

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-Second Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1925

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, Feb. 19, 1925.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Brown of Augusta.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Agriculture reporting "ought to pass" on resolve making appropriation for the study and control of the fruit or blueberry fly in Maine. (S. P. 27) (S. D. 24)

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

In the House, on motion by Mr. White of Bowdoinham, tabled pending acceptance of report in concurrence.

First Reading of Senate Bill

S. P. No. 16: An Act to change the name of Pleasant Pond, in the towns of Whitefield and Jefferson, to Clary Lake.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Judiciary reporting "ought to pass" on bill, an act relating to fees for the registration of motor vehicles. (S. P. 80) (S. D. 36).

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

In the House, on motion by Mr. Martin of Augusta, tabled pending acceptance of report in concurrence.

The following bills and remonstrances were received and, upon recommendation of the committee on reference of bills, were referred to the following committees:

Banks and Banking

By Mr. Martin of Augusta: An Act to enlarge the definition of the term "Securities" in Sec. 126, Chap. 144, P. L. 1923, so as to include contracts for the sale of fur bearing animals. (H. P. No. 839).

(500 copies ordered printed.)

Education

By Mr. Holman of Bangor: An Act permitting Children to be Excused from the public schools to receive Religious Instruction, amending Sec-

tion 37 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Management of Schools; Election and Discharge of Superintendent. (H. P. No. 840.)

(2000 copies ordered printed.)

Inland Fisheries and Game

By Mr. Eustis of Strong: Remonstrance of Ralph E. Eustis and 14 others against the passage of the provision of House Paper 315 changing the open season on Deer in Franklin and Oxford Counties as specified in that act. (H. P. No. 841.)

By the same gentleman: Remonstrance of Ralph E. Eustis and 14 others against the adoption of House Doc. 50, H. P. 259, relating to Night Fishing in the Inland Waters of the State of Maine. (H. P. No. 842.)

By Mr. Winn of Lisbon: Remonstrance of Frank H. Whittier and 48 others against any change in Chapter 53 of the Public Laws of 1923 relating to the close time on wild hares or rabbits. (H. P. No. 843.)

Judiciary

By Mr. Nichols of Portland: An Act relating to the collection of taxes by legal process. (H. P. No. 844.)

(500 copies ordered printed.)

Sea and Shore Fisheries

By Mr. Boman of Vinalhaven: Remonstrance of E. S. Lord and 33 others of Vinalhaven against the passage of the so-called Lamson Bill regarding the measurement of Lobsters. (H. P. No. 845).

By the same gentleman: Remonstrance of I. W. Tupper and 20 others of Criehaven against same. (H. P. No. 846.)

By Mr. Mansfield of Jonesport: Remonstrance of C. M. Crowley and 93 others of Beals against same. (H. P. No. 847.)

By the same gentleman: Remonstrance of E. B. Bagley and 45 others of Jonesport against same. (H. P. No. 848.)

By the same gentleman: Remonstrance of T. J. Colbeth and 70 others of Bucks Harbor against same (H. P. No. 849).

By Mr. Pike of Lubec: Remonstrance of A. E. Maloon and 30 others of Cutler against same (H. P. No. 850).

Taxation

By Mr. Mills of St. Albans: An Act to amend Chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, relating to exemption of es-

tates of soldiers, sailors and marines. (H. P. No. 851).

(500 copies ordered printed)

Taxation, and Ways and Bridges

By Mr. Boman of Vinalhaven: Remonstrance of E. S. Loud and 52 others of Vinalhaven against any increase in the gasoline tax without exemptions to fishermen (H. P. No. 852).

By the same gentleman: Remonstrance of L. O. Young and 15 others of Cushing against same (H. P. No. 853).

By Mr. Mathews of Cherryfield: Remonstrance of R. W. Cates and 29 others of Addison against same (H. P. No. 854).

Reports of Committees

Mr. Sturgis from the committee on Agriculture reported ought not to pass on resolve for aid in the payment of premiums awarded by the Houlton Agricultural Society (H. P. No. 367).

Report read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Decker from the committee on Military Affairs on bill, An Act to amend Chapter 174 of the Public Laws of Maine for 1923, known as the Military Law (H. P. No. 161), (H. Doc. No. 12) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 855) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Report read and accepted and the new draft ordered printed under the joint rules.

Mr. Sturgis from the committee on Agriculture reported ought to pass on resolve making appropriation for the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station for the purchase of additional land at Highmoor Farm (H. P. No. 183).

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on resolve making appropriation for the control and suppression of the European corn borer (H. P. No. 55).

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on resolve making an appropriation for the Maine Seed Improvement Association (H. P. No. 463).

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on resolve transferring the income from the Carleton Orchard Fund to the College of Agriculture of the University of Maine (H. P. No. 530).

Reports read and accepted and the resolves ordered printed under the joint rules.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER: Under orders of the day, the House will proceed to the unfinished business.

