

# 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-Third Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1927

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

## HOUSE

Wednesday, March 30, 1927.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Garland of Augusta.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act relating to Oak Grove Seminary, S. P. 549.

Comes from the Senate received under suspension of the rules and passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee.

In the House, received and given its three several readings under suspension of the rules, and passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee in concurrence with the Senate.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Judiciary on bill an act to compel legal voters to vote in primary and other elections, S. P. 412, S. D. 188, reporting that same be referred to next Legislature.

Comes from the Senate the bill and report indefinitely postponed.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Cyr of Waterville that body voted to indefinitely postpone the bill and report in concurrence with the Senate.

From the Senate: Majority report of the committee on Military Affairs on resolve appropriating \$5,000 for monument in France dedicated to C Company U. S. 14th Engineers Regiment, H. P. 785 reporting that same be referred to the next Legislature and minority report reporting that same ought not to pass, which report was accepted by the House, March 29,

Comes from the Senate, majority report accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Robie of Gorham that body voted to adhere.

## Orders

Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle pre-

sented the following order and moved its passage:

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that House Paper 429, resolve in favor of International Bridge over St. John River, Madawaska, Maine—Edmunston, New Brunswick, for a combined immigration and customs office, be recalled to the House from the committee on Ways and Bridges.

The order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. KITCHEN of Presque Isle: Mr. Speaker, in connection with that order I would simply like to make a brief statement. This resolve was introduced by Mr. Daigle of Madawaska for the construction of a house on the American side of the International Bridge. The Federal law provides that the State must provide such facilities for the convenience of the State and Federal Officers. The appropriation, or the money, must come from the general appropriation, and the Ways and Bridges committee felt that this resolve should go to the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. Therefore, I move that the resolve be referred to the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman postpone his motion until the bill comes into the House?

Mr. KITCHEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

## Reports of Committees

Mr. Goodwin from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on bill an act to define a chauffeur. (H. P. No. 918)

Mr. Blaisdell from same Committee reported same on bill an act to incorporate Augusta Humane Society. (H. P. No. 668) (H. D. No. 175)

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Majority report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on bill an act to amend the charter of the city of Portland. (H. P. No. 727) (H. D. No. 199) together with petitions. (H. P. No. 950, 951 and 952)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MORRISON of Franklin  
 DWINAL of Knox  
       —of the Senate  
 FULLER of Southwest Har-  
       bor  
 GOODWIN of Sanford  
 BLAISDELL of Franklin  
 McCART of Eastport  
 SARGENT of Brewer  
 Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland

      —of the House  
 Minority report of same Committee  
 on same bill and petitions reporting  
 same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1233)  
 under same title and that it "Ought  
 to pass".

Report was signed by the follow-  
 ing members:

Messrs. HOLMES of Androscoggin  
       —of the Senate  
 LITTLEFIELD of Kennebunk  
       —of the House

On motion by Miss Laughlin of  
 Portland, both reports tabled pend-  
 ing acceptance of either, and  
 specially assigned for Friday, April  
 1, and the new draft ordered printed.

Majority report of the committee on  
 Legal Affairs reporting ought not to  
 pass on bill, an act relating to the age  
 at which persons are capable of con-  
 senting to marriage. (H. P. No. 529)  
 (H. D. No. 138)

Report was signed by the following  
 members:

Messrs. MORRISON of Franklin  
 DWINAL of Knox  
 HOLMES of Androscoggin  
       —of the Senate  
 GOODWIN of Sanford  
 BLAISDELL of Franklin  
 McCART of Eastport  
 FULLER of Southwest Harbor  
 SARGENT of Brewer  
 LITTLEFIELD of Kennebunk  
       —of the House

Minority report of same committee  
 reporting ought to pass on same bill.

Report was signed by the following  
 member:

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland  
       —of the House

On motion by Miss Laughlin of  
 Portland, both reports tabled pending  
 acceptance of either.

Mr. Pike from the committee on  
 Ways and Bridges on bill, an act re-  
 lating to the town of Gorham (H. P.  
 No. 794), reported same in a new  
 draft (H. P. No. 1234) under same  
 title and that it ought to pass.

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

Mr. Kitchen from same committee

reported ought to pass on bill, an act  
 relative to State Aid apportioned to  
 cities and towns for the improvement  
 of highways. (H. P. No. 1090)

Mr. Metcalf from same committee  
 reported same on resolve in favor of  
 the town of Surry. (H. P. No. 563)

Reports read and accepted and the  
 bill and resolve ordered printed under  
 the joint rules.

Mr. Ayer from same committee re-  
 ported same on bill, an act relating to  
 the construction of a raised road  
 across the bar between Deer Isle and  
 Little Deer Isle, in the county of Han-  
 cock. (H. P. No. 149) (H. D. No. 48)

Mr. Kitchen from same committee  
 reported same on bill, an act in re-  
 lation to the breaking of roads in  
 winter. (H. P. No. 104) (H. D. No. 38)

Reports read and accepted and the  
 bills having already been printed were  
 read twice under suspension of the  
 rules, and tomorrow assigned.

### First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

H. P. No. 60, H. D. No. 521. An act  
 relative to clerk hire in the office of  
 the Clerk of Courts, Penobscot county.

H. P. No. 610, H. D. No. 522. An act  
 to increase the salary of County At-  
 torney for Oxford county.

H. P. No. 677, H. D. No. 523. An  
 act relating to clerk hire in the office  
 of Register of Deeds for Oxford coun-  
 ty.

H. P. No. 1229, H. D. No. 524. An  
 act to increase the salary of the Coun-  
 ty Treasurer for Oxford county.

H. P. No. 1230, H. D. No. 525. An  
 act relating to the salaries of the  
 Judge and Recorder of the Bangor  
 municipal court.

H. P. No. 602, H. D. No. 512. An  
 act to incorporate the city of Belfast  
 School District.

H. P. No. 393, H. D. No. 513. An  
 Act to increase the salary of the  
 Sheriff of Piscataquis county.

H. P. No. 395, H. D. No. 514. An  
 act relative to the salary of the Judge  
 of the municipal court of Brunswick.

H. P. No. 543, H. D. No. 515. An  
 act to make the chairman of the An-  
 droscoggin county commissioners a  
 full time office with the duty of su-  
 perintendent of buildings and to in-  
 crease his salary to fifteen hundred  
 dollars.

H. P. No. 678, H. D. No. 516. An  
 act to increase the salary of the Reg-  
 ister of Deeds of Oxford county, East-  
 ern District.

H. P. No. 1226, H. D. No. 518. An  
 act relating to pensions for the blind.

H. P. No. 1227, H. D. No. 519. An

act to increase the salary of the Clerk of Courts for Oxford county.

H. P. No. 1228, H. D. No. 520. An act to increase the salary of the Register of Deeds in the county of Androscoggin.

(Tabled by Mr. Sturgis pending assignment for third reading).

H. P. No. 706, H. D. No. 517. Resolve in favor of George E. Sparrow of Pittston, for reimbursement for damage done his fowl by foxes.

H. P. No. 1231, H. D. No. 526. Resolve in favor of Frank Tozier for reimbursement for money expended while working as constable in small-pox quarantine.

### Passed to be Engrossed

S. P. No. 258, S. D. No. 284. An act to increase the salary of the Judge of the Western Somerset municipal court.

S. P. No. 287, S. D. No. 280. An act establishing Mount Bigelow Game Preserve in the counties of Franklin and Somerset.

S. P. No. 397, S. D. No. 174. An act regulating speed at intersecting ways.

(Tabled by Mr. Chase of Cape Elizabeth pending third reading).

S. P. No. 485, H. D. No. 285. An act relating to certain State park.

S. P. No. 539, S. D. No. 283. An act relating to the government of the town of Camden.

H. P. No. 1220, H. D. No. 509. An act relating to the Kennebec County Agricultural Society at Readfield.

H. P. No. 454, H. D. No. 501. Resolve to reimburse Reed Plantation for support of a State pauper.

(H. P. No. 576) (H. D. No. 502) Resolve to reimburse the town of Kingman for support of Thomas Robichaud, a State pauper.

(H. P. No. 580) (H. D. No. 503) Resolve to reimburse the town of Vanceboro for support of Otis L. Crocker, a State pauper.

(H. P. No. 698) (H. D. No. 504) Resolve to reimburse the city of Old Town for support of Joseph Pelkey, a State pauper.

(H. P. No. 699) (H. D. No. 505) Resolve to reimburse the city of Old Town for support of George Loring and family, Indians.

(H. P. No. 814) (H. D. No. 506) Resolve to reimburse the town of Richmond for support of Arthur H. Weeks and family, State paupers.

(H. P. No. 824) (H. D. No. 507) Resolve reimbursing town of Machiasport for medical expenses of Indians.

(H. P. No. 825) (H. D. No. 508) Resolve to reimburse the town of Lebanon for support of Mary Mawson and child, State paupers.

(H. P. No. 1225) (H. D. No. 510) Resolve in favor of Lloyd F. Sewall of Bangor.

### Passed to be Enacted

An act relating to the jurisdiction of the Probate Court.

An act relating to facilities to be furnished Public Utilities Commission by public utilities.

An act relating to the use as part of name the words "Bank," "Savings," "Trust" and kindred words.

An act relating to fishing in Watchic Pond, in the town of Standish, in the county of Cumberland.

An act relating to officers of the Senate and House.

### (Emergency Measure)

An act to repeal acts incorporating Rangeley Village Corporation.

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

A division being had,  
One hundred and nineteen voted,  
and all in the affirmative so the bill was passed to be enacted.

### Orders of the Day

Mr. Piper of Jackman was given unanimous consent to introduce the following order, out of order:

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that the hearings of the committee appointed to investigate the Highway Department be held in the hall of the House when possible.

The order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

Mr. KINSMAN of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I would like the special privilege of the members of the House, and I will state my reasons therefor. There is a Society in Augusta known as the Maine Children's Home Society which has received aid from the State for several years. A few months ago one of the trustees of this society came before the budget committee asking

for the same amount that they have always received, and for some unknown reason the amount they requested was neglected to be recommended. I have been informed by the committee on Appropriations that the amount has already been laid aside that they asked for, and I desire, Mr. Speaker, the privilege of having the rules suspended that I may offer this resolve at the present time.

Thereupon the rules were suspended and the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Kinsman, presented a resolve in favor of the Maine Children's Home Society, and on motion by that gentleman it was referred to the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

**THE SPEAKER:** Under tabled and today assigned, the Chair lays before the House joint order relative to investigation of the hydro-electric powers of the State of Maine, H. D. 351, tabled by Mr. Morrill of Gray, March 24, pending passage; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gray, Mr. Morrill.

**MR. MORRILL:** Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the same position this morning that I did a week ago this morning in regard to the other water power bills, and I would ask the indulgence of the House to retable this matter until a week from today, and I so move.

Thereupon the House voted by viva voce vote to retable the above matter and specially assign it for Wednesday, April 6.

**THE SPEAKER:** The Chair lays before the House, under tabled and today assigned, Report A of the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game, reporting ought not to pass on bill an act to regulate ice fishing in the Belgrade Chain of Lakes, so-called, in the counties of Kennebec and Somerset, H. P. 850, and Report B of the same committee, reporting ought to pass on same bill, tabled by Mr. Bartlett of Bangor, March 28, pending the acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Bartlett.

**MR. BARTLETT:** Mr. Speaker, I do not care to make any motion on this matter, and I yield the floor.

**MR. WYMAN** of Sidney: Mr. Speaker, I move that Report B, ought to pass, be accepted.

**MR. MERRILL** of Dover-Foxcroft: Mr. Speaker, I should hope that this motion would not prevail. It seems to me one of those questions where it becomes necessary in order to secure the largest amount of good for the largest number of people that there be some personal sacrifice—

(At this point Mr. Hale, of Portland, assumed the Chair, amid the applause of the House.)

