

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-Sixth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1933

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

ERRATA:

**The following errata are
inserted because one or more pages
in this session day have errors
noticed and corrected here.**

- Page 473—An act to regulate the speed of motor vehicles (S. P. 357, L. D. 572)—Should be (S. P. 357, L. D. 512)
- Page 474—An Act to incorporate the Maine Reinsurance Company (H. P. 977, L. D. 313)—Should be (H. P. 877, L. D. 313)
- Page 475—Second act closing Middle Range Pond to ice fishing to be deleted.
- Page 478—Resolve regulating Fishing in Snow Mountain Pond (H. P. No. 462) (L. D. No. 228)—Should be (H. P. No. 562) (L. D. No. 228)
- Page 486—An Act relating to trapping muskrats in Sourdabscook Stream (H. P. 5351, L. D. 142)—Should be (H. P. 551, L. D. 142)
- Page 487—An Act providing for the calling of conventions for adoption or rejection of proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States submitted by Congress to conventions.—Should be H. P. 1594.
- Page 487—House Paper 205, An act relating to the prepayment of taxes—Should be L. D. 205.
- Page 495—An Act empowering William L. Milliken of Presque Isle in the County of Aroostook to Erect and Maintain Piers, Piles and Booms in the Aroostook River (H. P. 67) (L. D. 85)—Should be (H. P. 67) (L. D. 29)
- Page 504—resolve providing for a State pension for Leland Palmer of Carmel H. P. 685, L. D. 727—Should be H. P. 645, L. D. 737.
- Page 509—An Act to establish a board of finance of the City of Waterville. (H. P. 1551, L. D. 860)—Should be (H. P. 1551, L. D. 868)
- Page 537—Resolve providing for a state pension for Anne Foley of Lewiston (H. P. 907, L. D. 340)—Should be (H. P. 907, L. D. 840)
- Page 537—Resolve in favor of American Liability Insurance Company of Boston in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (S. P. 206)—Should read American Mutual Liability Insurance Company.
- Page 538—"An Act relating to beautification of landscape and roadsides" (S. P. 385)—Should be (S. P. 355)
- Page 567—An Act providing for sentences and the imposition thereof. (S. P. 596, L. D. 568)—Should be (S. P. 283, L. D. 568)
- Page 569—Error in spelling (the county).
- Page 571—"An Act relative to the fishing in the Mousam River" (S. P. 173)—Should be (S. P. 178).
- Page 587—(S. P. No. 564) (L. D. No. 832) Resolve regulating fishing for Pickerel in Oxford and York Counties.—Should be in York County.
- Page 587—(H. P. 560, L. D. 144) Resolve regulating fishing for pickerel in Oxford and York Counties.
- Page 600—Resolve appropriating money to pay World War Veterans claims heretofore approved by the Committee on Claims (S. P. 892, L. D. 948)—Should be (S. P. 592, L. D. 948)
- Page 601—Resolve extending open season on Mousam River. (S. P. 610, L. D. 993)—Should be (S. P. 610, L. D. 983)
- Page 601—The majority of the Committee on Bill "An Act relating to manufacture of intoxicating liquor" (S. P. 116, L. D. 163)—should read—The majority of the Committee on Temperance, etc.
- Page 601—The majority of the Committee on Bill "An Act relating to the pauperizing of unemployed wage earners" (S. P. 42, L. D. 26) should read—The majority of the Committee on Labor, etc.
- Page 601—(Signed) Holmes of Franklin—Should be Holman.
- Page 602—"An act relating to state aid for academies." (S. P. 1000, L. D. 577)—Should be (H. P. 1090, L. D. 577)
- Page 621—Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Augusta O. Goodwin of Augusta, (H. P. 75) (L. D. 670)—Should be (H. P. 75) (L. D. 671)
- Page 622—Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Lester Pagen of Hermon (H. P. 56) (L. D. 706)—Should be Lester Patten.
- Page 622—Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Arria S. Sargent of Auburn, (H. P. 383) (L. D. 08)—Should be (H. P. 383) (L. D. 708)
- Page 622—Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Fred E. Stevens of Chelsea, (H. P. 991) (L. D. 40)—Should be (H. P. 991) (L. D. 740)
- Page 622—Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Grace Griffin of Auburn, (H. P. 139) (L. D. 715)—Should be (H. P. 1397) (L. D. 715)
- Page 623—Resolve Providing for a Pension for Laura Witham of Lisbon, (S. P. 535) (L. D. 788)—Should be (S. P. 535) (L. D. 799)
- Page 633—Resolve in favor of several academies, institutes and seminaries (S. P. 598, L. D. 932)—Should be (S. P. 598, L. D. 942)
- Page 633—An act requiring the licensing of operators of creameries or milk distributing plants (H. P. 1618) (L. D. 953)—Should be milk distributing plants.
- Page 635—An act relating to Penobscot and Passamaquoddy Tribes of Indians (H. P. 1554, L. D. 875)—Should be (H. P. 1554, L. D. 857)