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether the business now in order is my motion for the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston (Mr. Holmes)?

The SPEAKER: The matter before the House is the matter of the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale.

Mr. HALE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that it is quite apparent to me that there are a large number of people who are deeply interested in this question, and who doubtless wish to address the House upon it.

The SPEAKER: The motion is not debatable.

Mr. HALE: I am merely offering, Mr. Speaker, a few explanatory words to the request which I am about to make, preliminary to withdrawing my motion. My reason for doing this is that I do not wish to shut off debate on a question of so much importance, on which there is so much legitimate interest, and with the permission of the House I beg leave to withdraw my motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale, withdraws his motion for the previous question.

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the situation which the gentleman desires to obtain will not result as a matter of this motion. The question which we wish to debate, and on which discussion is offered, is upon the merits of the resolve of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Spear, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Holmes, that we reconsider will prevail. We can then discuss the entire merits of the case.

Mr. HOLMES of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I ask for enlightenment upon the parliamentary situation. Am I right in my inference that if the motion of the gentleman from Portland, or the request of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale, is supported by the House, and he is allowed to withdraw his motion, then leaving the motion to reconsider which I made as the question before the House, that the subject is debatable under my motion to reconsider, and that the object which the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Wing)

wishes to accomplish would be accomplished in that way?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale has withdrawn his motion for the previous question. The matter before the House, then, is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Holmes, to reconsider the vote of yesterday whereby this resolve was indefinitely postponed. This motion is debatable at the present time to the merits of the proposition and in any other way. The Chair might explain that a motion to reconsider a vote can be put but once upon any proposition. If the motion to reconsider the action whereby the House indefinitely postponed this resolve is carried, the House then turns to the consideration of the passage of the resolve. If the motion to reconsider is lost, the resolve is killed. The matter before the House at present is the motion to reconsider the vote whereby this resolve was indefinitely postponed and the subject is open for debate.

Mr. HOLMES of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, availing myself of the ruling of the Chair, as I understand it, that although I made a motion to reconsider yesterday, I announced at the time that I hoped that my motion would not prevail, that, therefore, if I understand the ruling of the Chair correctly, I may take a few moments to state the reasons why I hope that my motion will not prevail.

I did not hear yesterday any member read the resolve. May I take a moment to read these words: "Resolved, that there be and hereby is appropriated the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars for the fiscal year from July first, nineteen twenty-five, to June thirtieth, nineteen twenty-six and the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars for the fiscal year from July first, nineteen twenty-six, to June thirtieth, nineteen twenty-seven, for the purpose of compiling and publishing data regarding agricultural, industrial and recreational resources of the State of Maine for general distribution to all persons interested in the State of Maine; said sums to be expended under the direction of the Governor and Council."

Please note, members of the House, that in this resolve there is not provided anywhere out of what fund it shall be paid, nor was provision made anywhere to whom an accounting should be made. This resolve, on the face of it is harmless and innocuous,

and it appeals to the best sentiments of all of us, all that is good in us, our loyalty for our State, and our interest in the material welfare of our fellow citizens. But, it should be considered, I believe, not on that principle, because we are not discussing and going to vote on the principle of boosting Maine because we do not believe there is any dispute among us on that principle. We all believe in boosting Maine but we are going to vote incidentally under this question of re-consideration upon this particular way, this particular bill or resolve, not upon the principle of boosting Maine.

This morning when I stepped into my seat I found laying on my desk what I presume all of you have found, a clipping from the Boston Herald, showing the photograph of one Ben S. Trynin, with an interview with him and the closing words I was struck with were these: "I foresee the time when the young reared in Pasadena and Miami will come to New England for their education and recreation as the New England youth of older days went to the Swiss Alps on the Continent."

We used to hear much about Switzerland and the thrifty Swiss, capitalizing their scenery and their summer and winter climate, but the great war exploded that theory. When the war came and Switzerland was shut off from the world, the thrifty Swiss would have starved to death if it had not been for the fact that in Switzerland the scenery is only a bi-product, and the real business of the thrifty Swiss is the manufacturing of optical instruments, Diesel engines, clocks and watches and chemicals and other things which the world wanted and was willing to pay a good price for.

It has been many years since I heard the argument used about the Swiss profiting for their scenery and their boosting of Switzerland. Of late it is, as intimated in this clipping, Pasadena and Miami. That is to say, it is California and Florida. And if you read this whole interview through you will see how he speaks of their boosting Florida and California by means of appropriations. Now, everyone of us knows very well that however they may call it, in the case of Florida and California, "boosting their States," that down at bottom those two great states are engaged today in a gambling game, and every time the Californian bets one million dollars on

California, Florida has countered with a bet of two million dollars on Florida. And I fear that if we sit into that game of bluff against those two desperate gamblers, we will find it a rather expensive pastime for our good old State.

