr. BUZZELL: Mr. President and members of this Senate, you understand that I approach this proposition without interest. One thing that I have thought of, and for a long time I have heard it on a great many different occasions—I have heard it from the mouth of a gentleman from Cumberland county whom I very highly regard. I think as much of him as most any one in the State of Maine, and that is my friend, the Honorable Edgar Rounds of Portland. I have heard him say on a great many different occasions that the city of Portland pays one-sixth of the entire State tax. I question whether or not all of you have heard that, but I have heard it at least once or twice in the course of my legislative experience. It is a credit, it is a distinction to the city of Portland. I have also heard nearly as many times that one-tenth of the State's population is there, and knowing of some of the difficulties of this Cumberland delegation by night, of their troubles by night, and then see them join hands by day, it is amusing. And in addition to one-sixth of the entire State tax and one-tenth of the entire population of the State, we can safely say that fifteen-sixteenths of the conversation in this Legislature comes from there.

Now let us be fair. Let us be fair to this proposition. Once more I want to speak about the budget committee. I am not going to assume the responsibility for any of the lives of the people that are liable or may be injured on that pier, but let us look at this and look at it right.

What provision did the budget committee make for the repairing or the rebuilding of this pier? Statistics from this Senate, from the Honorable gentleman from Cumberland and all others, say nothing. Now the insects, or the animals down there that have been eating that pier up, or whatever they are, must have been doing something of a job. They could not eat that pier this winter, eat all the piles and do it this winter; they must have been active for some little time to render that pier so dangerous. I wonder how many of the Honorable senators from Cumberland appeared before the budget committee and told about the activities of those cut worms or whatever they were that were cutting off these piles,—marine bugs, if you please. If as many of the gentlemen from that section appeared before the budget committee and argued the health and welfare of the immense number of people that were landing on that wharf to the Governor, the State Treasurer and the other Honorable members of that budget committee,—don't you suppose they would have taken notice of that?

I was asked the other day by the Chief Executive to table this resolve. I did so. He said at that time he wanted to send somebody down to inspect it, and if I mistook not the conversation it was to be the Honorable Senator from Sagadahoc, and I understand that he went. I believe that the Governor is safe in his position. I believe that he is a good business man. I believe that it is possible that he might take a few dollars from the contingent fund, not \$165,000, nearly a quarter of a mill of the State tax not \$165,000, but if these insects have eaten off a pile here and there he might put one in, or have it put in, and the pier become safe.

Now you talk about the people of the State of Maine that endorsed this proposition. My county voted for it, four hundred to some three hundred something, whatever the figures were. That was when propaganda was going the length and breadth of this State telling the great benefits of this pier. I do not believe they would do it today. Any way I feel that I am going to take a chance and support the Governor on this proposition and I believe it is right.

As I said at the beginning, I have no particular interest in this. I was

against it in the first place. I do not believe that the State ought ever to have expended a million and something on this project. It is a project of State ownership. I do not believe the project was ever justified in the first place. Fine from one point of view—you can stand and argue the benefits of it for a long time. I am against the principle. I thought at the time when this was considered that it would be one constant drain upon the State of Maine, the expense of this pier. I am satisfied of it more now than ever before.

Mr. BREWSTER: Will the courtesy of the Senate permit me to say a word in reply, the Senator from Waldo having spoken the second time?

The PRESIDENT: Unless objection is made. The Chair hears none. No objection is made.

Mr. BREWSTER: Just one word in relation to the budget committee on this matter. I take it that the Senator from Waldo was not advised that this matter was presented fully to the budget committee, at least so far as information in regard to it was then available. In December, when this matter came up.

This was not in the estimates of the budget committee; the matter was presented to the committee and one or two members of that committee at least advised me that the reason why they advocated no recommendation in regard to any renewals or extensions of the work of the State, that they were going to confine the budget to the actual conduct of the State's business as then existing without provision for renewals or extensions, feeling that then the Legislature would make their own decision as to what should be done.