HOUSE

Friday, March 17, 1933.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Bessom of Hallowell.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate:

The following Order:

Ordered, The House concurring, that a Committee of five be appointed; two from the Senate to be named by the President of the Senate, and three from the House to be named by the Speaker of the House, whose duty it shall be to study the laws of the State relating to support of paupers and the practical working of said laws and to consider the desirability of amending the same, and report to the next Legislature. The Commissioner of Health and Welfare shall act as a member of said Committee, ex-officio.

Said Committee shall receive such compensation and allowance for travel and other expenses as may be approved by the Governor and Council; (S. P. No. 665)

Comes from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Hill's of Northport, tabled pending passage in concurrence.

From the Senate:

Final report of the committee on Military Affairs.

Comes from the Senate, read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

Senate Bills in First Reading

S. P. 584, L. D. 904: An act relating to returns of telephone and telegraph companies and apportionment of tax.

S. P. 585, L. D. 905: An act relating to continuing accounts in Departments supported by direct appropriations.

S. P. 586, L. D. 906: An act to provide for the appointment of additional Justices of the Supreme Judicial or Superior Courts in cases where any Justice thereof is totally and permanently disabled.

S. P. 300, L. D. 917: Resolve ap-

propriating moneys for anticipated overdrafts for which no legislative appropriation has been made, and to provide for carrying on the activities of departments and institutions for the remaining months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933.

S. P. 320, L. D. 525: An act relating to forcible entry and detain-er

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Federal Relations on Memorial to Congress of the United States urging it to provide for a wider use of granite in Federal construction, reporting that same ought to be adopted.

Comes from the Senate, report read and accepted.

In the House, report read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Agriculture on bill an act regulating the manufacture and sale of ice cream and other frozen desserts, S. P. 297, L. D. 544, reporting that legislation thereon is inexpedient and that it ought not to pass.

Comes from the Senate, committed to the committee on Public Health.

Mr. WALLINGFORD of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and accompanying reports lie on the table pending committal to the committee on Public Health in concurrence.

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

Mr. CARSWELL of Gorham: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be committed to the committee on Public Health in concurrence. It is really an important matter and should receive the consideration of that committee.

The motion prevailed and the bill and report were committed to the committee on Public Health in concurrence.

From the Senate: Resolve in favor of Frederick A. Furbish of Mount Vernon, H. P. 1520, L. D. 842, which was recommitted to the committee on Claims in the House on March 15.

Comes from the Senate, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr.

Speaker, this claim is a very small one. It has been kicked around and it has been said in the lobby of this House that this man did not own the land that this claim was on. Now I hold in my hands an executed deed, made on the 15th day of June, 1928, showing that he does own the land. I also hold in my hand the tax bills for the past three years. It has been said that he paid only a tax of eight dollars and something, but it really was seventy dollars. It will average over seventy dollars for the past three years.

Now, gentlemen, this resolve was referred to the committee on Claims and they never heard the recommendation, but in the Senate they moved to indefinitely postpone because they had heard the same thing. This morning I received the deed and the tax receipts for the three years.

I move that we non-concur and move to have it sent to the committee on Claims. It was not heard by the committee on Claims the last time.

The SPEAKER: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Rounds, moves to insist and ask for a committee of Conference?

Mr. ROUNDS: Mr. Speaker, I was asked by the man who put it in the Senate to have it tabled at the present time, that we might see what should be done with it. My motion is to table it at the present time.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed and the resolve was tabled pending concurrence with the Senate.

From the Senate: Bill an act relating to apothecaries, and the sale of poisons, H. P. 1527, L. D. 836, which was passed to be engrossed in the House on March 10.

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

In the House, Senate Amendment A read.

Mr. CARSWELL of Gorham: Mr. Speaker, I move you that the House recede and accept the amendment passed by the Senate.

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action of March 10 whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed. Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and

the bill as amended by Senate Amendment A was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act granting preference to Maine bidders, H. P. 153, L. D. 85, which was passed to be engrossed in the House on February 16.

Comes from the Senate, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. FERNALD of Winterport: Mr. Speaker, my motion on this bill is going to be that we insist and ask for a committee of Conference. Now I would like to ask the members of the House to turn to this bill, Legislative Document 85. Under the present law, when two bids are made, one by a Massachusetts corporation and the other by a Maine corporation, and they both put in the same bid, the Maine corporation will get the bid.