The time was, as I remember, when they used to say in Florida that the Atlantic Coast Line Railway and the Seaboard Airline Railway were the true Governors of Florida, but they say today that their Real Estate Boards and their Real Estate Exchanges in Florida are the true Governors of that State. I remember the interesting case of the Yankee farmer who bought through the medium of advertising a truck farm in Florida, a quarter section—forty acres,—and when he got ready to pay the last installment he took a train and went down to Hillsboro County and called on the real estate firm with which he had been dealing and paid the last installment, and then decided that he would like to go out and see his farm, so the real estate agent took him out in his automobile and showed him the quarter section. And the farmer saw that it was nothing in the world but sand and saw grass, and as the agent showed him around and he looked over the property a little animal which we in the north would call a land turtle hopped out of his hole in the ground—in Florida they call it a gopher—and the Yankee said, "What is that?" and the real estate agent said, "That? That is a gopher." And the farmer asked, "Can it make a living on this soil?" And the real estate agent said, "Why of course it can." "Well, here," says the farmer, "Give the gopher the deed." (Laughter.)

Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, I say that for every dollar of southern money that has been spent in advertising Florida, two dollars of northern money, good hard-earned money, has been sunk in Florida swamps advertised as truck land, and Florida sand holes advertised as good land for citrus fruit growing.

Now, that is the aspect of it which does not appeal to me in this resolve, the gambling aspect and drawing the State of Maine into a gamble. We used to hear that at times the French people said that the English were a nation of shopkeepers, and they said it in contempt. I should be sorry to see the time

come when we would let the impression go out to the world that the people of Maine had become a race of boarding house keepers making their living by taking in boarders in the summer and taking in each other in the winter. (Laughter.)

If there were no other reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I would be opposed to this particular bill, hoping to impress again upon you the fact that I am with the proponents in principle, the reason that I would be opposed to this bill is, first, that it does not provide out of what fund the fifty thousand dollars shall be paid and, secondly, that it does not provide for an accounting of how the money shall be spent.

A few years ago, this Legislature, during the war, voted one million dollars into the hands of the Governor and Council for war purposes, and, Mr. Speaker and members, I defy any man in this State today to find out where that money went. I have tried myself, two years ago and I failed. I know a former State Auditor, one of the best financiers of this State, who tried it and he failed, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion insofar as the wording of this resolve goes, that the Governor and Council or others under them could spend that fifty thousand dollars to advertise the breed of Irish Setter dogs in Maine and never account for the spending of it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the proper thing for the House to do is to invite the proponents to withdraw, by means of our vote today, and invite them to present the matter over again in the form of a resolve which will be honest and clearly and sincerely worded, which will say what it means and mean what it says, and I believe that this House will give it sympathetic and favorable consideration. (Applause.)

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I think one of the difficulties here is that we are considering a matter negatively which should be considered affirmatively. The real question is on the passage of this resolve. If you will take the resolve and look up the statement of facts which accompanies it you will see assigned the reasons which the sponsors of the resolve give for the legislation. They say it will supplement, co-ordinate and carry forward the publicity work under-

taken through various appropriations made by cities and towns as authorized by the present law.

Now by the present law, under chapter four, section fifty-nine of the Revised Statutes, municipalities, towns and cities may raise money by taxation and advertise their resources and advantages.

You will recall that the distinguished gentleman who addressed us yesterday on the financial difficulties of the State, the Governor, in his inaugural address, called our attention to this same feature of publicity with regard to the State, and said that "the various agencies already existing in our State in Agricultural Associations, Chambers of Commerce and other similar Civic Organizations such as the Maine Publicity Bureau could then supplement with service the traffic that should result by distributing broadcast to all inquirers the literature compiled and furnished freely by the State of Maine. The State would be relieved of the burden of distribution, simply furnishing appropriate literature to all who might apply, and listing the agencies of a semi-public nature that would be glad to follow up with more detailed information the possibilities that were thus displayed."

You will observe that the resolve practically uses the same language as the Governor. "That there be and hereby is appropriated" certain sums. And it states the purpose, namely, "for the purpose of compiling and publishing data regarding the agricultural, industrial and recreational resources of the State of Maine for general distribution."

I take it that this House Document No. 3 is a statement, in the form of legislation, of the policy of the Governor with regard to publicity for the State, and the test comes right here now—whether this Legislature, this House, is to follow their Governor in his evidently sincere effort to do something progressive and enterprising for the State of Maine, or whether we are to leave him and not support him. That is the issue right here. It is whether this Republican Legislature is to support their Republican Governor in this Republican principle of publicity. If we are not, that is one thing. If we are, we should support this resolve. Now that, to my mind, is the question.