Now was the case fully presented to them at that time? It was not, because the seriousness of this situation was not brought home. I think, to any one until the collapse of the Grand Trunk wharf adjacent to this, a little over a month ago, when it was suddenly brought home to the engineers and the directors, and to every one else I think who has investigated the facts of the situation, what the collapse of that structure in the condition in which it now exists might mean to the people who were using that wharf. And I do not think that there is any one who feels that the structure can continue to be used. The only alternative is to fence it off and stop use

of it. That is the only alternative possible, on all these reports you have before you, and based on the very careful opinion of the senator from Sagadahoc, that it is impossible to repair or replace a portion of the structure, because the minute you take down one part the whole thing is gone. With that before you, it is the flat alternative of either putting that out of business, or carrying it on with proper provision for its reconstruction. That I think is the only issue. If the case had been fully presented to the budget committee we cannot know what their conclusions might have been.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question? The question is shall this resolve be finally passed and become law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? All those in favor of the resolve becoming law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor may vote "yes," and those who wish to sustain the veto of the Governor will vote "no." The secretary will call the roll.

The secretary called the roll. Those voting "yes" were Messrs. Adams, Allen, Brewster, Carleton, Clark, Cram, Croxford, Eaton, Elliot, Emery, Farrington, Hinckley, Hussey, Kirschner, Morison, Morneau, Phillips, Powers, Ryder, Sargent, Smith, Spiers, Stevens, Wadsworth—24. Those voting "no" were Messrs. Bemis, Buzzell, Trefethen, Spencer—4. Absentees, Messrs. Bailey, Wilson. Mr. Putnam announced that he was paired with Mr. Wilson, that he would vote "no," and Senator Wilson, if present, would vote "yes."

The PRESIDENT: The Chair wishes to state before voting that he realizes the importance of this resolve as dependent on and connected with other financial considerations that this Legislature has to face. The Chair has hesitated to cast his vote in a way that might result in loss or injury to life. The Chair votes "yes."

Twenty-five senators having voted "yes" and five having voted "no" the resolve was finally passed over the Governor's veto.

Veto Message from the Governor STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor Augusta
March 13, 1923.

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

I return herewith without my approval.

RESOLVE, in favor of the Commissioners of Pharmacy.

My reason for declining to approve this Resolve are similar to those which induced me to return to you without my approval, on Friday, March 9th last, a similar Resolve entitled, 'Resolve, in favor of the Board of Registration of Medicine.' The latter disapproval was sustained by your honorable body by a vote of 107 to 4.

The Resolve in question and the one above referred to are similar in purport and seek to give a preference to the two boards in question. I am not in favor of granting such a preference and believe all our State Boards should be placed upon the same basis and should be made self-sustaining.

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

The message was read by the secretary.

Mr. HINCKLEY of Cumberland: Mr. President, we have heard a great deal in veto messages about the budget committee, and about following the budget report. The budget committee recommended one thousand dollars for 1923 and one thousand dollars for 1924, for the specific purpose covered by this resolve, and I must say to you, I must say to the Senate: "Consistency thou are a jewel."

Mr. EMERY of Washington: Mr. President, I move that this resolve and veto message be tabled and specially assigned for consideration for next Wednesday.

A viva voce vote was had and the same was debated. A rising vote was then taken and the Chair announced that twelve senators voted in favor of the motion and eleven opposed, and that the motion was carried.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair wishes to suggest that every senator is supposed to vote on these matters unless excused for some reason. The Chair is not certain in regard to the number of senators who voted on this motion.

Mr. BREWSTER: Mr. President, I move we reconsider the motion whereby this resolve was tabled and specially assigned for next Wednesday. I voted with the majority.

A rising vote was had and sixteen senators voting in favor of the motion and eleven opposed, the motion to reconsider was adopted.

Mr. BREWSTER: Mr. President, in regard to the motion to lay on the table and assign for next Wednesday, I would not make such a motion. I moved to reconsider the vote in order to bring the matter before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Senate wish to vote on this message at this time or is there any other motion to be made? If not the matter reverts at once to the veto message. All those in favor of sustaining the veto of the Governor will vote "no," and all those who wish to pass the resolve over the Governor's veto will vote "yes."

Mr. EATON of Oxford: Mr. President, I beg to inquire if the Chair has presented the question properly?

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is shall this resolve be finally passed notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. All those in favor of passing the resolve notwithstanding the objections of the Governor will vote "yes." Those who wish to sustain the veto will vote "no."