**MR. MERRILL** resuming: As I said before, to secure the greatest good for the largest number of people, it seems wise for the comparatively few to forego a certain measure of privilege, of liberty, if you please, of long-established custom. It becomes the part of good citizenship, oftentimes, to take into consideration the larger question and yield on the smaller. It seems to me that the question of ice fishing is largely a question of that nature. If the opening of any of our lakes—which are of great interest to tourists and out-of-state people—to winter fishing will injure in any way the increase or the continuance of those who now come to our State for summer recreation and for fishing, it is certainly not wise to take that chance that a few may have the liberty to indulge in winter fishing.

The question as to whether winter fishing actually decreases the number of fish in a lake appreciably, whether it actually injures the fishing in that lake, is a debatable question. To my mind that is not the material question. Inasmuch as that cannot be very well definitely decided, it seems to me our whole attention should be given to the larger question: Would we derive enough satisfaction from the insistence upon our rights to fish through the ice in the winter time to offset the tremendous advantages derived from the summer business and the possible detriment to that business if it were to be broadcast that such a chain of lakes as the Belgrade had been opened to winter fishing. To my mind that is the definite question for consideration.

The Belgrade Lakes, so-called, is one of the most widely advertised sections of the State of Maine. It is known far and wide among summer tourists and this is due in large part to the sums that have been

spent in advertising the place. This has amounted to about sixty thousand dollars, all paid by those who are interested in the lakes. In addition to what property owners about the lakes have spent for advertising their own sections, they have contributed liberally to the State-wide advertising funds.

The property about the lakes is very valuable, due to the extensive manner in which it has been advertised, and the popularity it enjoys among summer tourists. The taxable value of the property about the lakes is over two million dollars, and these values, it is proposed to impair by this bill.

The summer resort industry of Belgrade Lakes is a great source of revenue to farmers contiguous to the lakes. The produce they sell to the resorts about the lakes is good for cash at their doors.

Farm labor is now the chief industry in the lake section. At one time there were mills at the villages, but they have been closed for one reason or another, some having been destroyed by fire, and the farming industry derives its revenues in great part from the recreational industries at the lakes, which have been built up by the enterprise of those who have to do with them.

Guiding about the lakes furnishes employment to many men in summer. These guides are paid seven dollars a day, and the ice and bait they furnish bring their remuneration up to nine dollars daily. Any impairment of the fishing at the lakes would reduce this employment.

From non-resident fishermen at the lakes the State derives no inconsiderable revenue from non-resident fishing licenses at three dollars each. The Belgrade fishermen pay the State about four thousand dollars yearly for licenses alone.

The existing laws are sufficient to take care of the fishing at the lakes and are satisfactory to the people who patronize the hotels and camps there.

The fact that ice fishing is being allowed there would be advertised far and wide and would keep tourists away even though the fish supply was not seriously depleted. Under the bill only seven fish can be caught by each individual fisherman, no matter what the kind. This would not be understood by visiting tourists. All they would know is that the ice

fishermen were taking fish from the lakes, depleting the supply for them in summer.

These lakes were closed to ice fishing in 1895, and this was done because it was demonstrated that the winter fishermen were slaughtering the trout and salmon.

One hotel owner alone paid out \$13,000 for supplies for the lakes in a single season, and this amount was doubled by other buyers. Merchants in Augusta and Waterville derive large revenues from this business and for that reason are opposed to the bill.

Ice fishing will cut down this business and serve to keep tourists from the lakes, and if it is allowed it will only benefit the comparatively few who want to do ice fishing, probably not over fifty.

The Belgrade Lakes recreational industries furnish work for a large number of boys going to schools and colleges and who must have employment if they are to continue their studies. There are distinguished doctors, lawyers, clergymen and others in different parts of the country who were able to educate themselves by working about these places in the summer, work which many boys will be deprived of if the lakes are made less attractive than they are to tourists.

The whole question of publicity for Maine, it seems to me, should be considered in this matter of winter ice fishing. As said at first, it seems to me we should take the broad view of striving to make the places attractive and bring to our State thousands and thousands of dollars which might be turned away into other parts of the country if it became known that we were not making any attempt adequately to protect the interests which they come here to enjoy.

Mr. CYR of Waterville: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: A similar bill has been presented to almost every Legislature for the last twenty years. The residents and tax payers around these lakes came here to almost every Legislature asking that some of their privilege that has been taken away from them, beginning in 1895—that a little part of it—be returned to them. They were always opposed by a very few representatives and some outside interests.

Now the town of Oakland, which is on the border of those lakes, two years

ago in town meeting, voted practically unanimously in favor of opening those lakes to ice fishing; and the town of Belgrade did about the same. Now especially this year, when they are asking for so little of their privilege to be given them, I think they should be recognized, and especially when the Kennebec Delegation, at a meeting, before this bill was drafted, stood unanimously in favor of this bill. I think we should be recognized too. Now the supporters of this bill claim that if you fish through the ice in the winter, it will hurt the fishing in the summer. I beg to say that they are making a mistake, because a few years ago, through a mistake, there was a certain kind of fish by the name of pike dropped into those lakes. They are a big fish, weighing from six to twenty pounds. They will destroy more fish in one month in those lakes than you could catch in ten years through the ice. They are a big fish, and their back fins are sharp like a saw, and they will dive under other fish and split them open and destroy many in that way. I think those fish will not bite in the summer, but they claim that they can be caught through the ice in winter with live bait and will bite at that time.

The argument that it will hurt the fishing in any way is that they have put a lot of money in to stock those ponds with black bass. I have been fishing in China lake and other lakes in the winter, and have never seen anyone fishing there catch a bass in the winter through the ice. I think they will not bite in the winter.

Now, they talk about property owners. I own a cottage there, and have done so for fourteen years. I think there are about one hundred and fifty cottage owners who are residents of Waterville, around the Belgrade Chain of Lakes, and you will find almost every one of those cottage owners in favor of that bill. If I thought that it would hurt our property around the Belgrade Chain of Lakes to open these lakes only eight days in winter, I would be opposed to this bill, but it will help us because we can go over there in winter, light a little fire, cut a hole in the ice and get a mess of fish.

Now as to the farmers, are you going to stand up here and vote in favor of outside people or are you going to protect your own citizens of Maine? They claim it will hurt the summer business because so-called sports from other states will not come here be-

cause the citizens of the State of Maine have a little right to fish through the ice in the winter. I do not think so, if they are regular sports. I do not believe that any of those sports will begrudge the farmer around those lakes the privilege of cutting a little hole in the ice and getting a little mess of fish in the winter, when he cannot go to Florida or other warm climates, as those sports can. I think that if they knew this Legislature was not going to pass this bill, on their account, they would say, "You are wrong because we are not so narrow; we are sports, and we want the citizens of Maine to have a little bit of their privilege."

For all those reasons (I will not say any more) I hope the motion of the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Wyman, will prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will say that the measure before the House is House Document 216.

Mrs. FOLSOM of Norridgewock: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who reside in the Belgrade Lakes region, and as one who owns a cottage on North pond of the Belgrade Lakes, I wish to oppose the motion of Mr. Wyman of Sidney. Much has been said regarding the lack of industries in the State of Maine. One of our principal industries is our summer business, and whatever is best for that business should be best for the State of Maine. The summer hotels and camps in that region furnish employment for the men and women of Maine, and they furnish a market for the farmer's product. Therefore I think it is best that the ought to pass report should not be accepted. (Applause)

Mr. CHURCH of Hallowell: Mr. Speaker, the people in that section around the lakes, it being farming territory, feel that they do not have much opportunity to fish in the summer time, and they merely ask that during February and March, for one day each week, with a limit of only seven fish for each person, they be allowed to fish in the winter time. A great many of these people cannot readily do it in the summer. We admit that they have a perfect right to do it in summer, the same as all other people, but it is not easy for them to do so. If you assume that the ice will go out of these ponds about April 20, you will find that there are over a hundred and sixty days' fishing in the summer time, whereas all that is asked for in this measure is eight or nine days in the winter time. That is,



we only ask about one-twentieth of the time that is allowed in the summer. And I think, in all justice and fairness to everybody concerned, they should be allowed this privilege. We do not believe that that amount of winter fishing will hurt the fishing in the summer time in the slightest. (Applause)

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft (Mr. Merrill) has said that we ought to take the broad view and consider the effect upon summer tourists. Is that really the broad view? Have we come to the point in this State where we know that the tourist industry is our prime object in life? Cannot we still consider, at least, that the citizens of the State of Maine ought to have as much right as the people who come down here in the summer time? (Applause.) I do not seek to minimize the importance of the tourist industry; but I think it has been greatly over emphasized in the State of Maine in the last few years.

If you try to analyze the statistics, put up to us for our consideration, of the importance of the tourist industry, I think you will agree that they consist largely of glittering generalities; but when you check them up, they do not mesh in together and do not check up at all. Let us not get the idea that the tourist industry is the most important thing we have.

Furthermore, something I do not understand is this: They say the tourist industry will save agriculture in the State of Maine. In the last fifty years this tourist industry has been spreading along the coast of Maine from Kittery to Bar Harbor. Look at that section and see what has happened, and see whether the tourist industry has caused a rejuvenation of agriculture there. I have lived on the coast of Maine all my life. In the section where I was born the tourist industry has caused more farms to be abandoned than any other factor. I think a resident of the State of Maine has as much right as the people who come down here in the summer time. (Applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Sidney, Mr. Wyman, that Report B of the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game "ought to pass" on the bill an act to regulate ice fishing in the Belgrade Chain of Lakes, so-called, in the counties of Kennebec and Somerset, be accepted.

All those in favor of the motion will signify it by saying aye, those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to accept Report B "ought to pass" prevailed; the rules were suspended, the bill was given its first two readings and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House, H. P. 942, H. D. 491, bill an act relating to the use of seines, weirs, nets and artificial flies, tabled by Mr. Boynton of South Portland, March 29, pending passage to be engrossed, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Boynton.

On motion by Mr. Boynton of South Portland the bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Passing for the moment the first unassigned matter on the calendar, the Chair lays before the House the second unassigned matter Senate report ought to pass in new draft of the committee on Agriculture on bill an act to amend Section 18, Chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the apportionment of State aid to agricultural societies, S. P. 165, S. D. 69, new draft, S. P. 493, S. D. 245, tabled by Mr. McKnight of Poland, March 22 pending acceptance of report in concurrence; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Poland, Mr. McKnight.

Mr. HOLMAN of Bangor: Mr. Speaker I notice an error in making up the calendar. On page fourteen, the thirty-second unassigned matter was specially assigned for this morning, and I believe that the record of the House Reporter will bear me out; and if in order, I would like to take this matter up at the present time as there are some waiting who would like to have it heard now.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Poland, Mr. McKnight, will allow the House to proceed with the matter mentioned by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman, as there seems to have been an error in the printing of the calendar.

The Chair lays before the House the matter printed as the thirty-second unassigned matter on page 14 which should have been printed with the assigned matters on page seven, House report A, ought not to pass,

and House report B, ought to pass, of the committee on Education on bill an act permitting children to be excused from the public schools to receive religious instruction, tabled by Mr. Holman of Bangor, March 29, pending his motion to accept report B, ought to pass, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman.

Mr. HOLMAN: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: Being one of the five who signed the report ought to pass, I beg the indulgence of the House very briefly at this time for the purpose of explaining the provisions of this bill and giving some reasons why I think it worthy of our favorable consideration. For the information of some two-thirds of the members of the House who were not here two years ago, I wish to say that this is the same bill that passed the House and also passed the Senate. I say that this is the same bill, and it is excepting one word. We have changed the word "sixty" so that it now reads "ninety" minutes; and in order that we may understand just the issue involved in this bill, I wish we might turn for just a moment to the bill itself, which is House Document 133. At page two, line 14, we will find the only change that is being made in this bill in relation to our present school law. Beginning at the bottom of page two, line 14, with the word "They," which refers to the school committees of our several towns and cities in the State of Maine, the amendment simply provides that those school committees, when requested by the parents or the guardians of children in their towns or cities, may excuse those pupils from the public schools for the purpose of receiving week day religious instruction in their respective churches. There is nothing in the bill that is compulsory in any way. It leaves to each town and each city the free will to do as they see fit with the matter. For this reason it seems to me that there should be no objection on the part of the small towns to permitting this measure to go through.