Now my proposition is this: That in case there is a two per cent difference in the bid between the out-of-state corporation and the Maine corporation, that the Maine corporation should get their bid for this reason: The Maine corporation does business in Maine. It pays taxes in Maine, and it employs Maine labor. Now that is the whole proposition back of the bill.

I introduced the bill, it was sent to the committee on Judiciary and it was reported unanimously ought to pass. It passed this House and went into the Senate and there was opposed by three gentlemen from Cumberland county.

Now let's look at our biographical sketch book, page 11, Harold F. Schnurle—

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will please not refer to members of the Senate or any action taken by that body. It is contrary to our Rules.

Mr. FERNALD (continuing): Page 11. We have a State representative of the Alpha Portland Cement Company. On page 7 we have another contractor. Now as I understand it, this cement is made in Pennsylvania. Consequently, our Maine cement, made in Thomaston, would not be given the preference. Now I am for the Maine contractors, I am for the Maine cement dealer, I am for the Maine taxpayer. Now one of these gentlemen, whom evidently I cannot name, came before the Judiciary commit-

tee, and this was his philosophy. He was opposed to this measure and he would go so far as to say that he would be against giving even Maine labor a preference with Maine contractors. Now I am absolutely opposed to that proposition. I believe that in these critical times we have got to look out for Maine.

Now lets look a little further! I have here the Lewiston Evening Journal of last evening containing an ad published by the Great Northern Paper Company, which says: "Buy something made in U. S. A. A manufacturer must compete with his products against the whole world," etc. In words what the Great Northern Paper Company is saying is "Buy Maine paper products." I agree with the Great Northern Paper Company for once.

I also have a Portland paper here which, down in one corner, is an ad "Buy America." I have another ad here: "Not only buy America, but buy at home." That is what this bill says, "Buy at home." Here is another ad: "Payrolls of locally-owned pasteurized milk dealers benefit every milk consumer." I agree with that.

Then here is another ad of the Randall-McAllister Company: "Buy American Fuel. We are distributors of this coal in Maine." I agree with that proposition.

If you will turn to your Advance Journal that you have been following along today, you will find just above where this matter is listed, "Senate Report — ought to adopt — report of the committee on Federal Relations on Memorial to Congress of the United States,"—and by the way the Chairman of the committee on Federal Relations is a gentleman from Cumberland County — "urging it to provide for a wider use of granite in Federal construction." In other words, "Buy Maine Granite." Well, according to my notion, the gentleman's position on Maine bidders is contrary to his position on Maine granite. I say "Buy Maine granite and give preference to Maine contractors." The whole program in a nutshell is this: Our Maine contractors have been here, employed our labor, paid our taxes, employed our men and are now assuming extraordinary burdens in order to take care of our poor and needy; and the profits that come to the Maine bidder come not to the people in Massachusetts, New

Hampshire or Chicago, but they are re-invested in our Maine industries and remain in Maine. I hope that my motion to insist and ask for a committee of Conference will prevail.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Winterport, Mr. Fernald, moves that the House insist on its former action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed and asks for a committee on Conference. All those in favor will say aye; contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House Messrs. Fernald of Winterport, Hussey of Augusta, and Goudy of South Portland.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on bill an act relating to Back Bay Sanctuary, S. P. 312, L. D. 700, reporting same in a new draft, S. P. 573, L. D. 861, under same title and that it ought to pass.

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

In the House: On motion by Mr. Plummer of Portland, the bill was recommitted to the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game for the purpose of correcting an error.

The following Bill was received pursuant to Joint Order passed in both branches of the Legislature on March 15th:

Mercantile Affairs and Insurance

Bill "An Act providing for the Temporary Support and Regulation of Insurance Companies" (H. P. No. 1612) (Presented by Mr. Plummer of Portland).

(500 copies ordered printed.)

Pensions

Petition of Harold B. Kaler and 29 others in favor of a Soldier's Pension for Will Howard of Union (H. P. No. 1613) (Presented by Mr. Walker of Rockport).

Orders

Mr. Lord of Lebanon, presented the following order and moved its passage:

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that the State Librarian be and

hereby is directed to issue to each member of the Eighty-sixth Legislature one copy of the Maine Book, written by H. E. Dunnack.

Mr. LORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief explanation of this order. On visiting the library I found there were about twelve hundred copies of this fine book, a history of Maine written by Mr. Dunnack, on file there. The Governor and Council, a number of years ago, authorized the publication of this book. It sold originally for two dollars a copy and is well worth the money. It is a fine and authentic history of our State and many things are brought out in it which you will find in no other history. It gives a brief account of the origin and building up of each one of our departments. It gives a brief biographical sketch of some of the men who have made this State what it is today, a great State.

As I understand it, this comes to us without any expense to the State or to the individual.