The distinguished gentleman from Lewiston (Mr. Holmes) finds fault that the sum spoken of in the resolve is not payable out of any particular fund. I was not aware that that was necessary, and if it be necessary to say that it should be paid out of a certain fund, this resolve can be very easily amended to that effect, but I don't believe that is necessary. It should be paid out of the funds of the State raised by the State tax, and this fund will be included in the money raised by the State tax. He finds fault that there will be no method of accounting, but that is not quite true because the purposes for the expenditure of the money are specifically and clearly stated in the resolve. They are for the purpose of compiling and publishing data. It is not to buy advertising in the Boston Herald. It is for the purpose of compiling and publishing data.

Now then, if we are to support our Governor, if we believe that he is correct, that he is right in spending his time in visiting different sections of the State and urging our citizens in their various town meetings to appropriate money for this purpose, it seems to me that we should provide this sum of money to meet the requirements of that action, and I hope that, in support of the Governor, the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Holmes, to re-consider, will prevail and that we then can be permitted to pass this resolve. (Applause.)

Mr. BECKETT of Calais: Mr. Speaker, and members of the House: When we hear one of our members make a motion and he tells us that he hopes that it will not prevail, when he tells us that he stands for the advancement of Maine, and at the same time speaks against a resolve which the most of us perhaps feel will cause that advancement, it is no wonder that our minds may be somewhat clouded as to the situation in different ways; and when he tells us that by advertising Maine we are entering into a gamble, do we believe it? We do not if we have any faith in Maine, if we have any faith in our land, in our waters, in our real estate dealers who will not induce people to come here and sell them waste land such as has been described, but land upon which they can make a living, a land on which

they can enjoy themselves. I believe that everyone of us here wishes the State of Maine to have the same high position that many of those who went out of Maine have helped to put other states in. Maine has always occupied a wonderful position in Washington by reason of the men we have sent there, the men that we have kept there, and the influence that they were thus able to exert. Look at the men and women who have gone from our State to other states! Wherever they are, you will find them occupying positions of influence, positions that have helped to raise those states. Where would Maine have been could we have kept those men and those women here? And is it not true that many times we look afar for the pot of gold and then return to find it at the place where we started? So we who believe in Maine believe that the pot of gold is here—the pot of financial gold, of recreational gold; and when we are referred to as a possible State of boarding house keepers, and so on, what disgrace is there in being a boarding house keeper?

We have been told that our agricultural people are in hard circumstances. What would benefit those agricultural people more than to have the people of other states come in here in greater numbers and possibly board with them or possibly buy products from them? Would it not help us all? Our land is so diversified, our territory is so great, that there is no immediate danger that we will be overcrowded.

I come from the St. Croix River. We have there three bridges across that river into New Brunswick, and if you could have gone up there any day last summer and have seen the line of cars with license numbers from states all the way from California east, you would have thought we had considerable business, but we still have more room and can accommodate more people. I believe, as does the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Wing), that this is only doing what we as individuals, what we as organizations, are attempting to do.

We have been told that just at present the State may possibly be in hard circumstances; but what does a business man do when he finds out that his business is not going just the way it should? Does he retrench? Does he stop spending anything? He does not. He looks around for op-

portunities to increase his business, and the first thing he does is to advertise and keep advertising. I believe that the State of Maine should advertise and that she should back up her business men and her other men, and Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, I sincerely hope that this motion to reconsider will prevail. (Applause.)

Mr. BOODY of Windham: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: Yesterday we were somewhat in the fog, but the atmosphere has cleared. Today I stand before you, not as a graduate of the red schoolhouse but of one that never was painted. I am now going to talk to you a few moments on the past, present and future of Maine. (Laughter.) Whoever discovered the State of Maine in its infancy saw her whole area covered with virgin forest. Today you see it with one-half of the wealth of the State held in twenty cities and towns, but the vast area of the rural sections is in an entirely different condition. You see in these towns beautiful houses and streets, wonderful buildings, costing millions of dollars, you see beautiful boulevards and things of that sort, and last, but not least, millionaires who have wrung the wealth from the virgin forest that has been taken away from our farmers who toil and labor by the sweat of their brow; and were it not for them, where would we stand today?

I have introduced into this House a measure of relief, something that should encourage diversified farming and give the rural sections such an opportunity as they never had. Then when finished with that, I have presented to you a resolve that a mill and a half of all the valuation of the State shall be distributed back to them for the loss of their revenues in the matter of unimproved roads for the purpose of equalizing the common needs of the rural sections and to give them encouragement and help. That will be to the advantage of the whole State. I shall also present to this House an income tax bill. I am proud to pay such a tax—

The SPEAKER: The Chair is inclined to give any member considerable latitude in debate, but the gentleman will kindly address himself to the motion before the House.

Mr. BOODY continuing: When these things are equalized, when we have accomplished all this, we can stand under the banner of the State

of which we are so proud and truly say "Dirigo, Maine leads,"—not only in her industries but in every other way.