I will frankly admit that from the physical condition in many of our smaller towns, it is and doubtless will be impossible for those children to avail themselves of the privileges herein provided; but in our larger towns and cities, where in many cases the churches are in close proximity to

the schoolhouses, it seems to me that this bill would do much good.

It is not my purpose at this time to enter into any extended arguments as to the necessity of our boys and girls receiving religious instruction. That necessity has long been recognized as the very foundation of all education and culture. Daniel Webster once said that a religious education is a greater safeguard of liberty than a standing army, and General Pershing has recently said that if the day ever comes when we fail to give to our boys and girls a religious training, then the downfall of the Republic is not far off. Many of our greatest theologians, including Dr. Cadman, Cardinal O'Connell, Rabbi Wise, and others, have repeatedly emphasized the importance and the necessity that our boys and girls receive this training.

It has recently been said that the place for every boy and girl, irrespective of race or religion, is in the public school system. If this is correct, it is also true that there should be no place in that system for the teaching of any religious faith, creed or doctrine. So the question naturally arises, how are our children to receive this training? And upon first reflection we are apt to say that it should be in the homes; but when we come to consider that answer we find that thirty-five per cent. of the children who come from these homes represent homes where the parents do not attend church of any kind, and for this reason it seems to me that it is our solemn duty to see to it that these children in some way are provided with this training.

There are those who feel that in this movement on the part of the churches that much is going to be accomplished for our future citizenship, much to overcome the great increase in crime and disregard for law that has grown up, and much to overcome this religious hatred and intolerance that seems to be dominating our day and generation; and so I say to you, gentlemen and ladies of this Eighty-third Legislature, can it be possible that we are going to vote thousands of dollars to advertising this grand old State of Maine, millions of dollars for our highways and bridges, and then deny to our boys and girls the opportunity of studying God's word for ninety minutes in a week?

One of the greatest of American

poets has said that the "thoughts of Youth are long, long thoughts;" and we here know that this is true. The greatest heritage that can come into the life of any boy or girl is not an inheritance of stocks or bonds or silver or gold, but that recollection that he or she may carry through life of having received in his or her early childhood days from the lips of a Christian father and a Christian mother those sweet stories of old that have come down to us through the centuries and have proven themselves to be the greatest influence in the making and developing of Christian character.

So I hope that when we come to vote the members of this House will feel that we owe a duty to these boys and girls, and that they will cast their votes to give to them an opportunity of knowing more of the life and the teachings of the greatest teacher of all mankind who said two thousand years ago "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not." (Applause)

Mr. EUSTIS of Strong: Mr. Speaker, it is with some misgivings that I rise to oppose the motion under consideration. The bill before us provides that local school committees, upon the request of parents of school children, be permitted to excuse those children during school hours for the purpose of religious instruction. Consideration of this bill might possibly be from two angles. First, is it desirable to excuse children for such purposes? Second, is such a law necessary?

Although an adequate discussion of the bill would call for such a two-fold consideration, I shall confine my brief remarks largely to whether or not such a law is necessary. First, however, I wish to point out that on March ninth, in Bangor, Dr. Payson Smith, formerly Commissioner of Education in the State of Maine and now Commissioner in the State of Massachusetts, in speaking before the Bangor Teachers' Union, stated in discussing the bill proposed that in his opinion it should not pass. Such is the opinion of a trained educator, a leading educator in the East and a man in whom we all have confidence.

I shall not discuss whether or not it is desirable to take time from our already overcrowded school curriculum. I shall not discuss the fact that two years ago a bill covering

the same subject matter called for the excusing of school children for six minutes while the present bill calls for an hour and a half. I shall not discuss at length the very delicate question of whether or not the religious issue should be brought in any way into our public schools. I shall confine myself rather to pointing out that the passage of the proposed law is unnecessary.

The bill provides that school children may be excused during school hours for the purpose of religious instruction. I will call to the attention of the members of this House that, under a ruling made by the Department of Education and supported by an opinion from the Attorney General's office, school committees now have all the rights provided for under this Statute. I hold in my hand a copy of a letter written by the Commissioner of Education, December 12, 1923 to Reverend E. H. Brewster, General Secretary of the Maine Sunday School Association, stating that so far as he is able to learn there is nothing in our laws, either constitutional or otherwise, which would prohibit the local school committee from excusing the children for the purpose of religious instruction. As a matter of fact in four communities of our State, namely, Bar Harbor, Calais, Wells and Berwick, such instruction is now being given. Thus the question will naturally arise in our minds, why is such a bill asked for? I asked this question of the committee and I would like to quote from the newspaper report of the reply of Bishop Brewster, one of the leading proponents of the bill. Bishop Brewster said that although several towns do permit pupils to be excused, and there might seem to be no need of a general law, it had been held by the corporation counsel of the city of Portland that it was unconstitutional to excuse children for religious purposes, and the present bill had been presented to clear up the doubt which might exist. Mr. Wilbur, corporation counsel for the city of Portland, in a conversation with me since the hearing, confirmed his opinion, and I have in my hand a copy of his letter to the Secretary of the Church Federation, and also a copy of his letter to Mr. Jack, superintendent of schools in the city of Portland, in which he

states that in his opinion the local school committee does not have the constitutional right to excuse children in the manner under consideration.

To say that Mr. Wilbur is not alone in his opinion I hold in my hand an opinion by Mr. Justice Seegar, Supreme Court Justice of the State of New York, in which he grants a permanent injunction against the school committee of the town of Mt. Vernon, New York restraining them from excusing children during school hours for the purpose of religious instruction. Thus we see that the Department of Education has ruled, and its ruling has been supported by an opinion of the Attorney General's office, that local school committees now have all the rights provided for under this act. Such instruction is going on in four of our communities. On the other hand, the corporation counsel of the city of Portland has ruled that so to excuse is unconstitutional.

Therefore, members of the House, we are faced by the fact that if on the one hand the law is unconstitutional, the passage of this act will not change the constitutionality; and, on the other hand, if it is not unconstitutional, the ruling of the Department of Education does not need to be supported by further legislation. In either case the proposed bill is unwise, unnecessary and inexpedient.

In closing, every member of this House will agree—and I include the proponents of the bill—that religious instruction should not be given in the public schools. That is no longer a disputed matter in the State of Maine. We agree, therefore, that the school committee has no authority to regulate religious instruction in the public schools; and, members of the House, I do not believe that the school committee has any power or authority to make rules and regulations by which rules and regulations it intends to do and assist in the doing of anything which it does not have the power so to do. (Applause).

Mrs. FOLSOM of Norridgewock: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature: I am one of the five members on the Educational Committee who signed Report A "ought not to pass". I therefore feel it incumbent on me to explain my decision. The American Nation was

founded upon the principle of absolute separation of Church and State. I therefore think it is un-American to inject a religious issue into our public schools and it is as one who was, for fifteen years, a member of the teaching profession, that I feel most strongly in this matter. I began my school career in the rural schools of Maine with six pupils and finished it in a High School in Massachusetts with over twenty-two hundred pupils. Whether in the one or the other, I found the day crowded with the subjects that the teachers were supposed to teach. To enumerate all these subjects taught in a first-class school would be laborious. Suffice it to say, that every minute of the five hours of the five days of the week is necessary for the teacher's task. But the teacher does not have five hours of five days a week. There are innumerable interruptions to the time. There are national holidays, and state holidays, and local holidays, and time off for this purpose and for that purpose.

Those five hours spent in school and ten hours spent in sleep leave nine hours in each school day, besides Saturdays and Sundays. Parents who wish their children to learn other things outside the school find ample time for it. They find time for their children to take lessons on the piano and violin and cornet. If they wish them to take singing lessons, they find time for it. If they wish them to take dancing lessons, they find time outside of school hours. If parents thought religious instructions equally necessary for the well-being of their children, they would find some time for that outside the school hours.

I do not mean to belittle religious instruction. I am Superintendent of a small Sunday School which is struggling for existence. That is proof of that fact. But I think the teacher's task is a hard one. Her day is crowded with subjects that she is supposed to teach her pupils. Therefore I think that time off for any purpose whatever is not wise, and that is the reason why I signed Report A "ought not to pass". (Applause)

Mr. SMITH of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I think this matter should receive our most serious consideration,

for after all it is one of the most important things, to my mind, that comes to the attention of this House. We have spent a great deal of time considering water powers, taxation, and other matters. Can you tell me anything more important today than what the children are being taught and what the children are thinking? More depends for the future of this State on the kind of thoughts the children are thinking and the instruction they are receiving and the ideals held before them than any attitude we might take on any of these economic questions.

Now the question arises in my mind is there a need to be met in the State of Maine? And as near as I can get at the facts, I have tried to do so. I have talked with several who are very much interested in work among boys and girls, and they tell me that without doubt in the State of Maine there are fifty per cent of the boys and girls who do not go to any Sunday School, and that as far as they know, many of these receive no regular religious instructions. I do not think anyone can deny that religious instruction is necessary and I have the utmost respect for the churches that realize that.

We have a problem here where forty per cent or fifty per cent of the boys and girls do not go to any Sunday School. And, whether or not to your mind it would be worth ninety minutes a week to have our boys and girls receive instruction along the lines of religion, would it not be as valuable as some of the studies now pursued in the schools, in the building of character? Would anything be lost by giving that small portion of time to teaching them their responsibility to God? I care not what idea one has of God; but it does seem to me that it is a great advantage to anyone to look back and remember that he has been taught some idea of responsibility to a governing power. This is being greatly neglected. Men who have thought deeply on this subject have said that secular education is not enough. Dr. Eliot said that secular education alone would not meet the necessity of religious instruction which is so necessary for the child.

This bill does not compel any child to receive religious instruction. It

simply asks the opportunity to allow those who do want it to attend. There is no compulsion whatsoever. It is simply an effort to meet this problem. Whether this will work out as the proponents hope, I do not know, but it is simply necessary to have some law at this time because there seems to be a confusion.

I will admit that when someone arises, especially a lawyer, and says that the thing is unconstitutional, it does not now have the effect that it used to have. I have learned that that is simply one way of frightening and surprising laymen, and the lawyers themselves say it is hard to tell what is unconstitutional. But if there is any question with regard to the legality of this, it seems to me the wise thing to do is to pass this law. I understand that in Portland this was discontinued because of this confusion. If that is so, it seems to me the best thing we can do is to pass this law and allow any city the opportunity to try to work out this problem. It seems to me we should not tie the hands of the men and women trying to solve this problem. If this does not meet the situation, it is simply an honest effort to meet the problem, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Bangor (Mr. Holman) will prevail.

Mr. LAIT of Old Town: Mr. Speaker, just a few words in regard to this bill. I wish to state my position in regard to religious instruction, the question of time being taken off for religious instruction in the schools. Among my own people we have schools that have sessions immediately following the close of the afternoon session, where we spend every day about an hour. As Mrs. Folsom said, she did not believe it at all necessary to take the time away from the school session for the purpose of receiving religious instruction. I heartily agree with her, knowing that in my boyhood days we used to attend religious instruction every day about an hour. I do not see any reason whatever for passing this bill. I believe that theoretically it may be good, but practically it is not at all necessary. Therefore I am opposed to the motion of the acceptance of the "ought to pass" report.

Mr. DAVITT of Millinocket: Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion of Mr. Holman of Bangor. I am sorry, but I cannot agree with him in

that matter, and in duty to constituents I feel that I voice their sentiments when I oppose this motion. To my way of thinking it is entirely unnecessary that we should excuse the pupil to attend religious instruction during the school period. The committee of my town and East Millinocket are much opposed to this measure. I opposed this measure two years ago, and am sorry to say that I have got to oppose it again on the same grounds.

I think the legislation asked for is unnecessary. I think that there is time in the churches in my town, of which I may speak especially, to have religious instruction. In my town there are four churches, Congregational, Baptist, Episcopal and Catholic and each of those churches has a Sunday School of an hour and a half on Sunday forenoon and afternoon. In East Millinocket they have a Congregational Church, a Baptist Church and a Catholic Church, and they have all kinds of time to teach their children religion on Sunday. Furthermore, I think that in the homes there is ample time—time enough—for the mothers and the fathers to give their children religious instruction without depriving the children of the time that they have for secular instruction in the school. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman.