Mr. BUZZELL of Waldo: Mr. President, I wonder if we are just right on the motion before the Senate: I thought the senator from Washington made a motion that this matter lie on the table and be specially assigned for next Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT: That motion was reconsidered by a majority vote. Any other motion could have been made if desired, and if no other motion is made the question reverts at once to the question of the veto.

Mr. BUZZELL: Mr. President, I say that I think a great deal of the recommendations of the budget committee, and something has been said by the way of referring to them, and it seems to me while this is a small matter, that we ought to give it passing consideration, anyway, and I move that it be tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday.

Mr. ALLEN of York: Mr. President, is that motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will State that it is because this is a question of a special assignment. If it was a pure question of tabling it would not be debatable.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. President and Senators, I take the ground that we

refused a few moments ago our honored senator to table a message from the Governor of a good deal more important than this. This is small, but I cannot understand why we should allow this to be tabled and not allow the other one to be tabled, out of respect to the senator who tried to table the other one.

The PRESIDENT: All those in favor of laying this matter on the table for special consideration next Tuesday will rise and stand until counted.

Five senators arose.

The PRESIDENT: All those opposed to the motion will rise and stand until counted.

Eighteen senators arose and the motion was lost.

The question reverting to the veto the secretary called the roll. Those voting "yes" were Messrs. Adams, Brewster, Carlton, Clark, Cram, Croxford, Eaton, Elliott, Emery, Farrington, Hineckley, Hussey, Kirschner, Morrison, Morneau, Phillips, Powers, Putnam, Ryder, Sargent, Smith, Speirs, Stevens, Trefethen, Wadsworth—25. Those voting "no" were Messrs. Allen, Bemis, Buzzell, Spencer—4. Absentees, Messrs. Bailey, Wilson.

Twenty-five senators having voted "yes" and four having voted "no" a two-thirds vote was cast in favor of the final passage of the resolve notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

Veto Message from the Governor

STATE OF MAINE

Augusta,

March 15th, 1923.

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

I return herewith without my approval—

RESOLVE for Appropriating Money to Repair the Eastport Bridge.

The situation which this Resolve presents is a difficult one. There can be no question but that this bridge needs extensive repairs, but the present tendency is for communities where the tax rate is high to call upon the State for aid. If this plan is continued the State will find itself overburdened with bills for the repair and reconstruction of roads and bridges.

I have no doubt but that there are many bridges in Maine as much in need of repair as the Eastport bridge. The Legislature has a fund of approximately \$112,000 which it can use to meet emergencies, and it would seem to

me that resolves similar to the one before you should be paid out of this special legislative fund. Even if the Legislature should appropriate from this special fund one-half the amount called for, on condition that the city of Eastport and the town of Perry contribute the other half, it would afford substantial relief to those communities.

There are several bridge resolves pending before the Legislature and no doubt the arguments in favor of one will apply with equal force to the others. I am not able to discriminate between them. If this Resolve and those similar to it are passed it means that a considerable addition will be made to the tax rate. The cities and towns of the State are under a very direct obligation to maintain their own roads and bridges and once the bars are let down there will be no end to the demands made upon the State treasury.

Respectfully submitted,

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

The message was read by the secretary.

Mr. EMERY of Washington: Mr. President, if in order, and I do not propose to discuss this matter unless there is a demand for such discussion, for I believe most of the members of the Senate were in the House yesterday and heard the matter fully taken up there.

I only want to say, however, that the bill is backed up by a unanimous committee report, and the Governor admits the necessity and his only objection is the source from which the funds are taken. And in this connection I am willing, and I believe every senator here is willing, to have that left to a man like Representative Granville, House chairman of the committee on ways and bridges and Senators Adams, Stevens and Smith.

I hope the resolve will be passed over the Governor's veto.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is whether this resolve shall be finally passed and become law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. All in favor of passing the resolve over the Governor's veto will vote "yes," and those who have a contrary view will vote "no."

The secretary called the roll. Those voting "yes" were Messrs. Adams, Allen, Bemis, Brewster, Buzzell, Carlton, Clark, Cram, Croxford, Eaton,

Elliott, Emery, Farrington, Hinckley, Hussey, Kirschner, Morison, Morneau, Phillips, Powers, Putnam, Ryder, Sargent, Smith, Speirs, Stevens, Trefethen, Wadsworth—28. Voting "no" Mr. Spencer. Absentees Messrs. Bailey, Wilson.