Mr. PALMER of Island Falls: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I have no oration to deliver on this resolve. I just want to rise and let the people and the members know where the people of Aroostook stand in regard to this. It is not fair to accuse people of not being progressive because they are not able to be. I was sorry to hear the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, crack the party whip. The people of Aroostook have the name of being just as good Republicans as the people in the rest of the State. I think our record will bear s out. But we represent a people that owe twenty million dollars. Ten million dollars is what the farmers of Aroostook owe the fertilizer people alone. Ten million more represent the mortgages on the farms. Now it is not fair to accuse the people of Aroostook county of not being progressive, because they are. We do not feel as a delegation that we should vote for one cent of needless appropriation to add to the burdens of our people, and I wish that we would not try to make this a party measure. I can count a number of the democratic members who are voting for the measure and I can count a lot of good Republicans who are voting against it. They are doing so because they represent their people. It was said yesterday afternoon to us that all who were against it were the Aroostook delegation and the Frenchmen. That may be so, but I doubt it. Suppose it is! If I am from Aroostook county and represent people who do not feel that they are able to expend money to advertise the southern part of the State, should I vote for it? If I represent some French people, poor laborers, who are working for a small wage and trying to pay for their homes, should I be called down for voting against this measure? I do not think so, I believe that every man here is voting the way he feels himself or to represent his people, and I resent the cracking of the party whip for I am just as good a Republican as anybody, and I did not even go with the Progressives. Thank you. (Applause).

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen: I share the view of the gentleman from Island Falls (Mr. Palmer) who has just spoken.

I think it is extremely regrettable that there has been any attempt to make of this a party question. I think it is extremely regrettable that any Republican should feel called upon to vote for this resolve and for the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston (Mr. Holmes) to reconsider. I think it is extremely regrettable that any imputation should be cast upon his party loyalty. I think that the Governor of Maine, if he were here, would be the first to deny that this was a party question. I do not think that the Republican party has ever been committed in any way to the policy of State advertisement. I am not aware that anything was in the party platform about State advertisement, and, although I am well aware that the Governor himself has personally favored or did in his inaugural address personally favor some such measure as this, I think we must also bear in mind that the Governor was before us yesterday saying very frankly that the situation had changed since he came before us at the opening of the session, and that a new situation financially had been brought to light.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this House who oppose this resolve are loyal sons of Maine, and they do not deny that publicity has its uses, and a certain efficacy. I say, and I think many people agree with me, that publicity is not the function of the State, but it is the function of the individual. I think we must face that broad question of principle very squarely before we even come to consider whether twenty-five thousand dollars is a lot of money or whether it is only a little money.

The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Nichols, told you yesterday that the great states of California and Florida, whose example is so often cited, have never spent one cent for publicity. I picked up the morning papers this morning and I read that American tourists left in Europe last year four hundred million dollars. That four hundred million dollars is almost the difference between the solvency and the insolvency of Europe, stricken as it is by the war. The tourist business means an immense amount to Europe. Has any gentleman here heard of any European nation spending money on publicity? Even the Swiss? The analogy suggested by the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Beckett, between the manufacturing or industrial man spending money on advertising and

the State spending money for that purpose is a deceptive analogy which is likely to mislead us. The executive of a great private industry by keeping his finger on the sales or returns from a particular industry as related to its advertising expenditures can have some yardstick to measure whether his publicity is effective. I question very gravely whether you can ever tell whether the twenty-five thousand dollars which you spend in these two years has ever brought one cent into the State. We will be here ten years from now still debating whether such expenditures have been of real benefit.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, that a further objection to publicity on behalf or by the State is that while the incidence of this form of taxation is universal, the benefit of this form of taxation is badly distributed. There is no question in my mind—and I do not believe in the minds of the gentlemen and lady of this House,—I do not believe there is any question but that the hotel keeper and the garage keeper and the automobile man derive a much larger proportional benefit from such expenditure than anybody else; and if there is any question about that, let the gentlemen look about the lobby. (Applause). If we are going into an advertising campaign, this twenty-five thousand dollars is not a drop in the bucket. What is the capital value of the State of Maine? What would the private corporation having the wealth of the State of Maine be spending in advertising? Would it be twenty-five thousand dollars? They would be spending hundreds of thousands of dollars. Are we going to do that?

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that we who oppose this resolve are apostles of gloom. We are apostles of nothing of the sort. We are apostles of individual initiative, which is the only thing that ever improved any state or any nation in the world. (Applause.)

The SPEAKER: When the House is ready for the question the Chair will endeavor to explain the situation.