Mr. CROCKETT of Hollis: Mr. Speaker, and members of the House: I support the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman. I hope it will have a passage. I feel that it cannot do any harm and may do much good. It is simply an enabling act. It is not compulsory and will not be enforced in any community where it is not wanted. It is not an experiment. It has been tried out in other States very satisfactorily, especially in the city of Gary, Indiana. It has been in force there for a long time and is highly approved by the teachers. It is not an experiment in our State, having been tried out in several places. But there is question, as has been stated, regarding the legal right of our school authorities to excuse these pupils from the day school for the purpose of going to a Church or some other suitable place for religious instruction. I think the passage of this measure will help to clear up this situation, and I do not believe anyone here wants to oppose an oppor-

tunity of any child to receive religious instruction.

The answer may be made that the home is the proper place for that instruction. Such instruction used to be given in the home, but today the home is giving over many things to the schools and other institutions. There are many things that appeal to the boys and girls today that did not appeal to the boys and girls when we were young. The automobile, the movie, and all these things take up the child's attention. I feel that if we, in this way, provide for religious education during school hours, keeping in mind that it will not be a part of our school work, we shall help solve a problem that is a real problem, which is the right development of our boys and girls.

There is something more important than taking care of the physical well-being of our boys and giving them information and training their minds. We want to develop their characters. In order to do that we must see to it that they have some religious instruction and training. It has been said that we cannot afford to let them have time out of the day school period. It was my privilege to have breakfast, not long ago, at Westbrook High School. That breakfast was prepared and served by the students of that school, and it was a fine breakfast. In the rooms where we were served I noticed a sewing machine. On the walls there were charts showing that those students were taught the use of needle and thread. In the rear of that building was a building where the boys were taught the use of tools. Now I think it is a fine thing to teach boys and girls to do such things in connection with their school work, and I think it is just as essential that we allow some of this time, if their parents desire it, for the purpose of religious instruction. It is equally important with other matters. I certainly hope we will make it possible for them in this way to receive such instruction.

Mr. RAWLEY of St. George: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The previous question is moved. As many as are in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will return the count.

A sufficient number having arisen the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is shall the main question be put now? The motion is debatable, each member being allowed to speak not more than five minutes; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Lait.

Mr. LAIT: Mr. Speaker, I move that the vote be taken by yea and nay.

Mr. HOLMAN of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken I would like to avail myself of the opportunity of saying—

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may address the House on the question of the putting of the previous question, but may not address the House on the merits of the main question itself.

Mr. HOLMAN: Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the opportunity is denied me at this time of stating anything in rebuttal?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the motion was made for the previous question and a sufficient number arose, so that the Chair must now put to the House the question of whether the main question be put now. The gentleman may address the House in opposition to the motion for the previous question so that he may be again in position to address the House upon the merits of the question; but the gentleman may not now address the House on the merits of the main question, the pending question being whether the main question shall be put now.

Mr. HOLMAN: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that having taken up so much time already in the discussion of this question, I will not ask the indulgence of the House to say anything in rebuttal. I move, Mr. Speaker, that the previous question be now put.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The motion before the House is the motion of the gentleman from St. George, Mr. Rawley, that the previous question be put now; and the question before the House is shall the main question be put now. As many as are in favor will signify by saying aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion that the previous question be put now prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: And the question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman, to accept report B, ought to pass, on an act permitting children to be excused from the public schools to receive religious instruction, H. D. 133; and the gentleman

from Old Town, Mr. Lait, has moved that the yeas and nays be called for. Is this the pleasure of the House? All those in favor of calling for the yeas and nays will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will return the count.

A division being had, and a sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays were called for.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GREENLEAF of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, will the Chair please restate the question?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman, that the House accept report B, ought to pass, on bill an act permitting children to be excused from the public schools to receive religious instruction. A vote "yes" will be in favor of the motion and will be in furtherance of the ultimate passage of the act. A vote "no" will oppose the passage of the act. The Clerk will call the roll.

YEAS—Allen, Anderson of South Portland, Bailey, Belleau, Bisbee, Boynton, Brackett, Brewster, Buker, Butler, Cole, Crawford, Crockett, Dagle, Fuller, Gay, Gilchrist, Goodwin of Lebanon, Harris, Holman, Houghton, Hughes, Ingraham, MacKinnon, Mears, Morin, Robie of Gorham, Robie of Westbrook, Roy, Smith, Sturges, Sturtevant, White, Williams of Falmouth, Wood, Wyman—36.

NAYS—Anderson of New Sweden, Ayer, Bissett, Blaisdell, Boston, Breen, Briggs, Brown, Bruce, Carleton of Portland, Carleton of Winterport, Chamberlain, Chaney, Chase, Church, Clifford, Comins, Cowell, Cram, Cyr, Davitt, Deakin, Decker, Deering, Douglas, Dudley of Calais, Dudley of Castle Hill, Ellis, Eustis, Farrington, Ferguson, Flint, Folsom, Forhan, Gagne, Gillespie, Goodwin of Sanford, Greenleaf, Greene, Griffin, Hammond, Hathaway, Heath, Holbrook, Jackson, Jones, Kane of Addison, King, Kitchen, Lait, Laughlin, Leathers, Littlefield, Lowell, Mansfield, Marriner, McCart, McIntire, McKnight, McLean, Metcalf, Morrill, Norwood, Page, Patterson, Pendexter, Pike, Piper, Powers, Rawley, Richardson Rounds, Ruggles, Sargent, Saucier, Seavey, Snow, Staples of Eliot, Staples of Waterville, Stone of Bridgton, Stone of Biddeford, Storm, St. Clair, Thurston, Tripp, Tucker, Vail, Varnum, Webber, Weston, Williams of Webster, Wing of Auburn, Wing of Kingfield, Winslow—94.

ABSENT—Aldrich, Bartlett, Bishop, Booker, Burns, Cain of Clinton, Dennison, Foster, Hamel, Hawkes, Kinsman, Maloon, Marden, Melcher, Merrill, Miliken, Nadeau, Snowman, Wheeler—19.

HALE—Speaker pro tem.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Thirty-six having voted in the affirmative and 94 in the negative, the motion for the acceptance of report B failed of passage.

On motion by Mr. Eustis of Strong, it was voted to accept House Report A, ought not to pass.

Mr. EUSTIS: I now move to reconsider, and I hope my motion will not prevail.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to reconsider failed of passage.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House the second unassigned matter on page eight of the calendar being Senate report ought to pass in new draft of the committee on Agriculture on bill an act to amend Section 18, Chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the apportionment of State aid to agricultural societies, new draft (S. P. 493) (S. D. 245), tabled by Mr. McKnight of Poland, March 22, pending acceptance of the report in concurrence; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Poland, Mr. McKnight.

Mr. McKNIGHT: Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives; I wish to call your attention to Senate Document 245. This is an act to amend Section 18 of Chapter 34 of the Revised Statutes relating to the apportionment of State aid to agricultural societies, and I want to say right at the start that I am opposed to this amendment, and in as few words as possible I wish to convey to the members of this House the reasons for my being so opposed.

If the members of the House will turn to this new draft and will follow down to Section 18, line second, they will see that it says there that "there shall be appropriated annually from the State treasury a sum of money not to exceed three and one-half cents per inhabitant of the State, which shall be known as the State stipend for aid and encouragement to agricultural societies and hereafter in this act designated as the stipend." If they will follow along down to the tenth line they will see that it says there "Two thousand dollars shall be paid annually to the Maine Pomological Society and the balance of said stipend shall be

divided pro rata among the legally incorporated societies, not heretofore provided for according to the amount of premiums and gratuities actually paid in full." Now I wish the members of this House would turn to line 48 where it says "in no case shall any society be entitled to any share of the stipend unless it shall have raised and paid in premiums in the classes heretofore set forth at least four hundred dollars. That is the principal objection I have to this bill. It further says "No society shall receive any portion of the stipend in excess of twenty-five hundred dollars." I do not agree with that statement there. Then this bill goes on to state the rules and regulations which these fairs shall come under in order to get this State stipend from the State of Maine. On the next page in line sixty it says "The stipend may, however, be paid to such agricultural society or societies as may display a lesser number of exhibits of vegetables, fruits, or dairy products than as hereinbefore required, provided the commissioner shall certify that in his opinion such society or societies have been unable for good and sufficient reasons to secure such required number of exhibits."

That is the rule and requirement, so the commissioner has in the past allowed small fairs to receive a part of the State stipend; otherwise they would have been debarred.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, members of this House, I find myself in a peculiar situation this morning. I shall have to say at the start that I have had more or less experience with fairs and I helped resurrect one fair from the graveyard and put in five years of hard work into that fair. I was an exhibitor for two years in Western New York in all the fairs there. I have attended two World Fairs. I think, perhaps, I am fairly familiar with the ways fairs are run in one way or another. Now I understand that when this bill was presented to the committee the proponents of this bill appeared there, and I do not think there is any dispute in regard to what I will say, that there was not a great deal of opposition. It is well known that before these legislative committees here a great many times there is not any opposition for the simple reason that people opposed to these meas-



ures are unable to get there. For myself, being on two committees, I was unable to appear before this committee. I am in a peculiar situation. I know all the members of this committee. They are my personal friends whom I have known for a long time. I know the men who appeared before the committee in regard to this bill.

Now I have here a statement which I received from the Chairman of the Agricultural Committee, and he is the same gentleman who introduced this bill into the Senate; and I am going to presume that it is correct, having come from the Commissioner of Agriculture. I also have a clipping here from the Bangor Daily News, which I think is fairly accurate, and it agrees with the other statements I have here except in one particular instance one part is left out. Otherwise the two statements agree.

The point I wish to make is this, that in Maine at the present time there are fifty-nine fairs. Four of these fairs made no report this year; three of them are provided for by legislative resolve that they are entitled to twenty-five hundred dollars each. The Maine State Pomological Society gets two thousand dollars, and the rest get their pro rata of this money raised not to exceed three and a half cent per inhabitant of the State. They get what is left out of that amount. Now, ladies and gentlemen, on this list there are fifty-one fairs.

In this bill here before me it says that no fairs shall receive any State stipend unless it has paid a premium of not less than four hundred dollars. In that list beginning there and running through, there are fifty-one fairs that receive more or less State stipend. Out of the fifty-one there are exactly twenty-one that last year paid less than four hundred dollars. Under this bill and in that same list there are twenty-six that paid more than five hundred dollars. That is almost fifty per cent that paid a premium of less than five hundred dollars and a little more than fifty percent that paid more.

(At this point the speaker resumed the Chair.)

It is not a personal matter with me. The fair that I helped to resurrect is built up to where it has paid \$991.10 which is almost ten per cent as much in premiums as the largest

fair in the State, and that fair is able to look out for itself.

My opponents say there are too many fairs in this State. That argument is like saying that there are too many small houses feeding people in Augusta and that it would be well to get rid of them by having everybody go to one or two big hotels. That holds good in reference to any small business. Any small business has got to make a small beginning in order to get up to be a large business. When I was connected with this fair that I was interested in, the same story was told, that there were too many fairs. There were fifty-seven fairs then, and now there are fifty-nine. This is neither increased nor decreased to any great extent. In the natural course of events some fairs go out of existence and others spring up.

Three things govern fairs. The principal thing is the geographical location. I can remember when the Lewiston State Fair was much smaller than now, and the newspapers used to tell of a crowd when there were five thousand people there. Now they speak of twenty thousand or more. They began small and worked up. It was all owing to the geographical location of that fair, which is on the railroad and near a big city. They could not help growing. These little fairs are just little fairs around some local town where there is a Four Corners and a Grange Hall, and the local people take pride in having a fair. Many of these little fairs will never grow to be any larger. It is impossible. They have not any railroad facilities, and but for the fact that the local people take pride in them, they would soon go out of existence.