Twenty-eight senators voting "yes" and one voting "no" the resolve was finally passed notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

Mr. Buzzell of Waldo, before voting on this matter, spoke as follows:

Mr. President, I wish to state at this time that I believe this resolve, or the money it calls for, is very much needed, and that the State would make a real saving by providing this money in this way, rather than to build this bridge under the bridge bill. Therefore, I vote "yes."

Veto Message from the Governor

STATE OF MAINE

Office of the Governor

Augusta, March 15th, 1923.

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

I return herewith without my approval Senate Document No. 82 entitled—

A RESOLVE Appointing a Committee of Investigation to Procure plans and Estimates for a State Library Building.

Two years ago a Resolve similar to the one before you was passed by the Legislature but in it the appointment of a Library Commission was made optional with the Governor. After considering the matter from every angle I concluded not to take advantage of the power conferred upon me by the 1921 Resolve.

In my opinion it is unwise to start a project that will cost in the neighborhood of Five Hundred thousand Dollars, unless before starting it we have reason to believe that the funds can be obtained to carry the project to completion. It is comparatively easy to set in motion a movement for a new Library Building, but it will not be easy to find the funds with which to build it.

The State has had some experience in the past in matters of this sort, and oftentimes a comparatively harmless looking Act or Resolve has been the beginning of a great expenditure, which probably would not have been authorized had the Legislature originating it fully appreciated what future developments would be.

It cannot be questioned that our

State Library is crowded but in my opinion for the time-being we can get along without undue inconvenience. If Five Hundred Thousand Dollars was now available I believe it could be used to better advantage in erecting new buildings at certain of our State institutions where there is a real need of additional housing and equipment than in the construction of a new Library building. Let us first care for our Insane and Feeble Minded, for our Prisoners at Thomaston and South Windham even though for a few years our State Library is somewhat overcrowded.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed)

PERCIVAL P. BAXTER,
Governor of Maine.

The secretary read the message.

Mr. SARGENT of Hancock: Mr. President, the Governor stated in his message that this resolve is practically the same as the one presented two years ago. That, however, had the words "shall appoint," changed to "may appoint," leaving it with the Governor optional whether a commission should be appointed or not. The result was that no commission was appointed.

The committee which presented this resolve has investigated to the best of its ability the need for proper housing of the State Library. They were satisfied that something should be done. This resolve provides that a commission shall be appointed to give the more careful consideration to it than can be given by a legislative committee. The resolve carries no appropriation for salaries; it simply makes provision for the expenses of the commission.

If a proper commission is appointed it would seem probable that it would not take them very long and under a very small expenditure, to determine whether or not from their investigation preliminary plans are necessary.

I hope this resolve will be passed regardless of the objections of the Governor.

Mr. BUZZELL of Waldo: Mr. President, what is the amount called for by the resolve?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair was about to read the resolve:

"Resolved: That a committee of five to consist of the following: One appointed by the governor; one mem-

ber by the senate to be appointed by the president of the senate; one member of the house to be appointed by the speaker of the house, the State librarian and the governor, who shall be chairman of said committee, shall be appointed to investigate and report to the next legislature in regard to plans, estimates and specifications for a State library building. The committee subject to the approval of the governor and council may employ such assistance and incur such expenses as it deems necessary not exceeding five thousand dollars. The committee shall serve without pay but shall receive its actual expenses."

Mr. BUZZELL: Mr. President, I see in the newspapers, day by day, that the lists of petitioners in bankruptcy are increasing from time to time, day by day, as we hear. Those people all over the State, or the other people all over the State, besides myself and the members of this Honorable Senate, are reading the news and they see the number of people in financial trouble, and these people are watching the members of this Legislature, and they are wondering if we really are taking our job seriously.

"Now I do not question but what this money might be spent wisely, but I do not believe it is any time to expend in this way. I have no doubt but what this resolve will go as some others have gone, but I wish to say that I am not in favor of its passage.

Mr. HINCKLEY of Cumberland: Mr. President, I am glad on this matter to join hands with the senator from Waldo. I shall always vote with him when he is right.