Mr. FROST of Belfast: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I doubt very much if I can add anything of particular value to what has already been said except possibly in the way of explanation. It just happens by chance that I am a member of the executive committee of the Maine Development Or-

ganization. From its very inception, when it started in this House last fall, I have been in touch with it. It has been my privilege on several occasions to listen to talk along this line by the Governor of our state and I am wondering if, under the influence of all this oratory to which we are listening today, we may not lose sight of the fact that the Governor, backed by a considerable number of business men of this State, is trying to map out what may be a real service to the State of Maine. I listened yesterday with a great deal of interest to the gloomy picture that was painted of the State of Maine by one or two of the representatives, and, if you will permit me, I would like to illustrate my feelings by relating an incident that happened, or at least is said to have happened, in the city of Portland at the close of a very enthusiastic evangelical campaign. The hotel was overcrowded and the proprietor asked permission to put a second man into a room with one who had already registered, and the man inquired somewhat about this newcomer, and gave his consent. The newcomer had been attending the evangelistic meetings and he came in under the influence of things that were said there. Before retiring he kneeled down and made his prayer and confession to God. The other man had already retired and been in bed long enough so he had gone to sleep; but this man's prayer awakened him and he listened with a great deal of attention. After a little time he got out of bed and began dressing, and when the man had finished his prayer his room mate was fully dressed. The newcomer said to him "What does this mean?" His room mate replied "I am going out. If you are one-half as bad as you have just told the Lord you are, I wouldn't stay in the room with you five minutes." (Laughter) Of course the point in my illustration is this:

If Maine is one-half as bad as some of the members of this House would have us understand, then the best thing we can do, those of us who are at the present time engaged in business in the State and bearing the burdens of taxation, the best thing we can do is to move out of the State as quickly as possible because there certainly must be other places than the State of Maine much more attractive. But do we believe that? No we do not believe it. There isn't a man here but who, if you were

talking with him privately out here in the corridor and you should attempt to say anything disparaging about the State of Maine, would defend it to the last issue. We know that the State of Maine is one of the finest and best places to live in and do business in that there is anywhere under the sun (applause), and no amount of talking to the contrary would make us feel any different.

Now one member stated a minute ago that he regretted very much that the party whip had been used. Well, possibly that may be a cause for regret; but anyway, friends and members of the House, we must realize that the Governor of this State is committed to this program. He has spent a great deal of time and a great deal of thought on it, and while you may not know it, all of you, a large number of you must know that there is a wide program that is being put forth in the State of Maine, the intention of which is to include every last town in the State in their contributions to this publicity campaign. And personally, as one of the members of the Executive Committee, I have spent at least a week's time in writing letters and sending them out into the different towns of my county advising the Selectmen to insert an article in the town warrant to enable the towns to make a contribution, be it ever so small, according to their own judgment, to carry out this plan of publicity.

What effect, gentlemen, will it have on those towns if the record of today's proceedings is against the granting of this small amount of money equal only to two cents on a thousand dollars?

Now, we speak about the burden of taxation. There was a time once when I thought I knew something about the value, or the wealth, of some of the citizens in my section of the State. And those that I listed among the men who were having a hard time, just barely able to make both ends meet, within a year of the time when I came to that decision bought automobiles costing from three to four thousand dollars.

Now, you say there are certain sections of the State that cannot possibly afford this two cents on a thousand dollars for each of the two years 1925 and 1926. Possibly there may be, but in our county, of which Belfast is the largest town in the county, and they having a popula-

tion, of not over four thousand, the county down there has on deposit in the two banks in our town nearly six millions of dollars, and it is constantly increasing, and increasing rapidly. Now that is a farming section to a very large extent. Personally, Gentlemen, I feel it would be a great mistake, a great rebuke to the Chief Executive of our State, who is doing everything he possibly can to help us to prosper and to take our place as we should among the states of this Union, it would be a great mistake not to pass a vote to reconsider this proposition and to vote the resolve as we have it. (Applause)

Mr. CUMMINGS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say a word upon this question. There are two things, however, that have come up to which I would like to refer. The last speaker, and some others, have in a somewhat similar town endeavored to connect the Governor with this proposed appropriation, or having us infer—at least, leading us to infer—although they have not explicitly so stated, that in his inaugural address he recommended something of this sort. This I deny. In his inaugural address he did recommend the plan of raising money by cities and towns. I have read it and I do not think I have forgotten it. My memory is that he did not refer to this matter of State appropriation in any way, shape or manner and the bringing of it in at this time looks to me to be merely an endeavor to influence the vote by asking people to stand by the Governor.

There is one other thing that I want to call to your attention and that is this: You always want to consider carefully when you start upon a road whether or not that is the road that you want to travel, and the time to decide is before you start. If the State of Maine desires to embark upon this line of State appropriation for this purpose, that appropriation will naturally constantly increase. If you desire to do this, then pass this resolve. If you do not, if you think it would be a wrong policy for the State of Maine to pursue then do not begin it. (Applause.)

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. WINN of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks upon this question. I want to say in the first place that although I am brand-

ed with the letter D (applause) as the bronchos they brought from the West years ago were branded, I am sorry when we come here as men to legislate for the interests of the State that anything should be brought in to intimidate anybody. I want to say now that I have the highest respect for our Governor. He is my Governor and Governor of the entire State of Maine, (applause) and I intend to support him in every one of his acts and to assist him; but I do not think that it should enter into this proposition.