I make this statement out of consideration for that gentleman from Cumberland County who has so zealously guarded our budget here. I do not want to offer anything that would endanger this fine program of economy in which I thoroughly believe. But I do say that this is a fine book to take home as a souvenir and it should be added to the library of every home in the State.

Thereupon, the order received passage and was sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Haggett of Wiscasset, the rules were suspended and the members permitted to smoke for the remainder of the session.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Devereux from the Committee on Claims reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of Vito Mininni, Inc., of Biddeford (H. P. No. 799).

(Tabled by Mr. Stern of Biddeford pending acceptance of the report.)

Mr. Lindsey from the Committee on Claims reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of Vito Mininni, Inc., of Biddeford (H. P. No. 798).

(Tabled by Mr. Stern of Biddeford pending acceptance of the report.)

Mr. Devereux from the Committee on Claims reported "Ought not

to pass" on Resolve in favor of the town of Lincoln (H. P. No. 532) as it is taken care of in another way.

Mr. Bussey from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Stetson (H. P. No. 757) as legislation is inexpedient.

Mr. Smith from same Committee reported same on Resolve providing for a Screen at the outlet of Brackett Lake (H. P. No. 756) as legislation thereon is inexpedient.

Mr. Sterling from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Belgrade Lakes Association (H. P. No. 755) as legislation is inexpedient.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Non-resident Fishing Licenses" (H. P. No. 65) (L. D. No. 35) as legislation is inexpedient.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Closed Season on Deer in Oxford County" (H. P. No. 116) (L. D. No. 63) as it is taken care of by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve relating to Fishing in Stanley Pond (H. P. No. 751) (L. D. No. 257) as legislation is inexpedient.

Mr. Crowell from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Annual Closed Season on Deer in Waldo County" (H. P. No. 117) (L. D. No. 64) as it is taken care of by other legislation.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Prohibiting Hunting from Automobiles and Transportation of Firearms therein" (H. P. No. 723) (L. D. No. 331).

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve in favor of a Fish Screen in Bickford Pond (H. P. No. 758) as legislation thereon is inexpedient.

Mr. Hescock from same Committee reported same on Resolve providing for the Rebuilding of the Screen at the Outlet of Lake Onawa, in the county of Piscataquis (H. P. No. 759) as legislation thereon is inexpedient.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Closed Season on Deer in Franklin, Oxford and Somerset Counties" (H. P. No. 204) (L. D. No. 112) as it is taken care of by other legislation.

Mr. Fogg from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Closed Time on Deer in

Penobscot County" (H. P. No. 700) (L. D. No. 248) as it is taken care of by other legislation.

Mr. Bussey from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to regulate the Closed Time on Deer" (H. P. No. 550) (L. D. No. 141) as it is taken care of by other legislation.

Mr. Smith from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Deer in Piscataquis County" (H. P. No. 702) (L. D. No. 367) as it is taken care of by other legislation.

Mr. Rea from the Committee on Ways and Bridges reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Winterport. (H. P. No. 466)

Same gentleman from same Committee on Petition of Frank McGuire and others in favor of making a Bridge Survey across Eggenmoggin Reach (H. P. No. 671) reporting that same be placed on file.

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Osgood from the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act requiring the Licensing of Operators of Creameries or Milk Distributing Plants" (H. P. No. 1083) (L. D. No. 571) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1618) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. White from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of Kineowatha Camps Inc. of Wilton. to reimburse it for removal of Floating Bog on Wilson Lake (H. P. No. 813) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1619) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Rounds from same Committee on Resolve in favor of Daniel Mahar of Bangor (H. P. No. 1531) (L. D. No. 809) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1620) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Bussey from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Resolve relating to Muskrat Hunting on the West Branch of Sebasticook River (H. P. No. 748) (L. D. No. 414) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1621) under title of "Resolve relating to Closed Season on Muskrat on the West Branch of the Sebasticook River" and that it "Ought to pass"

Same gentleman from same Committee on Bill "An Act relative to Lumber Camps not to Serve Salmon, Trout and Togue" (H. P. No. 727)

(L. D. No. 334) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1622) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Smith from same Committee on Bill "An Act relative to the Classification, Registration, and Fees of Guides" (H. P. No. 737) (L. D. No. 406) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1623) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Same gentleman from same Committee on Bill "An Act relative to Fishing Licenses for Residents and Non-residents; Fees therefor; Revocation thereof" (H. P. No. 725) (L. D. No. 305) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1624) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Sterling from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Ice Fishing in the towns of Porter and Hiram" (H. P. No. 752) (L. D. No. 258) reported same in new draft, Resolve (H. P. No. 1625) under title of "Resolve regulating Ice Fishing in York County" and that it "Ought to pass"