Mr. BUZZELL: Mr. President, That is from the point of view of the senator from Cumberland. I wish to say at this time that I hope I shall always vote with him when he is right.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is shall this resolve be finally passed and become law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor. Those who wish to sustain the Governor's veto will vote "no," and those who wish to pass the resolve over his veto will vote "yes."

The secretary called the roll. Those voting "yes" were Messrs. Brewster, Cram, Croxford, Elliot, Emery, Kirschner, Morneau, Wadsworth—9.

Those voting "no" were Messrs. Adams, Allen, Bemis, Buzzell, Carlton, Clark, Eaton, Farrington, Hinckley, Morison, Phillips, Powers, Putnam, Ryder, Sargent, Smith, Speirs, Spencer, Stevens, Trefethen—20. Absentees, Messrs. Bailey, Wilson.

Senator Sargent changed his vote from "no" to "yes."

Nine senators voting "yes" and twenty voting "no" the resolve failed of passage over the Governor's veto.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will appoint the members of the conference committees which came up early in the session.

On H. D. 191, An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 319, Public Laws of 1915 as amended by Chapter 243, Public Laws of 1919, relating to State and county aid in the construction of highway bridges, the Chair will appoint as conference committee on the part of the Senate.

MESSRS. ADAMS of Kennebec

WILSON of Aroostook,
EMERY of Washington.

On the Act repealing Section 43 of Chapter 19, Relating to local health officers, the Chair will appoint as conference committee on the part of the Senate:

MESSRS. HINCKLEY of Cumberland
BUZZELL of Waldo,
ELLIOT of Knox.

**Communication from the Office of the
Secretary of State
STATE OF MAINE**

Office of the Secretary of State
Augusta, March 15, 1923.

To the President of the Senate and
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Gentlemen:—

In accordance with the requirements of section four, chapter one, of the revised statutes, I have the honor to notify you that the public acts, a list of the titles of which is hereto appended, have been approved by the Governor.

Very Respectfully,

Your Obedient Servant,

(Signed) EDGAR C. SMITH,
Deputy Secretary of State.

Read and placed on file.

On motion by Mr. Clark of Lincoln, the Senate voted to reconsider the vote whereby it passed to be engrossed re-

solve for laying the county taxes for the year 1923.

Mr. CLARK: Mr. President, I move that this resolve be tabled until next Tuesday, and my reason for asking this is as a member of this committee I will state these resolves were advertised at two different times for a period of eight days, giving anyone a chance who had objections to these estimates being allowed to present their case. And I would like to investigate the reason for offering House Amendment A which was adopted this morning by the Senate in concurrence.

The motion was agreed to and the resolve was tabled and specially assigned for Tuesday next.

On motion by Mr. Hinckley of Cumberland, the rules were suspended and that senator presented out of order: Resolve to provide more suitable secondary education for the children of Beal's Island in the town of Jonesport.

Read and adopted and sent down for concurrence.

Bills in First Reading

S. 243. An Act to amend Section 43 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes of Maine, 1916, as amended by the Public Laws of 1919, relating to the compensation of registers of deeds of Knox county.

S. 244. An Act to amend Section 37 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relative to the salary of county attorney of Somerset county.

S. 245. Resolve, in favor of Northern Maine Sanatorium, at Presque Isle, Aroostook county, for personal services, maintenance, repairs, and improvements.

S. 246. An Act to amend Section 18 of Chapter 135, Revised Statutes, relating to bail.

S. 247. An Act to amend Section 24, Chapter 128, Revised Statutes, relating to conspiracies.

S. 248. Resolve, in favor of the Augusta State Hospital for maintenance during the years July 1, 1923, to June 30, 1924, and July 1, 1924, to June 30, 1925.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Powers, from the committee on Legal Affairs, on An Act to amend Chapter 211 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to court jurisdiction of violation of the motor vehicle law and transmission of fines to the Highway Commission (Senate Doc. No. 176), reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Phillips, from the committee on Public Health, on An Act to amend Chapter 197 of the Public Laws of 1917 entitled "An Act to create a State Department of Health," reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same senator, from the committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation, on bill "An Act to amend Section 42, Chapter 8, of the Revised Statutes, relative to forest fires within woodlands," reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Bemis, from the committee on Taxation, on Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution permitting the classification of property for the purpose of taxation and the assessment of different classes at different rates (Senate Doc. No. 152), reported that the same ought not to pass.