I was approached this morning by a man who was branded with an R, and he asked me if there had been any get-together of the members of the Democratic side of the House, and I told him that we certainly had not; and I want to say now that I have been approached on this question by two different men. One of them was a Republican for whom I have the greatest respect, a splendid man. The other was a Democrat, a man for whom I also have the greatest respect, and they both tried to get me to change my vote and vote as they suggested.

It seems to me that we should not at this time forget the people at home. The people at home in nearly every section are the ones who, in my opinion, we should try to represent, and if we represent them honestly and faithfully, you will find the combined representation of them will be the fair representation of the entire State of Maine. Take our industries! This is a manufacturing State to a great extent, and the manufacturers are being so to speak, cramped by the increase of taxes. I come from a town of over four thousand population which contains one of the largest industries in the State of Maine, the manufacture of woolen goods, and which pays a tax into the town of sixty-four thousand dollars a year and which has been shut down nearly all winter. The citizens of that town are walking the streets and loafing, and when they are called upon to pay their taxes next year, wouldn't it be pleasing to them to know that they were going to have a reduced tax rate? They are now getting together at home in an effort to reduce the tax rate at the next annual town meeting. They are going to try to find some way, if possible, to get a reduced tax rate. We are confronted

with the situation with our fixed charges of a tax rate right close to thirty mills; and I believe what is true of that town is true of most other sections, especially the farming sections.

Taking all these things into consideration, the greatest advertisement we can give to the State of Maine when this Legislature adjourns is to adjourn with a reduced tax rate. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The Chair will attempt to explain the situation. Yesterday, the members will recall, this resolve was taken from the table, came up for passage, and the members voted to indefinitely postpone it. Indefinite postponement is the same as killing the measure. The pending question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Holmes, to reconsider the vote whereby that indefinite postponement was made. A vote of yes is for reconsideration, and if such a vote prevailed, the resolve would be before us for passage and the question of passage would be again debatable. A vote of no is against reconsideration and the matter would then be permanently killed. When the vote is called for, if a member is desirous of seeing this resolve become law, he would do well to vote yes. If a member is desirous of killing this measure he would do well to vote no. Is the House ready for the question.

Mr. NICHOLS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move, when the vote is taken, it be taken, by yea and nay.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Nichols, requests a yea and nay vote, and for that purpose one-fifth of those members present must vote affirmatively. As many as are in favor of a yea and nay vote being had will stand in their places until counted and the monitors will return the count.

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

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Allen of Harpswell, Allen of Hampden, Ayer, Bartlett of Bangor, Beckett, Bisbee, Bishop, Boody, Brown of Bethel, Brown of Waterford, Buker, Bump, Burnham, Campbell, Clarke, Crockett, Curtis, Davis of Dexter, Davitt, Decker, Deering of Saco, Drake, Dudley, Dunbar, Dwinall, Ellis, Eustis, Flint, Forhan, Foster, Friend, Frost of Belfast, Frost of Berwick, Frost of Eastport, Fuller, Garnsey, Greenleaf,

Haggett, Hamilton, Harrington, Hayford, Hight, Holman, Ingraham, Ireland, Kinsman, Lait, Larrabee, Lausier, Leland, Ludwig, Lunt, Mansfield, Marden, Martin, Mathews, Melcher, Metcalf, Mills, Mitchell of Newfield, Moore, Morse, Oakes, Peaslee, Pendleton, Pierce, Pillsbury, Piper, Pullen, Roberts, Robinson, Sargent, Seidel, Smith, Spear, Stitham, Stone, Thissell, Towle, Tupper, Warren, Wheeler, Wing of Kingfield, Wing of Auburn, Young—85.

YAY—Allen of Yarmouth, Atwood, Audibert, Bartlett of Hanover, Benoit, Boman, Boynton, Bragdon, Briggs, Cole, Comins, Cummings, Cyr, Daigle, Davis of Portland, Deering of Denmark, Dunning, Farley, Gagne, Gallagher, Gauvin, Gilchrist, Gilmour, Goodrich, Gordon, Hale, Hall, Hallett, Ham, Hammond, Harriman, Holmes, Houghton, Jones, Jordan, Kilburn, Kitchen, Lamson, Leighton, Lessard, Lewis, Littlefield, Lowell, McDonald, Mears, Mitchell of Houlton, Nichols, Norwood, Page, Palmer, Pike, Robie, Roy, Snow, Spruce, Sturgis, Thompson, Vail, Waterman, Whitcomb, White, Winn—62.

ABSENT—Burns, Johnson.

The **SPEAKER**: Eighty-five having voted in the affirmative and 62 in the negative, the motion prevailed. (Applause).

Mr. **WING** of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, what is the pending question?

The **SPEAKER**: The pending question would be whether this resolve now have final passage.

On motion by Mr. **Wing**, the resolve was finally passed.