This fair business is a big business like any other. The idea of this bill is to take away the money that would go to those twenty-five small fairs and hand it over to the twenty-six larger ones. The four fairs that received a special resolve from the Legislature do not get any more than before. It is no advantage to the larger ones and is a disadvantage to the smaller ones.

I am not going to stand here and argue all day about this but will leave it to the members of this House whether it is fair to help drive out these small ones, to take the money from the small fairs and give it to the larger ones.

Mr. PAGE of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, this matter was heard before the committee, and the report "ought to pass in a new draft" has been accepted by the Senate. I believe the committee heard the evidence on both sides and I think they know more about it than we can learn in the House. I move the acceptance of the report "ought to pass in a new draft" in concurrence with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Page, moves that the House accept report of committee "ought to pass in a new draft" in concurrence with the action of the Senate.

Mr. ROEBIE of Gorham: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word as a member of the committee on Agriculture. The original idea of the State stipend was to encourage agriculture by aiding some of our fairs. So many fairs came in on that and have raised their premium list to such an extent, that the original purpose is defeated. It is impossible to satisfy everybody. The big fairs would like more, and the little fairs want theirs. We tried to opportion out the largest top limit and the bottom limit. There must be a limit somewhere. This bill is the result of a unanimous vote by the Agricultural committee. I trust that the motion of Mr. Page will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Page, that the report of the committee "ought to pass in new draft" be accepted.

Mr. McKNIGHT of Poland: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

A division of the House was had. Eighty-two having voted in the affirmative and eighteen in the negative, the report of the committee was accepted in concurrence, and the bill received its first two readings and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the third unassigned matter Senate report, ought to pass in new draft of the committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation on bill an act relating to the operation of portable sawmills, new draft S. P. 498, S. D. 253, tabled by Mr. Littlefield of Kennebunk, March 22, pending acceptance of the report in concurrence; and the Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Littlefield.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield of Kennebunk, a viva voce vote being taken, the matter was retabled and specially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourth unassigned matter House report, ought not to pass, of the committees on Public Utilities, Interior Waters and Judiciary on bill an act to incorporate the Maine Water Storage and Power Transmission Company H. P. 21, H. D. 10, tabled by Mr. Patterson of Castine, March 22, pending acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Castine, Mr. Patterson.

Mr. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious why this report was tabled. You all know that they are having a discussion of this matter in the other body—I mean the water power bills. Some in the House feel, like myself, that there should be no definite action upon this particular bill until these other matters are considered in the House. Therefore, I ask the indulgence of the House and move that this matter be retabled and specially assigned for Friday, April 1.

Thereupon, a viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifth unassigned matter House report, ought not to pass, of the committee on Public Utilities on bill an act relating to inventories and rates of electrical companies, H. P. 98, H. D. 36, tabled by Mr. Wing of Auburn, March 22, pending acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing.

Mr. WING of Auburn: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: This was a piece of legislation in which I was very much interested. The bill provides that no increase in any rate or service of any "electrical company" within the meaning of the definition of "electrical company" shall be allowed, ordered or decreed to such company by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Maine unless such Company seeking such increase has first filed with the said commission an itemized inventory of its assets, which said inventory shall state after each item thereof, the date

of its purchase and its depreciation as figures on their books and the valuation as carried on their books.

I did not expect that any such sensible requirement as this would meet the approval of the electrical companies themselves. I know enough to know—at least I think I do—that if you undertake to do business with a man, if you go to a bank to borrow money, the bank very properly asks you for an inventory of your property so that there can be some basis by way of property for your credit. That was the theory of this bill that property committed to the public use should be known by the public utilities company before net rates were increased. Now this did not meet with the approval of the Public Utilities Committee, for what reason I know not. Today is the thirtieth day of March and we have been here a long time trying to make progress, and I do not propose at this hour or at this time in the session to in any way hamper the efforts of men and women here who are striving to bring this session of the Legislature to a close. I am interested in seeing our business conducted promptly and with dignity and dispatch. I want to go to doing something else, and I therefore shall move the acceptance of this bill and the committee's report in the interest of time. (Applause)

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

The motion prevailed and the report was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the sixth unassigned matter being House Report, ought to pass, in new draft of the committee on Judiciary on resolve authorizing James H. Kerr of Rumford in the county of Oxford to bring a suit at law against the State of Maine, new draft, H. P. 1193, H. D. 438, tabled by Mr. Wing of Auburn, March 22, pending acceptance of the report; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing.

On motion by Mr. Wing, the report ought to pass in new draft was accepted; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the rules were suspended and the resolve was given its first reading, prior to that gentleman offering House Amendment A.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will

state that this is a resolve and the amendment can now be offered.

Mr. WING: I now offer House Amendment A. This resolve authorizes James H. Kerr to bring suit against the State of Maine for a specified sum of money having to do with the loss which he says he incurred by virtue of relations and business with the State Highway Commission. This amendment will enable Mr. Kerr to bring his suit, take out the evidence and report the case, as we say, on the law and facts for the final determination of the Supreme Judicial Court. It has the endorsement of the attorneys who are interested in the matter and also of the Attorney General. I offer the amendment and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment A to H. D. 438, resolve authorizing James H. Kerr of Rumford in the county of Oxford to bring a suit at law against the State of Maine.

Amend by striking out in the thirteenth and fourteenth lines thereof the words "The conduct of said suit shall be according to the practice of suits in the said Supreme Judicial Court", and inserting the words "the evidence shall be taken out before a single justice of the Supreme Judicial Court in term time or vacation and the case reported to the law court for final determination, so that said resolve as amended shall read as follows:"

On motion by Mr. Wing of Auburn further reading of the amendment was dispensed with and House Amendment A was adopted and tomorrow morning assigned for the second reading of the resolve as amended by House Amendment A.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the seventh unassigned matter bill an act relating to the survey and sale of wood, H. P. 1162, H. D. 418, tabled by Mr. Littlefield of Kennebunk, March 22, pending third reading; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Littlefield.

On motion by Mr. Littlefield the bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eighth, unassigned

signed matter bill an act relating to the pay of jurors, H. P. 1183, H. D. 437, tabled by Mr. Ellis of Fairfield, March 23, pending third reading; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Ellis.

On motion by Mr. Ellis of Fairfield that gentleman offered House amendment A and moved its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to act relating to pay of jurors, H. P. 1183, H. D. 437.

Amend by striking out the word "six" in line five and inserting the word "five," so that said section as amended shall read as follows:

Section 8. Per diem of jurors increased to five dollars. Grand and traverse jurors, attending the supreme judicial court or superior courts, and jurors attending on any other occasion prescribed by law, shall each be allowed five dollars a day for their attendance, and six cents a mile for their travel out and home, to be paid out of the county treasury.

Mr. WING of Auburn: I move the indefinite postponement of the amendment and the bill.

The pay of jurors at the present time is four dollars a day. I do not think that pays a juror. I do not think that five dollars a day, as provided by this amendment, pays a juror. I do not think that six dollars a day, as provided by the bill before it was attempted to be amended, pays a juror. There is no office in our entire list that is comparable to the office of a juror. He is somewhat like a member of the Legislature. He is not paid. He has to make his contribution as a citizen to public affairs. This bill, if you pass it, will materially increase the county taxes. I think we should have some heart for the tax payer—the ordinary tax payer. And there is no particular reason why jurymen who have served during the time of the war, when prices were greatly enhanced—why, at this time, when costs in every line are falling, when the price of living is falling, when the National Government is trying to make and has made a reduction in taxes—there is no particular reason which appeals to my sense of right and wrong why we should increase the cost of Government—because it is in the cost of Government that the

amount of tax is reflected. Now, mind you, I have said that a jurymen would not be paid if you paid him six dollars or if you paid him five dollars. A jurymen is someone we must have in the nature of our law. He is a necessity. He comes and has to serve whether he wants to or not. It is the greatest duty of the citizen to be a jurymen. And you may call a man from his work who earns many thousands of dollars, or one who is not capable even of earning the five dollars that you propose to give him. You cannot compensate him. It is something that the citizen must do. I think that this House should begin to retrench. I think this House should follow the example of the Federal Government in reducing the cost of Government instead of constantly and persistently increasing it. I move the indefinite postponement of the amendment and the bill. (Applause).

Mr. HOLMAN of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, will not prevail. It seems to me that after this House has gone on record as increasing its own salaries, after we have gone on record as increasing the salaries of Judges of our Supreme Courts, that we ought to continue consistent and give to these farmers, who especially make up our juries in many cases an opportunity to have a little increase in salary. (Applause) I will not take further time of the House, but I trust the motion of the gentleman will not prevail.

Mr. HAMEL of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Wing) will prevail. He referred to the salaries during the war and to the pay of jurors during the war. I know the increase of salaries would not be paid by the county. In our own county, Androscoggin county, the pay of the workmen has decreased, and the pay of the jurors has not decreased. I am greatly in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, for that reason—that we should not increase the pay of the jurymen while the pay of the taxpayers has decreased, and I agree with the gentleman from Auburn.

Mr. ELLIS of Fairfield: Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I am op-

posed to all increase of salaries at this time, but from the amount of bills that have gone through increasing the salaries all over the State, and especially in county offices, and other bills increasing salaries in State offices and in our courts, it seems to me no more than fair that the jurors should receive a slight increase along with the rest. But if Mr. Wing or any member will agree to cut out all increase of salaries all over the State, I will certainly vote with him.

Mr. DAVITT of Millinocket: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in regard to the pay of jurors. In my town and in East Millinocket we are a manufacturing town. The men in that town are earning from five to ten dollars a day. I think it is not just for those men to serve on a jury and receive less compensation than what their daily wages provide. Some of these men have wives and families, and with the present high cost of living, the pay they would receive as jurors is less than what they receive as wages. It is not fair to workmen of this State to be asked to serve on a jury for less pay than they would receive from their daily work.

When we go to a jury trial we are there from ten to thirty-five days, depending on the business of the court. I think that when they come to town from their homes, and have to pay for their room and board, they have nothing left for their wives and families, and I believe six dollars a day is a very small item to pay the working man of this State for serving on a jury. As has been said, six dollars is not a large compensation, but it helps out. Now they receive four dollars a day. What does a jurymen have left after paying for room and board, to keep his wife and family? I hope that the motion of Mr. Wing of Auburn will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, that the amendment and the bill be indefinite postponed. As many as are in favor of this motion will—

Mr. PIPER of Jackman: I ask for a division.

A division of the House was had,

Seventeen having voted in the affirmative and 85 in the negative, the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, to indefinitely postpone the amendment and bill was lost.

Mr. WING: Mr. Speaker, I now move to amend the amendment by

substituting the word "six" instead of "five".

The SPEAKER: There is pending before the House, House Amendment A in which the word "six" was stricken out and the word "five" inserted; and the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, moves to strike out the word "five" and insert the word "six".

Mr. STURGIS of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I take objection to the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing. It was intimated by the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman, that most of the jurors are farmers. It has been stated by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Hamel, that the majority of the jurors in Androscoggin county are farmers and workmen. If I am right, the majority of jurors from Androscoggin county are not farmers; if they are, they are getting better pay than they get at home. I am surprised at the feeling in regard to expenditures. We have heard, from time to time, of different ones in different departments wanting more pay. The supreme court judges want an increase in their pay. The gentleman from Auburn says, in regard to juries, that jurors have to serve anyway. They are pretty nearly like a man at a funeral. From what I read in the papers of business men, the man with ideas of his own, and lots of times very small ideas of his own, is excused from the jury, and is peddling fish about the town. But the little fellow has to serve. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, to amend House Amendment A by striking out the word "five" and by inserting the word six".

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may state it.

Mr. CHASE: Will the effect of the amendment to the amendment be to re-establish the terms of the original bill, which I understand is six dollars. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER: The Chair so understands.

Mr. CHASE: So, Mr. Speaker, that the two amendments together are the same as voting for the original bill?

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that if this amendment is carried, it would be the same as the

original bill. Perhaps someone from the committee will inform the House as to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Webster: Mr. Speaker, I think the Chair is correct.

Mr. HAMEL of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, is inconsistent. He was not willing to give the jury five dollars, and now he wants to give him six. For the benefit of the taxpayers I am going to stick to the five dollars, and try and save that other dollar. (Laughter.) I hope the motion will not prevail.