The reports were accepted and sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Brewster, from the committee on Legal Affairs, on An Act to amend Sections 1 and 5 of Chapter 169 of the Public Laws of 1919, as amended by Chapter 183 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the support of dependents of soldiers, sailors and marines, reported the same in a new draft, under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

The report was accepted and the bill tabled for printing under the joint rules.

Final Reports

Mr. Hinckley from the committee on Salaries and Fees submitted its final report.

The report was accepted.

Passed to be Engrossed

H. 163. An Act additional to Chapter 433 of the Private and Special Laws of 1907, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the Portland Water District,' and to limit and define the powers of the trustees of said Portland Water District in certain things.

H. 230. Resolve, in aid of navigation on Moosehead Lake.

H. 248. Resolve, providing for the purchase of "Music and Musicians of Maine."

H. 261. Resolve, providing for the purchase of 'Maine 1783-1815.'

H. 333. An Act to incorporate the Fall Brook Improvement Company.

H. 334. Resolve, appropriating money to set forth the natural, agricultural, industrial and recreational advantages of the State of Maine.

H. 335. An Act to amend Section 19 of Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 69 of the Public Laws of 1917 and Chapter 171 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the duties of Boards of Registration of Voters.

(On motion by Mr. Morneau of Androscoggin, the vote whereby H. 335, An Act to amend Section 19 of Chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 69 of the Public Laws of 1917, and Chapter 171 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the duties of boards of registration of voters, was passed to be engrossed was reconsidered.)

H. 336. An Act to amend Section 58 of Chapter 87 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the setting aside of verdicts by single justices.

House 327: An Act to amend Section 6 of Chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 47 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the foreclosure of mortgages.

House 338: An Act to amend Chapter 136 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to night fishing in certain waters of Kennebec County.

House 339: Resolve, in favor of Leslie E. Jacobs, Secretary of Committee of State School for Boys, State School for Girls and State Reformatories.

House 340: Resolve, appropriating money for the care, maintenance and repairs of Fort William Henry in the town of Bristol.

House 341: An Act to amend Section 49 of Chapter 211 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the weight of heavy vehicles.

House 342: An Act to amend Chapter 173 of the Public Laws of 1919 relating to the registration of resident hunters.

(On motion by Mr. Kirschner of Androscoggin, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.)

House 344: An Act for the better protection of smelts in the Damariscotta River.

House 345: An Act to amend Section 19 of Chapter 98 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to suspension and revocation of lobster licenses.

House 346: An Act to repeal Chapter 14 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to protection of deer in the town of York.

House 348: An Act to repeal Chapter 151 of the Public Laws of 1919

providing for the collection of agricultural statistics by assessors.

House 350: An Act to amend Paragraph IX of Section Six of Chapter Ten of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 105 of the Public Laws of 1919, as further amended by Chapter 119 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to exemption from taxation of the estates of War Veterans.

House 352: Resolve, providing for aid in the payment of premiums awarded by the Houlton Agricultural Society.

House 354: An Act to amend the charter of the city of Calais, providing for the election of a city manager.

House 356: An Act to regulate the sale of vinegar.

House 357: An Act to amend Section 9 of Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to the screening of lakes and ponds.

House 358: An Act to amend Section 52 of Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1917, as amended by Chapter 196 of the Public Laws of 1919, relating to the setting of traps in organized or incorporated places.

House 359: An Act to amend Section 18 of Chapter 45 of the revised statutes as amended by Section 2 of Chapter 98 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to the issuing of lobster licenses.

House 360: Resolve, appropriating money for the purpose of operating the fish hatcheries and feeding stations for fish, for the protection of fish, game and birds and for printing the report of the commissioner of inland fisheries and game and other expenses incident to the administration of the department of inland fisheries and game.

House 361: An Act to amend the charter of the city of Eastport.

H. 362. Resolve, providing a State pension for Jane Anne Sewall of York.

H. 363. Resolve, providing a State pension for Ada M. Cowan of Sidney.

H. 364. Resolve, for increase of pension of Sarah J. Everson.

H. 365. Resolve, in favor of Wilmore Quimby of Haynesville for State pension.

H. 366. An Act to amend Section 84 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes, relating to contracts with academies.