The **SPEAKER**: Under orders of the day the Chair presents, out of order, a paper from the Senate which was there read, passed and ordered placed on file—a resolution of respect for Chief Justice Cornish, introduced by the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Maher.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the wise division of governmental powers between the three coordinate branches, executive, legislative and judicial, has ever proved in this State the exact expression of the genius of the people of the State of Maine with whom rests the ultimate sovereignty, and

Whereas, there has ever existed the mutual confidence, trust and respect of said governmental agencies for the rights, responsibilities and functions of each, and

Whereas due to his somewhat overtaxed physical condition, the great Chief of the judicial branch of the government has deemed it discreet to resign from his high trust,

BE IT RESOLVED, that it is the sense of the Eighty-second Legislature of Maine that there shall be

spread upon its records a vote expressive of its appreciation of his splendid character, great gifts of mind and purpose, high ideals, inspiring integrity and fine service.

AND BE IT RESOLVED, that the Legislative branch of government of the State of Maine does hereby express and record its esteem, regard, love and loyalty for the Honorable Leslie C. Cornish, Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine, and wishes him long years of health and happiness to come.

Mr. **WING** of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I move the passage of the resolution and that we record our vote by rising.

Thereupon the resolution was adopted in concurrence with the Senate by a unanimous rising vote.

The **SPEAKER**: We are proceeding under orders of the day.

Mr. **WING** of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the table the joint order requiring railroads to file list of salaries, etc., tabled by me February 18, pending passage.

The **SPEAKER**: The document is in the hands of the printer at the present moment.

Mr. **WING**: Will the Chair entertain the motion at this time?

The **SPEAKER**: Certainly.

Mr. **WING**: I yield to the gentleman from Windham, Mr. Boody.

Mr. **BOODY** of Windham: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire through the Chair of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. **Wing**, for what purpose he yields the floor?

Mr. **WING**: For the purpose of showing him the courtesy of doing anything he has a mind to with his order, and the floor is his for that purpose.

The **SPEAKER**: A motion for passage of the order would be in order at the present time. The Chair would state to the gentleman that it is customary for a matter to be taken from the table by the gentleman who tables it.

Mr. **BOODY** of Windham: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this order is the investigation of the affairs of corporations like this one coming here and asking for a reduction of taxes. I ask that these corporations shall be required to file their salary lists and that they shall show their hand so that we may be able to know whether the conditions under which they ask such reduction are honorable or dishonorable. This order was drawn for the purpose of compelling railroad or electric corporations,

asking that their taxes be reduced, shall show their outgo and their income on an equal basis that we may determine the fair balance of two. If we find there is not sufficient for the outgo, I want to know what the outgo is so as to be able to determine whether they are extra, vagant or otherwise. This order is for that purpose, that they shall submit to this House the amount of the income they receive and a statement of the salaries they pay out so that we may determine whether it is greater than the taxpayer can afford, and if it is, then they must reduce on their household expenditures. Therefore, I move you, Mr. Speaker, the passage of this order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Windham, Mr. Boody, moves that the order relative to the furnishing of information by railroads have passage.

Mr. CURTIS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this order is now in the hands of the printer. Many of us would like to see it, and I move that the order be tabled until we can have an opportunity to peruse the order as presented yesterday by the gentleman from Windham (Mr. Boody).

The motion to table prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Dudley of Woodstock it was voted to take from the table joint order to investigate Department of Education, tabled by that gentleman yesterday pending passage, and that gentleman yielded the floor to the gentleman from Kingman, Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kingman: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I presume you are aware of the fact that I introduced an order to investigate the Department of Education. I have in my feeble way investigated the matter to my satisfaction and I believe it is all right. In regard to the personal expenses of the head of that department I consider them very economical, and I would like to withdraw that order and ask permission so to do.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kingman, Mr. Campbell, re-

quests the permission of the House to withdraw his order. Is it the pleasure of the House that such permission be given him?

Permission being granted, the order was withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The House is still proceeding under orders of the day.

On motion by Mr. Hale of Portland, it was voted to take from the table H. D. 61, resolve to reject Child Labor Amendment, tabled by that gentleman February 4, pending reference; and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was referred to the committee on Legal Affairs.

On motion by Mr. Sturgis of Auburn, it was voted to take from the table the communication transmitting Child Labor Resolution, tabled by that gentleman February 11, pending reference in concurrence; and on further motion by the same gentleman the communication was referred to the committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Sturgis of Auburn, it was voted to take from the table resolve rejecting Child Labor Amendment, S. P. 125, tabled by that gentleman February 11, pending reference in concurrence; and on further motion by the same gentleman it was referred to the committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Sturgis of Auburn, it was voted to take from the table a resolve to ratify Child Labor Amendment S. P. 121, tabled by that gentleman February 11, pending reference in concurrence; and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was referred to the committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Harriman of Readfield,

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.