Same gentleman from same Committee on Bill "An Act relative to Definitions of Hunting, Resident, Aliens, Jacklight and Trapping" (H. P. No. 695) (L. D. No. 364) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1626) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Same gentleman from same Committee on Resolve relating to Fishing in Baker Pond (H. P. No. 556) (L. D. No. 225) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1627) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Burgess from same Committee on Resolve regulating Fishing in Day Mountain Pond (H. P. No. 744) (L. D. No. 411) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1628) under title of "Resolve regulating Fishing in Day Mountain Pond. in the town of Avon," and that it "Ought to pass"

Same gentleman from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Open Season on Fur Bearing Animals" (H. P. No. 709) (L. D. No. 370) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1629) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Goudy from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act relating to the Interstate Transfer of Dependent Persons" (H. P. No. 1114) (L. D. No. 623) reported same in

a new draft (H. P. No. 1630) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Hill from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Support of State Paupers" (H. P. No. 1113) (L. L. No. 622) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1631) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

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

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Offenses against Habitations and other Buildings" (H. P. No. 1123) (L. D. No. 632)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Weeks of Somerset, Holman of Franklin of the Senate; Farris of Augusta, Tompkins of Houlton, Fernald of Winterport, Eldridge of Eastport, Miss Laughlin of Portland of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1615) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Holmes of Androscoggin—of the Senate. Hill of South Portland, Goudy of South Portland—of the House.

(On motion by Mr. Farris of Augusta, a viva voce vote being taken, the majority report ought not to pass was accepted.)

Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to Repeal the Act Incorporating Number XIV Plantation in Washington County" (H. P. No. 623) (L. D. No. 184)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Weeks of Somerset, Holman of Franklin—of the Senate, Farris of Augusta, Tompkins of Houlton, Goudy of South Portland, Eldridge of Eastport, Miss Laughlin of South Portland—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1614) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Messrs. Holmes of Androscoggin—of the Senate. Fernald of Winterport, Hill of South Portland—of the House.

Mr. LINDSEY of East Machias:

Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill and the accompanying reports lie on the table pending acceptance of either report.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had, Eighty voting in the affirmative, that being obviously a majority of the members present, the motion prevailed and the bill and accompanying reports were tabled pending acceptance of either and the new draft ordered printed.

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to the School Board of the city of Lewiston" (H. P. No. 637) (L. D. No. 189) reporting same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1616) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Farnsworth of Aroostook, Page of Somerset—of the Senate. Chase of Baring, Tompkins of Bridgewater, Sargent of Brewer, Chase of Sebec, Miss Martin of Bangor—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Blaisdell of Hancock—of the Senate. Quine of Bangor—of the House.

Mr. PLUMMER of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I notice that my name was left off as one of the signers of the majority report. I suggest that it be added to the majority report on this bill.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman has placed himself on record as being in favor of the majority report, though his name is not on the report.

On motion by Mr. Audet of Lewiston, the bill and accompanying reports were tabled pending acceptance of either and the new draft ordered printed.

Majority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act providing for a New Charter for the city of Portland" (H. P. No. 859) (L. D. No. 402)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Blaisdell of Hancock, Page of Somerset, Farnsworth of Aroostook—of the Senate. Chase of Sebec, Sargent of Brewer, Miss Martin of Bangor—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in

a new draft (H. P. No. 1617) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Quine of Bangor, Plummer of Portland, Chase of Baring, Tompkins of Bridgewater—of the House.

(On motion by Mr. Plummer of Portland, the bill and accompanying reports were tabled, and 500 copies of the new draft, as recommended by the minority report, were ordered printed).

Majority Report of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to the Purchase and Sale of Lobsters" (H. P. No. 1155) (L. D. No. 616)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Blaisdell of Hancock—of the Senate, Shaw of Milbridge, Smith of Vinalhaven, Peacock of Lubec Lewis of Boothbay, Newcomb of Scarborough—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs: Littlefield of York, McLoon of Knox—of the Senate. Wentworth of Kennebunk, Richardson of South Portland—of the House.

Mr. PEACOCK of Lubec: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the majority report ought not to pass

Mr. WENTWORTH of Kennebunk: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I move the adoption of the minority report ought to pass.

I think the best argument that could possibly have been put up for this bill was put forth by the gentleman from Winterport (Mr. Fernald) just a few minutes ago when he spoke for Maine industries. I am for Maine industries, and I am for the lobster dealers in the State of Maine, and the lobster fishermen.