Mr. McKNIGHT of Poland: Mr. Speaker, that bill was threshed out in the committee room, and the original draft called for seven dollars. I feel that inasmuch as all the gentlemen have expressed their ideas, I will say that we felt that perhaps five dollars was a fair compensation for the jurymen. We all know that no man can any more than get by on that if he stays at a hotel. It makes no difference whether he is a farmer or who he is, or how much he makes on a farm. Some days a farmer gets nothing but the next day he gets a little something.

Mr. WING: Mr. Speaker, may I have permission to withdraw this particular amendment.

Thereupon permission was given and the amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WING: Mr. Speaker, now may I offer an amendment creating the amount of seven dollars? If we are going to pay jurymen, Mr. Speaker, we might as well pay them. May I have the number of the House bill?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state it is H. P. 1183, H. D. 437.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD of Kennebunk: Mr. Speaker, I can see Mr. Wing's object in this. He wants to kill the whole bill. Now while I care nothing about it for myself, I wish to say this, that the jurymen are not paid a fair wage at four dollars a day, and we all know it. The men who are in attendance, with the same pay as the jurymen, are not fairly paid. The purpose of this bill was to raise the jurymen's pay. I think the man who introduced the bill forgot entirely that there were many attendants upon the jury such as deputy sheriffs, etc. You raise the jurymen's pay from four dollars to seven dollars, and it means three dollars a day for thirty-one to thirty-three men. I do not know how it would be with other counties, but that

would mean anywhere from ninety to one hundred dollars a day for the jurors in York county.

Now at the last term of court in York county, the jurors drew thirty-two hundred dollars at four dollars a day. Now who pays those jurymen? The jurymen himself pays his proportion, and the farmer pays his proportion—the man who stays at home. Mr. Wing's idea is inconsistent. First he starts to kill them and then he wants to resurrect them. He is simply trying to kill this bill.

There is another bill here that was brought up here today which is the sheriff bill, simply to keep the pay of sheriffs and that of jurors together. I do not want to put a premium on this, so that every man will strive to get on the jury. That is not the way out. A jury trial is supposed to be a fair trial before fair men, and not men who try to get their names put into the jury box because they can earn more that way than they could earn at home. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Ellis, of five dollars a day will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is upon the amendment to House Amendment A offered by the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Wing, to amend said House Amendment A by substituting the word "seven" for the word "five" in said amendment. As many as are in favor of the motion to adopt this amendment to House Amendment A will say "aye"; those opposed "no".

A viva voce vote was taken, and the motion was lost.

Mr. HOLMAN of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move now the indefinite postponement of all the amendments, and if this motion prevails I will then move that we accept the report of the committee of a new draft "ought to pass."

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the report of the committee has already been accepted, and the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman, moves the indefinite postponement of House Amendment A, which has been read, striking out the word "six" in line five, and inserting the word "five." As many as are in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment A will say "aye"; those opposed "no."

A viva voce vote was doubted.

The SPEAKER: As many as are in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment A will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will return the count.

Mr. GREENLEAF of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether we are voting for five dollars or six dollars a day.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that amendment A apparently reduces the report of the committee from six dollars to five dollars a day. The Chair will further state that the House is now voting upon the motion to amend the original bill, whether to accept the amendment which reduces that amount by one dollar. The House is now voting on the amendment which gives jurors five dollars a day. The motion is to indefinitely postpone that amendment. As many as are in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone Amendment A which strikes out the word "six" and inserts the word "five" will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will return the count.

Mr. FOSTER of Ellsworth: Mr. Speaker, now this thing is not plain. Are we voting to give the jurors five or six dollars a day?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the amendment which is being voted on is to give the jurors five dollars a day instead of six, and the motion before the House is to indefinitely postpone that amendment. Is the question clear?

Mr. WING of Kingfield: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the men who stand up now are voting for six dollars a day?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will again explain that the question now before the House is on House Amendment A which reduces the pay of jurors from six dollars, as reported by the original bill, to five dollars. What will happen after this amendment, the Chair cannot state because it does not know.

Mr. WING of Kingfield: Mr. Speaker, if this motion passes, all we have left is the bill which says six dollars a day. Is that right?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman is correct. The question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman, to indefinitely postpone the amendment in which the word "six" of the original bill was stricken out, and the word "five" inserted. Is the

matter clear? As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Holman, to indefinitely postpone House Amendment A will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will return the count.

A division of the House being had, Forty-five voting in the affirmative and 74 in the negative the motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment A offered by Mr. Ellis of Fairfield failed of passage.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is on the adoption of House Amendment A, and the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Ellis, moves that House Amendment A be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, may the amendment be read again, Mr. Speaker?

(Amendment read.)

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to adopt House Amendment A prevailed, and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

Order, out of order.

On motion by Mr. Hale of Portland, it was

Ordered, that when the House rises it be to recess until five o'clock this afternoon.

On motion by Mr. Crockett of Hollis it was voted to take from the table the 26th unassigned matter being House Amendment A to bill an act relating to school supervisory unions, H. P. 1213, H. D. 471, tabled by that gentleman March 29, pending adoption; and on further motion by the same gentleman the matter was recommitted to the committee on Education.

Mr. WING of Kingfield: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House rise, Calls of "No, no, no."

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to rise failed of passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the ninth unassigned matter resolve in favor of Myron H. Crocker, compensating him for destruction of apple trees by deer, S. P. 8, S. D. 201, tabled by Mr. Merrill of Dover-Foxcroft, March 23, pending final passage; and recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Merrill.

On motion by Mr. Merrill the resolve was finally passed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the tenth unassigned matter resolve in favor of the South Kennebec Agricultural Society, H. P. 937, H. D. 333, tabled by Mr. Robie of Gorham, March 23, pending final passage; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Robie.

Mr. ROBIE: Mr. Speaker, what I have to say on this resolve also applies to the Lewiston Fair proposition which will come off the table a little later in the morning. I understand that the parties interested in the Lewiston proposition wish to consult the Commissioner of Agriculture further on that subject. The Commissioner is out of town at the present time so I move to retable this resolve.

Thereupon the matter was retabled pending final passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the eleventh unassigned matter resolve in favor of Richard Jacobson of East Waterford, compensating him for damage done his orchard by deer, H. P. 456, H. D. 343, tabled by Mr. Merrill of Dover-Foxcroft, March 23, pending final passage; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Dover-Foxcroft, Mr. Merrill.

On motion by Mr. Merrill the resolve was finally passed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the twelfth unassigned matter Senate report ought to pass, of the committee on Salaries and Fees on bill an act relating to the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture, S. P. 255, S. D. 256, tabled by Mr. Greenleaf of Auburn, March 24, pending acceptance of the report in concurrence; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Greenleaf.

Mr. GREENLEAF: Mr. Speaker, I will say that, as Mr. Robie stated, the absence of the Commissioner of Agriculture has held up the conference which we hope will expedite both the twelfth and thirteenth unassigned matters. I am not certain when I shall be able to take them up but I will do so as soon as possible after the Commissioner's return.

Mr. STURGIS of Auburn: Mr.

Speaker. I would like to know what difference it makes in regard to this bill whether the Commissioner is at home or not. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Greenleaf, will not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Greenleaf, that the twelfth unassigned matter be retabled.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to retable prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the thirteenth unassigned matter Senate report ought to pass in new draft of the committee on claims on resolve in favor of the Maine State Agricultural Society for the State stipend for 1926, new draft S. P. 510, S. D. 257, tabled by Mr. Greenleaf of Auburn, March 24, pending the acceptance of the report in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Greenleaf the matter was retabled.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fourteenth unassigned matter resolve in favor of the Pownal State School for additions and improvements, S. P. 13, S. D. 169, tabled March 24 by Mr. Foster of Ellsworth pending final passage; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Foster.

On motion by Mr. Foster the resolve was finally passed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the fifteenth unassigned matter bill an act relating to the charter of the city of Waterville, H. P. 1198, H. D. 446, tabled March 25th by Mr. Cyr of Waterville, pending its third reading; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Cyr.

Mr. CYR: Mr. Speaker, there was a clerical error in this bill and I wish to present House Amendment A and move its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to House Paper 1198, House Document 446, "An act relating to the Charter of the City of Waterville."

Amend by striking out in section one after the word "inserting" in the fourth line thereof, all of the words to and including "as follows" in the ninth line thereof and substi-



tuting therefor the words "in place thereof the following:"

Also, amend section two by striking out all after the word "out" the following: "words 'and aldermen' in the fifteenth line thereof so that the section, as amended, shall read as follows:" and substituting therefor the following: "whole of said section and inserting in place thereof the following:"

Also, further amend by striking out in section nine of said paper all between the words "Section" and "following", both inclusive, and inserting in place thereof the following: "chapter three hundred eighty-three of the private and special laws of nineteen hundred and one is hereby repealed"; "section sixteen of chapter one hundred ninety-five of the private and special laws of eighteen hundred eighty-seven is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:"

Thereupon House Amendment A was adopted, and the bill as amended by House Amendment A was passed to be engrossed, and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. HAMMOND of Van Buren: Mr. Speaker, the investigation starts at half past one and several members of the House are on that investigation committee, I move that we recess until five o'clock.

A viva voce vote being taken the House recessed until five p. m.

#### After Recess

At this point the Honorable Henry Lord of Bangor, Speaker of the House of Representatives in 1878, was escorted to a seat beside the Speaker amid the applause of the House, the members rising.

The SPEAKER: Members of the Eighty-third Legislature: We have a great honor conferred upon us this afternoon by the visit and by the presence of a very distinguished son of Maine. If we turn back the pages of legislative history, we will find that in 1878 there was presiding in this House a young man of thirty years of age, a young man from the city of Bangor. Since that time there have been and there are living today three men in the State of Maine who have been President of the Senate of Maine and Speaker of the House, holding both offices: The Honorable Frank G. Farrington is one; the

Honorable Frank Holley is another; and the gentleman who visits us today is the third. And during the passing of the years he has always maintained a keen interest in the affairs of this State. His life has increased with the State. The years have dealt gently with him, and he has still the enthusiasm of youth. I know that we would like to hear a few words from him, and it is a great privilege and honor to introduce to you the Hon. Henry Lord, Speaker of this House in 1877-78. (Applause, the members rising).

THE HONORABLE HENRY LORD: Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-third Legislature: I called upon your Speaker this afternoon. He received me very cordially and said he wished I would be seated by him during this afternoon session, and he intimated that perhaps I might say a few words to this body. A man, when he gets to be eighty years of age, had better make short speeches. They say "there is no fool like an old fool", but I hope I am not quite in that class. I will be pleased to say a few words of the Legislature of fifty years ago, of the House of fifty years ago and forty-nine years ago, when it was my fortune to be Speaker. I remembered going to the beginning of the legislative session in 1877, and in the caucus to nominate the House officials a very good looking young man six feet and an inch or two tall, like your Speaker, came to me and said, "Mr. Lord, I am one of your constituents. You probably do not know it." And he said "My name is Edwin C. Burleigh. I want you to put me in nomination for a place as Assistant Clerk of the House." I did put in nomination for the Assistant Clerk of the House this young man's grandfather (referring to Speaker Martin) who was my friend until he died, a United States Senator.

In the House of 1877 there were many things that I could speak of, but time does not permit. There is one thing that I remember in the sessions that happened that interested me, and I am going to speak of that because I think it will be appropriate for the occasion. In those days, in 1877, the clergymen of Augusta, Hallowell and Gardiner, and sometimes of Portland, Lewiston and Bangor, acted as chaplains. One morning Speaker Nealley said: "We

have with us today one of the most beloved pastors of the State of Maine, a man beloved all over this State, "Campmeeting John Allen." Then he made one of the most impressive prayers I ever listened to, and I learned how wonderful the human voice is. He was the grandfather of Nordica, one of the sweet singers of the world. I will not undertake to describe that prayer, but there was just one sentence that I remember, that I will repeat. He said: "Oh, God, grant unto this body of men wisdom, for thou knowest that they need it." (Laughter) I think that should be properly prayed before every legislative body. (Laughter.)