H. 367. An Act to amend Section 91 of Chapter 53 of the Revised Statutes,

as amended by Chapter 39 of the Public Laws of 1919, relating to annual statement of conditions of insurance companies, and providing a penalty for neglect to file the statement.

H. 368. Resolve, in favor of Blanch A. Grant for State pension.

H. 369. Resolve, providing a State pension for Hattie C. Knowlton of Liberty.

H. 370. Resolve, providing a State pension for John B. Wallace of Lubec.

H. 371. An Act to amend Section 27 of Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1917, as amended by Chapter 244 of the Public Laws of 1917, and by Chapter 196 of the Public Laws of 1919, and by Chapter 218 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to use of traps, spears and nets in taking fish in inland waters.

H. 372. An Act to incorporate the Yarmouth Water District.

S. 54. An Act to amend Section 45 of Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 291 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to intoxicating liquor.

(On motion by Mr. Morncau of Androscoggin, tabled pending acceptance of the report of the committee on bills in the second reading.)

S. 70. An Act to amend Section 51 of Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes, relating to change of name of a corporation.

S. 153. An Act relating to the distribution of the assets of an insolvent estate.

S. 239. Resolve, in favor of the Maine railroad committee.

(On motion by Mr. Wadsworth of Kennebec, tabled pending acceptance of the report of the committee on bills in second reading.)

S. 240. Resolve, in favor of W. M. Stuart, postmaster of the Senate of the Eighty-first Legislature.

S. 241. Resolve, in favor of Warren Prouty and Austin W. Jones Company.

S. 242. Resolve, in favor of George A. Dow, postmaster of the House of the Eighty-first Legislature.

On further motion by the same senator the bill was tabled and assigned for next Thursday.

Passed to be Enacted

An Act to amend Section Thirty-nine of Chapter One Hundred and Seventeen of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to salaries of Registers of Probate.

An Act to amend Section Seventy-five of Chapter Forty-five of the Revised Statutes relating to the taking of smelts.

An Act to amend Section Three of Chapter 264 of the Public Laws of 1919 as amended by Chapter 100 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to applications for soldiers' bonus.

An Act to provide for the better protection of clams within the limits of the town of Roque Bluffs.

An Act to amend Section 129 of Chapter 301 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to the care and treatment of certain infectious diseases.

An Act to amend Paragraph Seven of Section 45 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 214 of the Public Laws of 1919, as further amended by Chapter 219 of the Public Laws of 1921, relating to amount allowed for clerk hire in offices of Register of Deeds and Register of Probate in Kennebec County.

An Act to authorize the Register of Deeds of the southern Registry District for the County of Aroostook to certify records.

An Act to amend the Act of incorporation of the trustees of Fryeburg Academy in the town of Fryeburg and County of Oxford.

An Act to amend Section 78 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes to provide transportation for pupils who live on islands on which there are no secondary schools and from which regular transportation lines are established.

Finally Passed

Resolve, in favor of Miss Edith L. Soule.

Resolve, making an appropriation for the Maine Seed Improvement Association.

Resolve, for carrying out the provisions of an Act of the Legislature of 1923, relating to the production and sale of certified seed.

Mr. BREWSTER of Cumberland: Mr. President, I would like to inquire if there was an act on its final passage relating to appeals from probate?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair does not recall any such bill.

Orders of the Day

The PRESIDENT: This brings us to orders of the day, on which there is a special assignment H. D. No. 219, An Act to accept the provisions

of the Act of the Congress of the United States, approved Nov. 23, 1921, entitled An Act for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy and for other purposes, the pending question on which is the passage to be engrossed.

The Chair recognizes the senator from York, Mr. Allen.

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. President, I move that this bill be passed to be engrossed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: This brings us to orders of the day, unassigned matters.

Mr. CRAM of Cumberland: Mr.

President, I move that we take from the table S. D. 91, An Act to amend Section 64 of Chapter 86 of the Revised Statutes, relating to property exempt from taxation, which was tabled by me yesterday pending the acceptance of the report of the committee, which was ought not to pass.

The motion was agreed to, and on further motion by the same senator, the bill with accompanying report was recommitted to the Judiciary committee.

On motion by Mr. Morison of Penobscot,

Adjourned until Monday, March 19, at 4.30 o'clock, P. M.