Today, in the State of Maine, the lobster dealers are in the same predicament as was Custer when he was surrounded by the Indians. This bill is just as much an emergency measure as some of the other emergency bills we have acted upon at this session. We all realize there is a lack of business from the de-

pression, but we all know that this lobster business is being hampered by a certain cause. Why do we not act to remove the cause? Briefly, the cause is that the dealers in the State cannot fill their orders for nine-inch lobsters and therefore have to lose a large portion of their business in the larger sizes. This naturally hurts the Maine fishermen, and if the dealers are unable to get relief from this Legislature, the fishermen will be hurt still more as the dealers get most of their larger sizes from the Maine fishermen.

I think if you read this bill carefully you will see that the fishermen cannot be harmed. The bill provides that Maine dealers can buy nine-inch Canadian lobsters under bond. To acquire this right the dealer must buy a \$250 license and furnish a \$5000 bond that he will sell these lobsters only outside the State. Can anyone conceive of a dealer forfeiting a \$5000 bond for bootlegging nine-inch lobsters in the State? At all times the shipment of these lobsters from Canada would be under the supervision of the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries.

The purchasing of these Canadian lobsters would not be detrimental to our fishermen, as, in any event, they would go to market, if not through Maine, through Boston. It would help to bring Maine back in the picture as a lobster center, there would be increased haulage for railroads and trucks, and a considerable expenditure of money for labor and materials. If the dealers were given the privilege of filling all their orders in the State of Maine, it would necessarily stimulate the lobster business for all concerned.

The demand for chicken or nine-inch lobsters is increasing every day. A dealer must be able to cater to his trade if he hopes to hold it. If a customer cannot get a nine-inch lobster, he will not buy a 10 1-2 inch lobster. I am speaking now of large purchasers who buy several hundred pounds of different sizes. In Maine we talk against legalizing nine-inch lobsters from a conservation standpoint, but if Canada will sell them to us for our out-of-state trade, why should we worry?

I have a handful of telegrams here that came from out of the State, mostly from western cities, asking dealers in this State to ship

nine-inch lobsters. I will read just one as an illustration:

“Joplin, Mo.

Rackliffe and Witham,
Rockland, Me.,

Ship fifty live one pound baby lobsters

HOTEL CONNOR.”

The dealer could not fill the order. I have several others that are similar.

Miss LAUGHLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, the other day this House defeated a bill permitting the sale of nine-inch lobsters and the taking of nine-inch lobsters in the State of Maine, because, I believe, of a belief that it would help conserve the Maine industry. I think the belief was erroneous. I held it myself until a study convinced me it was not so, but we defeated that, I believe, because we felt it was going to conserve the Maine lobster industry.

Now this bill in no way affects the taking of lobsters in Maine, or the sale of lobsters. If we reduce it to its lowest terms, it simply permits the Maine dealer to buy Canadian nine-inch lobsters. Canada permits these lobsters taken at the present time. At the present time the Maine dealer cannot buy them because he cannot even keep them in this State. Consequently he is at a great disadvantage with a Boston dealer who can buy the Canadian lobsters under nine inches and every other size and carry them through the Maine waters to Boston and impound them in Massachusetts and sell them there. The Maine dealer is prohibited in effect from buying the nine-inch lobsters that Canada permits taking and therefore he is at a great disadvantage with the Boston dealer.

The whole substance of this bill is that the Maine dealer will be allowed to buy Canadian lobsters and impound them by giving a bond for five thousand dollars. If he sells any in this State he is liable to have his license to do so taken away from him. But he may impound them so he can sell Canadian lobsters, which today he cannot do because we do not even permit him to keep them. Now it does seem to me that if Canada can sell nine-inch lobsters, certainly the dealers in this State should be put on a level with the dealers in Boston and be able to buy those lobsters. Why should the persons who are opposed

to letting nine-inch lobsters in Maine be taken, then take the position of not allowing our dealers to buy them from Canada?

I do not want to say this in any unamiable way, but it seems to me they are acting like the dog in the manger. “We won't let you sell nine-inch lobsters in Maine and we won't let you buy them from Canada. If we can't sell them, we will not let you get them anywhere else.” It seems to me only a matter of fair dealing that since Canada sells them, we should enable dealers of this State to buy them and ship them out in lawful competition with dealers in Boston. Of course we should put them under heavy restrictions to see that they do not sell them in this State and, if they are convicted of that, they have to be put under a bond of five thousand dollars as well as losing their license. Therefore I might say that I am opposed to the motion to accept the majority report and trust we will accept the minority report.

Mr. WALKER of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I assume in this Legislature that all of us are in favor of Maine industries, that we are simply attempting to hold the balance even. We are not for putting the State into business; we are not for putting our business men out of business. I am sure that an understanding of this question would lead to the giving of the lobster dealers freedom in the matter so long, as they do not transgress the laws of Maine, as has been pointed out, ample safeguards are provided.