The most effective speech of eight or ten minutes that I ever heard made, in my opinion, was made in that House of 1877. There was an effort made to create a State Board of Health, and the opinion seemed to be that there would be no trouble in carrying the measure through. Three men made very eloquent speeches in its behalf: Henry B. Cleaves, who had been Speaker, Attorney General and the Governor; J. Manchester Haynes, a man of large interests, owner of timberlands and shipyards, ice houses, etc.; and Joseph A. Locke, afterwards President of the Senate. These three made very eloquent speeches. They were on a sort of dress parade. It was early and they wanted the members of the House and others who gathered to witness, to know what they could do. When their speeches were over, nobody expected any opposition; but a shrill, sharp voice was heard from the center of the House. The Speaker did not know who he was nor where he belonged, and he said, "The gentleman from where?" And the man replied "From Denmark, Oxford County, Sir." He was a man long past the middle of life. He turned around to that House and in a very short speech he killed that measure so that it died without any effort. I will not undertake to say what he had to present in his speech beyond this: It was just at the beginning of the "Greenback Craze", in the State of Maine, as we called it. He said, in substance, this: "We have heard that we need to help the doctors, that they want to organize and want to draw money from the treasury." He said "One gentleman" (and that was Mr. Locke) "has told us a

good deal about the danger from miasmatic influence," and the way he spoke those words was enough to make anybody cringe—"miasmatic influence!" And he said "Mr. Speaker, I do not know much about that, but we do not have any of it, I know, up among the Oxford hills." (Laughter) He said "I am not a youth myself, but there are a lot of people up in the Oxford hills, and they are in perfect health and they do not need any doctors. I think, at the present time, we have not a doctor in the town. We have one Justice of the Peace and one lawyer, but they do not seem to get ahead very fast." Then he said "Gentlemen, we came here not to create new organizations, not to pay larger salaries, but we came here to reduce taxes." Just about that time we were getting back to a gold basis and everything was hard. Solon Chase was going around over the State with his oxen and telling his people, "These oxen won't bring so much money now as they would when they were yearlings." Then he said, "Gentlemen, let us kill this thing. That is the first entering wedge to get into the treasury to help the doctors who don't have patients enough." He said "Let us kill it and kill it now." But he did it in a very much better way than this, and his style of oratory was good. The thing was killed right then and there, and there was no State Board of Health for eight or ten years afterward.

Now, members of the House, let me say a word or two about the House of 1878. What I have to say will perhaps be, to a certain extent, personal. There were four candidates for Speaker that year; one, George Weeks, the mayor of Augusta; one, George Pillsbury, the mayor of Lewiston, a Trustee of Waterville College, and the head of one of the big corporations there. The other was Roscoe L. Bowers, mayor of Saco, afterwards Railroad Commissioner; and the other was Henry Lord, of Bangor, at that time thirty years of age, a business man. It is rather unusual, but it was my fortune to win, and I want to say about that House—this is a very fine looking body of men, but you appear very youthful compared with the men of 1878. Glancing over this House, I do not see a single member with a whisker. (Laughter). Men in the

House of 1878 wore beards, and they were a much more dignified looking body of men than you are. (Laughter). In that House were three future Governors. Can you pick out three future Governors in this House, Mr. Speaker? (Laughter). I have no doubt you can pick out a good many who would like to be Governor, but not a great many who will be. (Laughter). Those men were Edwin C. Burleigh, Joseph Bodwell, and Mr. Robie. I think Mr. Robie has a grandson in this House. The baby of the House was Leslie C. Cornish, for years, you know, Chief Justice, and one of the best we ever had. I hope you have got a Chief Justice in the House now.

Now I am going to say a word about my acquaintance, and I was favored with the acquaintance of three of the ablest men that Maine ever had. "Hannibal Hamlin." I lived near by him in the city of Bangor, and when he was Vice President of the United States, he had a little farm out on the Carmel road. A neighbor got his hay ready to go into the barn and said "Mr. Hamlin, I have not crew enough to get my own hay in. Can't you manage to get your hay in?" And he said, with a smile, one hot July day, that he guessed he could. I saw Mr. Hannibal Hamlin, Vice President of the United States, driving a one-horse hayrack. He had a straw hat on and a blouse. I believe I had never seen him before without a tall hat and swallow-tailed coat. He called me up to him and said "Will you help me get some hay in this afternoon?" I said "Yes. Mr. Hamlin, if my father is willing." My father was ill with consumption, and I asked him if I could help Mr. Hamlin get some hay in. He said "What Mr. Hamlin?" I said "Mr. Hannibal Hamlin." He said "You can go anywhere with him." So I went out and got in three small loads of hay that afternoon. It was a very hot afternoon. He pitched on to the cart and I stowed it as best I could. He pitched it onto the mow and I stowed it away up there. As I said, it was a very hot afternoon, and down that dark nose of his ran a perfect stream of perspiration. But he could pitch hay anyway. I learned to know Hannibal Hamlin, as a boy, and he knew me all the way along. So about fifteen years afterward, when I was to be a candidate for Speaker, I said to Mr. Hamlin

one day that I was going to be a candidate for Speaker—he had learned that I was going to be a candidate for Speaker—and he said "Go ahead, Henry." I said "I wish I could have your help." He said "Henry, Mr. Bisbee, one of the best men in the State, with whom I have served as Trustee of Waterville College for years, is to be a candidate." Mr. Hamlin told Mr. Bisbee that one of his neighbor's boys was going to be a candidate, and that he would have to ask to be excused from having anything to say about that contest. But when I was elected Speaker one of Mr. Hamlin's friends from down in Washington County brought up to me a letter that I had written asking for his support, to which he did not make any reply. He passed me a letter on a single sheet, and over his signature he had written "Senator Hamlin says this young man is all right." Mr. Hamlin wrote right above it "He is all right," and underscored it and signed it "Hannibal Hamlin." So I got help indirectly from Hannibal Hamlin. I had a letter from Thomas B. Reed. He said "Mr. Speaker, a young man of integrity and ability, who has been a student in my office, has been elected to the Legislature. There are not many lawyers in your branch, and if you can see your way clear to put him on the Judiciary Committee, it will be of advantage to him and to his numerous friends, of whom I am one." I was able to appoint George M. Seiders on that Committee. He justified the expectations of Mr. Reed, for he afterwards was President of the Senate, Attorney General, and a defeated candidate on the Bull Moose Ticket for Congress.

Mr. Blaine told me one day, "Mr. Lord, I congratulate you on being elected Speaker. Of the numerous offices I have held the one that I got the most rich enjoyment out of, the most happiness, was the Speakership of the Maine House." So years afterward, it was my fortune to see a good deal of Thomas B. Reed. He had as Secretaries three men with whom I was well acquainted acting with that Legislature of the State, Amos Allen, Forrest Goodwin, and the man who compiled the parliamentary book, Asher Hinds.

I would occasionally go down to Washington and go to the Speaker's office. I was always greeted cordially. I did not go very often, but I learned, I want to say, from my acquaintance with those three men—and let me add that in 1880, when they had the trouble here that they called "The State Steal," I was in and out of Mr. Blaine's house and saw him for a week or ten days and heard him talk. I want to say that in many instances, when you get in touch with great men, you find they have very weak spots, but those three men, to me, grew in grandeur and greatness, the more I saw them,—Hannibal Hamlin, James G. Blaine and Thomas B. Reed!

I might go further and tell you something more of those days of fifty years ago, if I had the time. I thank you very much for your courtesy and your kindness, and for the honor you have done me by giving me the opportunity, at my time of life, to make this speech before this Legislative body of the State of Maine. (Prolonged applause, the audience rising).

The SPEAKER: Under tabled and unassigned the Chair lays before the House the first unassigned matter being Senate report, ought not to pass, from the committee on Judiciary on bill an act regulating moving of household goods, chattels, and personal effects of residents of Maine, S. P. 173, S. D. 72, tabled by Mr. Hale of Portland, March 22, pending acceptance of the report in concurrence; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale.

On motion by Mr. Hale the report of the committee ought not to pass was accepted in concurrence.

The following papers from the Senate were taken up out of order and under suspension of the rules.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

#### Senate Bills in First Reading

S. P. 236, S. D. 287: Resolve to reimburse Elliottsville Plantation for support of John Lynch, a State pauper.

S. P. 275, S. D. 288: Resolve in favor of the town of Oakland for money paid for mother's aid.

S. P. 188, S. D. 296: Resolve to re-

imburse the town of Phippsburg for burial expenses of the child of John Murphy, Jr., a former resident of Malaga Island.

S. P. 189, S. D. 297: Resolve in favor of the county of Somerset, for reimbursement for expenses incurred in the sickness and death of John Stewart.

S. P. 544, S. D. 298: Resolve to reimburse the town of Littleton for care and burial expenses of Arthur Berube, or Burby, a Spanish War Veteran having no settlement in the State.

S. P. 364, S. D. 141: An act to amend Section 26 of Chapter 14 of the Revised Statutes relating to school moneys of Tribe of Indians of Old Town Island, how expended.

S. P. 216, S. D. 286: An act relating to ice fishing in Annabessacook Lake.

S. P. 540, S. D. 292: An act relating to the issuance of permits to propagate game birds, game and fur-bearing animals.

S. P. 542, S. D. 294: An act relating to the protection of wild hares or rabbits.

S. P. 367, S. D. 144: An act relating to the employment of children.

S. P. 339, S. D. 289: Resolve providing for a State pension for Mabel Armstrong of Lewiston.

S. P. 340, S. D. 290: Resolve providing for a State pension for Bertha J. Hodson, of Lewiston.

S. P. 341, S. D. 291: Resolve providing for a State pension for Nellie Buck of Lewiston.

S. P. 549, S. D. 295: Resolve providing for a State pension for Timothy F. Donovan of Lewiston.

S. P. 369, S. D. 146: An act to provide for the maintenance of highways on which Legislative road resolve appropriations have been expended.

S. P. 360, S. D. 133: An act to amend Section 92 of Chapter 211 of the Public Laws of 1921, relative to disposition of motor vehicle fees.

From the Senate: Majority report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting ought not to pass" on bill an act relating to marriage certificates (S. P. No. 197) (S. D. No. 79)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MORRISON of Franklin  
HOLMES of Androscoggin  
DWINAL of Knox

—Of the Senate  
GOODWIN of Sanford

BLAISDELL of Franklin  
 FULLER of Southwest Har-  
 bor  
 SARGENT of Brewer  
 McCART of Eastport  
 LITTLEFIELD of Kenne-  
 bunk

—Of the House

Minority report of same Committee reporting ought to pass on same bill.

Report was signed by the following member:

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland

Of the House

Comes from the Senate, majority report read and accepted.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Fuller of Southwest Harbor, both reports were tabled pending acceptance of either.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the next reports which will be presented are the various reports on the power bills. The Senate, in order to expedite business, handled these matters together; and with a view of adjourning on April 9 the Chair will suggest, if it meets with the approval of the members of the House, if the same procedure can be given the bills here, it will help matters along. In the Senate the reports "ought to pass" were all accepted and the bills given their first and second readings and passed to be engrossed. We could give them their first two readings and then table tomorrow and specially assign them, if the members wish, for Friday, which would give the public and members plenty of time to prepare for debate, and leave Friday, so far as possible, free for the consideration of these matters which are of course of great importance. The Chair merely offers this as a suggestion and it is of course entirely up to the members of the House.