Sometimes people act under a mistaken impression against their own interest. I represent the fishermen of the City of Rockland, a considerable number of people engaged in that vocation. I may be said to represent four or five dealers in the City of Rockland. Politically, the fishermen outnumber the dealers, but I do not consider there is any conflict of interest between the two. Let me reiterate: The fishermen must have dealers if they are to prosper. They are not in a position to market their own product. Let me reiterate that the fisherman must have prosperous dealers in order to prosper himself, and if he throws the dealer out he has not strengthened his own position.

Let us not foster any fictitious sense of conflict between these two

industries. It simply does not exist. These two must go on together or fall together.

One of our dealers also has a large branch in Boston where I understand he transacts more business than he does in Rockland. Rockland wants the business and needs it. The fishermen need it. I am for the adoption of the minority report on this bill in order that the fishermen whom I represent and the dealers whom I represent may have a chance to retrieve their fallen fortunes and go on together in some degree of prosperity in the days that are before us.

Mr. SMITH of Vinalhaven: Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I have promised not to take as much time as I did last week. I will try and keep within five minutes.

I cannot follow the reasoning of the gentleman from Kennebunk (Mr. Wentworth) when he refers to the talk of the gentleman from Winterport (Mr. Fernald) as being in favor of his argument. I was congratulating myself that the gentleman from Winterport had made just the talk I had intended to make, and I think every word he said about Maine industry applies to this situation, and I thank the gentleman for what he said in my behalf. He said, as he read those newspapers, "Buy America," "Buy goods made in Maine." He didn't say anything about buying goods made in Canada or other foreign countries. How are you going to twist that around to make it apply to their other argument? I cannot see how you can do it.

Now, members of the Eighty-sixth Legislature, we have a proposition here which is so much worse than the bill which we defeated here last Thursday that there is no comparison. It is infinitely worse. It seems to me that it is almost incomprehensible that any man or any group of men would present such bill before a Maine legislature composed of patriotic men and women. I cannot understand it. It is almost beyond belief. Why, gentlemen, it would be as logical to bring in a bill here proposing to fill Aroostook potato houses with inferior potatoes from Canada or Russia, that they might be used to control the market against Aroostook potato growers.

It would be as logical to store Maine warehouses—to put it plainly—with booze, or opium or any other illegal thing, or thing permitted in other countries or other states. I say it is inconceivable they should come before us with such a proposition.

Now I was asked several times yesterday what this would do to the fishermen, how it would hurt the fishermen, and I intend to try and show you how it would hurt the fishermen. For instance, there is one company in Boston, not a Maine dealer, a Boston company that has storage room in Maine pounds for 1,750,000 of lobsters. That is exclusive of the Maine dealers. Now what is to prohibit those dealers from filling those pounds with illegal lobsters from Canada, and when such time comes on the coast of Maine there is a scarcity of lobsters—and you know scarcity of a product means a better price—when there is a scarcity on the Maine coast they will release the lobsters in this pound in direct competition with lobsters caught by Maine fishermen. It is absolutely possible and quite probable.

Now it seems to be that this fight for the minority report is a good deal like—as the gentleman from Kennebunk accused another member on the Islesboro bill—the efforts of a man who doesn't know when he is licked.

I think this is a very important thing. This bill has never had a committee hearing. Now do you want to pass a bill that has never been heard in a committee? I will explain how that happened. On the day we considered the other lobster bill, Legislative Document 54, so much time was taken that it got to be very late in the afternoon, and a man had come there with a bill relating to quahaugs, and he had a long ways to go and he told the committee he had to go home and milk his cows, so we gave him the rest of the afternoon. This bill was supposed to be put over until the following week, but it never had any hearing.

Is it a fair proposition to enact a bill here that has never been heard? The dealers, it is true, have been here and maintained a large lobby. The fishermen cannot afford to maintain a lobby here.

Another important factor: There is at this time pending before Congress a bill which proposes to pro-

hibit the very thing which this bill proposes to allow in the State of Maine. The dealers and fishermen got together on that bill, and went before the committee and tried to put through a bill which prohibits the very thing which this one proposes.

Now they mention the point this bill provides a \$5000 bond which the dealer must put up, so that if he violates any provision of this act his bond is forfeited. They make quite a lot of capital of that argument. Now to me, gentlemen, the very fact that they provided a bond of \$5000 to be forfeited, the very fact they have asked a license fee of \$250, that shows they recognize the dangerous possibilities of this bill. So much for that.

Now there are a lot of other features which we might discuss. Possibly I will have to answer some further arguments, so I want take your time.

The dealers tell you there is a demand for this short lobster, but they also say they can get all they want in Canada at present, or in Massachusetts, but they cannot bring them into Maine and store them so as to be able to manipulate the market and control the price against the Maine fishermen when a scarcity might give him an increase in price.