From the Senate: Majority report of the Committees on Public Utilities, Interior Waters and Judiciary jointly on bill an act to provide for the organization of electric transmission companies, with limited powers, and to provide for issuing permits to electrical companies and others to sell electricity thereto for transportation and sale outside of the State of Maine under certain specified conditions (S. P. No. 100) (S. D. No. 40) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 523) (S. D. No. 259) under title of an act to provide for the exportation of surplus power, and that it "ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GRANVILLE of York  
 MAHER of Kennebec  
 DOUGLAS of Hancock  
 DUNBAR of Hancock

—Of the Senate

RICHARDSON of Monmouth  
 CHASE of Cape Elizabeth  
 GREENLEAF of Auburn  
 BISHOP of Boothbay Harbor  
 WING of Kingfield  
 PATTERSON of Castine  
 HALE of Portland  
 POWERS of Caribou  
 TUCKER of Sanford  
 MILLIKEN of Old Orchard  
 PIPER of Jackman  
 DOUGLAS of Chelsea

—Of the House

Minority report of same committee reporting "ought not to pass" on same bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DRAKE of Sagadahoc  
 LORD of York  
 CARTER of Androscoggin  
 OAKES of Cumberland  
 CRAFTS of Piscataquis

—Of the Senate

DUDLEY of Calais  
 PAGE of Skowhegan  
 COMINS of Eddington  
 HUGHES of Mapleton  
 BRIGGS of Monticello  
 THURSTON of Appleton  
 ALDRICH of Topsham  
 WING of Auburn  
 BARTLETT of Bangor

—Of the House

Comes from the Senate the majority report accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, with a view to expediting business in the matter suggested by the Chair, I move that the majority report of the joint committee be accepted, and that the bill be given its first two readings at this time.

Mr. COMINS of Eddington: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee on Public Utilities and as one who signed the minority report on this bill, I wish to support the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale.

Thereupon the majority report was accepted, and the bill had its first two readings.

Mr. CHASE of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to interrupt the assignment for the third read-

ing, but I wish to offer an amendment. I offer House Amendment A and move its adoption, and that the amendment be printed. When the amendment is read I wish to speak briefly in explanation of it.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment A to Senate Paper 523, Senate Document 259.

Amend said Senate Paper 523 by inserting after Section 5 a new section as follows:

"Section 6. Any public utility which makes application for a permit to sell and deliver surplus power to a corporation organized under this act shall expressly declare and agree, in consideration of the issuance of said permit, that it will, with the consent of the public utilities commission, but from each and every person, firm or corporation owning a hydro-electric power plant generating, or which may hereafter generate, electric power within the territory which said public utility is authorized by its charter to serve, upon reasonable terms, and under reasonable conditions, any and all surplus power for which it has an available market, and that in such transactions and arrangements it will not discriminate nor favor one party more than another; provided that the person, firm or corporation selling such aforesaid surplus power shall extend its lines to connect with the lines of such public utility, for which extension charter authority is hereby granted. Every permit issued to a public utility shall be on condition that the foregoing shall be observed and performed under the supervision of the Public Utilities Commission. Said Public Utilities Commission is hereby charged with the duty of investigating all complaints hereunder, and is vested with authority to decide all questions arising under this section and to enforce the provisions hereof by proper orders and decrees. If any public utility violates any order or decree of the commission hereunder, said Public Utilities Commission is hereby authorized to revoke its permit."

And further amend said bill by renumbering sections after the new section six, so that old section six becomes section seven, and so on.

Mr. CHASE: Mr. Speaker, in the discussion with regard to handling the power situation, if the Smith bill should become a law, a great deal

of consideration was given to the situation in which the smaller power producers, such as the industrials, paper mills and cotton mills, would find themselves. It was deemed desirable by many that a market should be afforded for the power which would be produced by such power plants, and that if any action was to be taken to permit the exportation of surplus power, it was highly desirable that a market should be afforded for such power produced.

The amendment which is introduced has the approval of the proponents of this bill, and I know of no reason why it should be objectionable to any opponent of the bill because I think that everyone here would be glad to see such an arrangement effected.

The section stands alone, has no reference to any other section, and it does not change the purport of the bill. It is simply a new section put in which imposes upon the public utility companies who ask for a permit under the provisions of the Smith bill the duty of looking after the whole power situation in that territory in a reasonable way, and handle all the power in a reasonable way subject to the supervision of the Public Utilities Commission.

Thereupon House Amendment A was adopted and ordered printed and tomorrow assigned for the third reading of the bill as amended.

From the Senate: Majority report of same Committees reporting "Ought not to pass" on bill an act to create a Commission to negotiate a treaty regarding water power and electricity in New England. (S. P. No. 177) (S. D. No. 75).

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAHER of Kennebec  
DUNBAR of Hancock  
GRANVILLE of York  
DOUGLAS of Hancock  
—of the Senate  
RICHARDSON of Monmouth  
MILLIKEN of Old Orchard  
CHASE of Cape Elizabeth  
PIPER of Jackman  
HALE of Portland  
GREENLEAF of Auburn  
PAGE of Skowhegan  
BISHOP of Boothbay Harbor

HUGHES of Mapleton  
BRIGGS of Monticello  
DUDLEY of Calais  
ALDRICH of Topsham  
TUCKER of Sanford  
DOUGLAS of Chelsea

—of the House

Minority report of same Committees on same bill reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 524) (S. D. No. 262) under title of an act to create a Commission to investigate and negotiate a compact, regarding water power and electricity in New England, and that it "Ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. OAKES of Cumberland  
LORD of York  
CARTER of Androscoggin  
CRAFTS of Piscataquis  
DRAKE of Sagadahoc  
—of the Senate  
POWERS of Caribou  
PATTERSON of Castine  
COMINS of Eddington  
WING of Kingfield  
WING of Auburn  
THURSTON of Appleton  
BARTLETT of Bangor

—of the House

Comes from the Senate the minority report accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A."

Mr. HALE: Mr. Speaker, for the reasons which I stated in connection with the former bill, I move that the minority report be accepted in concurrence with the Senate.

The motion prevailed.

Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as thus amended had its two several readings and tomorrow assigned.

From the Senate: Majority report of same Committees reporting "Ought not to pass" on bill an act to amend the charters of Maine corporations incorporated for transmission of electricity and to limit the rights of foreign corporations authorized to do business in Maine for similar purposes. (S. P. No. 12) (S. D. No. 7).

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. DUNBAR of Hancock  
GRANVILLE of York  
DOUGLAS of Hancock  
—of the Senate

RICHARDSON of Monmouth

COMINS of Eddington  
ALDRICH of Topsham  
POWERS of Caribou  
HUGHES of Mapleton  
TUCKER of Sanford  
PIPER of Jackman  
HALE of Portland  
GREENLEAF of Auburn  
DOUGLAS of Chelsea  
PAGE of Skowhegan  
BISHOP of Boothbay Harbor

CHASE of Cape Elizabeth  
MILLIKEN of Old Orchard  
WING of Kingfield

—of the House

Minority report of same Committees on same bill reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 522) (S. D. No. 261) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CARTER of Androscoggin  
CRAFTS of Piscataquis  
DRAKE of Sagadahoc  
OAKES of Cumberland  
—of the Senate  
DUDLEY of Calais  
THURSTON of Appleton  
PATTERSON of Castine  
BARTLETT of Bangor  
WING of Auburn

—of the House

Comes from the Senate the minority report accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have stated in connection with the other two matters, and notwithstanding that I myself, signed the majority report, I move the acceptance of the minority report and that the bill be given its first two readings at the present time.

Thereupon the minority report was accepted in concurrence and the bill had its first two readings and tomorrow assigned.

From the Senate: Majority report of same committees reporting "Ought to pass" on bill an act to amend the charters of all corporations making, generating, selling, distributing and supplying electricity. (S. P. 11) (S. D. 6)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. CARTER of Androscoggin  
 CRAFTS of Piscataquis  
 LORD of York  
 DUNBAR of Hancock  
 DRAKE of Sagadahoc  
 OAKES of Cumberland  
     —of the Senate  
 PAGE of Skowhegan  
 POWERS of Caribou  
 BRIGGS of Monticello  
 THURSTON of Appleton  
 BARTLETT of Bangor  
 PATTERSON of Castine  
 COMINS of Eddington  
 DUDLEY of Calais  
 WING of Auburn  
 WING of Kingfield

    —of the House  
 Minority report of same Committees reporting "Ought not to pass" on same bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GRANVILLE of York  
 DOUGLAS of Hancock  
     —of the Senate  
 BISHOP of Boothbay Harbor  
 RICHARDSON of Monmouth  
 HUGHES of Mapleton  
 TUCKER of Sanford  
 ALDRICH of Topsham  
 DOUGLAS of Chelsea  
 GREENLEAF of Auburn  
 HALE of Portland  
 PIPER of Jackman  
 CHASE of Cape Elizabeth  
 MILLIKEN of Old Orchard  
     —of the House

Comes from the Senate Majority report accepted and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the House:

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, for the reasons which I have stated before I move the acceptance of the majority report in concurrence, and that the bill be given its first two readings at this time.

Thereupon the majority report was accepted in concurrence, the bill had its first two readings and tomorrow assigned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the following reports are the last matters to be taken up today and will not take long.

#### Reports of Committees Out of Order

The following reports were taken up out of order under suspension of the rules:

Mr. PATTERSON from the Committee on Judiciary reported "Ought to pass" on bill an act relating to the fees of jurors. (H. P. 961).

Mr. ALDRICH from same Committee reported same on bill an act to incorporate the Howland Sewerage and Water District. (H. P. 1096).

Mr. HALE from same Committee reported same on bill an act relating to fees of witnesses. (H. P. 891).

Mr. WING of Kingfield from same Committee reported same on bill an act to amend the Charter of the Belfast Water District so as to authorize the refunding of bonds. (H. P. 1097).

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

Mr. FLINT from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on bill an act to prohibit trapping of muskrats in Ward Stream. (H. P. 783) together with Petition (H. P. 784) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1238) under title of an act to prohibit the trapping of muskrat in Ward Stream, in the towns of Newburg, Hermon and Hampden, in the county of Penobscot and that it "Ought to pass."

Same gentleman from same Committee on bill an act to create a game sanctuary in the town of Kennebunk, to be known as the Bragdon Wild Life Sanctuary. (H. P. No. 851), (H. D. No. 217) together with petition (H. P. No. 852) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1237) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. BARTLETT from the Committee on Judiciary on bill an act relating to the care and support of paupers and other dependent persons having no settlement within the State. (H. P. No. 1124), (H. D. No. 380) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1239) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. BAILEY from the Committee on Pensions on Resolve in favor of the town of Sherman to assist in the support of a pauper (H. P. No. 535) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1236) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

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

Mr. STURGIS from the Committee on Agriculture reported "Ought



to pass" on bill an act to define and regulate the sale of oleomargarine (H. P. No. 1099), (H. D. No. 392).

Mr. PATTERSON from the Committee on Judiciary reported same on bill an act relating to State Highways (H. P. No. 1069), (H. D. No. 359).

Mr. Hale from same Committee reported same on bill an act relating to notices in divorce actions (H. P. No. 1037) (H. D. No. 338)

Mr. Patterson from same Committee reported same on bill an act making the Clerk of Courts of Waldo County Recorder of the Belfast Municipal Court. (H. P. No. 1151) (H. D. No. 391)

Mr. Hale from same Committee reported same on bill an act to provide for the organization, operation and supervision of credit unions and to define their powers. (H. P. No. 1066) (H. D. 363)

Reports read and accepted and the bills having already been printed, were read twice under suspension of the rules and tomorrow assigned.

Majority report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on bill an act regulating the sale and use of certain firearms, silencers and noxious gases, and prescribing penalties, and rules of evidence with reference thereto. (H. P. No. 929) (H. D. No. 273)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. OAKES of Cumberland

CARTER of Androscoggin

—Of the Senate

DUDLEY of Calais

ALDRICH of Topsham

BARTLETT of Bangor

HALE of Portland

WING of Auburn

—Of the House

Minority report of the same Committee on same bill, reporting same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1240) under title of an act regulating the sale, possession and use of certain firearms, silencers and noxious gases, and prescribing penalties, and rules of evidence with reference thereto, and that it "ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. MAHER of Kennebec

—Of the Senate

PATTERSON of Castine

WING of Kingfield

—Of the House

On motion by Mr. Cole of South Portland, both reports tabled, pending acceptance of either.

On motion by Mr. Church of Hallowell, the new draft was ordered printed.

The SPEAKER: This completes the papers which we have received for this afternoon.

On motion by Mr. Hale of Portland, Adjourned until nine o'clock tomorrow morning.