Just one or two more things and I am done. Someone says that there are probably not more than six dealers who would take advantage of this proposition. Now do we want to enact legislation in the Maine Legislature that is only going to benefit six people, to the detriment of three thousand fishermen. They told you last week we have already lost 2000 lobster fishermen. If this goes through it will possibly drive away fishermen off of the coast of Maine.

Now let me conclude with this statement: There is no legislation which the Maine Legislature can enact which will help the lobster industry. The only legislation which can help the lobster industry in Maine or in the United States is a federal law in the nature of a tariff. And that reminds me: These lobsters come in absolutely duty free; there is no tariff on lobsters. They go down into Canada and buy them and fill those pounds with lobsters at a price less than the Maine fisherman can produce them for. It costs 17 cents a pound to produce lobsters in Maine. They can

buy them in Canada for 12 cents or less and put them in direct competition with the Maine fisherman at a price less than he can produce them for. I certainly hope the House will vote to accept the majority report.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said it was like buying potatoes in Russia instead of Aroostook, and I would say that if the dealers from Aroostook came in and passed a law to prevent buying potatoes from Aroostook, we might be justified in buying them somewhere else. He says it is going to come in competition with the Maine lobster fishermen. All of these Canadian lobsters are going to market now; they are all being sold; the only difference is that the Maine dealers cannot buy them or sell them while the Massachusetts dealers can buy them and sell them. We are not going to stop the sale of these lobsters. I agree with the gentleman that as long as we keep this law, we should have a tariff to prevent Canadian lobsters coming in, but that does not lie with this House; it lies with the Congress of the United States which has refused to pass such a law because Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Jersey, and other States permit the taking of nine-inch lobsters and they go to Congress and prevent the passing of a law to keep out Canadian lobsters, because they want them. The Maine people have tried to get such a tariff, and they failed. So we have got to meet the situation that there is no tariff preventing these lobsters coming in from Canada, and the Legislature of Maine has no power to impose such a tariff. Therefore the Canadian lobsters are coming to American markets, as many as they can sell, and the only difference is that if we pass this law we prevent the Maine dealers from competing with the dealers from other states in selling them. They are going to be sold, and the question is whether Maine dealers shall be allowed to come in and have an equal chance with the dealers in other states?

Mr. SHAW of Milbridge: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vinalhaven (Mr. Smith) has covered this question very fully, and I heartily agree with what he has said. In my opinion, if this bill is passed it will be more harmful to the lobstermen in the State of Maine than

the straight nine-inch law. I hope the House will accept the majority report of the committee, ought not to pass.

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I am not a lobster fisherman or a lobster dealer. I have no connection with either. I have, however, become interested in this subject, particularly, perhaps, because of the opportunity that I have had for a number of years to see much of the work of the lobster fishermen along our coast. I am interested in protecting the several thousand lobster fishermen and their families who are dependent upon this industry for their living.

I wonder why all this agitation has come about at this time? As I understand it, three or four years ago we had some five thousand men engaged in fishing for lobsters in the State of Maine, and now those who advocate these changes in the law point out that there are only some 2700 or 2800 men engaged in that industry. But I do not understand that the decrease in the number of lobster fishermen is due to any change in the laws. As far as I have been able to learn, there is one cause and one alone for this depression in the lobster industry, and that is the general economic condition that is affecting every other industry in the State of Maine and in the country.

I think the situation is that today a great many people who formerly went into a hotel or a restaurant and ordered a broiled live lobster now either do not go into the restaurant for dinner at all, or, if they do, they order pea soup or dried beef. Hence the demand for lobsters has been reduced and with it the price.

Now under this bill, as I understand it, the lobster dealers of the State of Maine would be permitted to purchase their lobsters from Canada, the short lobsters which we prohibit here. What would be the result of that? It seems to me that instead of buying the product of our fishermen here in the State of Maine, our dealers are going to turn for their supply, in part at least, to the Canadian fishermen, and buy there the short lobsters instead of buying the long lobsters which the Maine fishermen are catching. And if the dealers say they would buy only a portion of their lobsters from Canada, it would seem to me to fol-

low that if they buy short lobsters from Canadian fishermen the situation would arise wherein they would find it more profitable to buy in larger quantities from the Canadian markets and hence would buy at least some long lobsters from Canada. At any rate, instead of buying the product of the Maine fishermen they would buy at least in part from Canada, to the further detriment of the already burdened lobster fishermen of Maine.

I have seen those fishermen along our coast. I have a great deal of sympathy for them. I am reminded of the words of the poet Whittier:

"From gray sea fog, from icy drift,
From peril and from pain,
The homebound fisher greets thy lights,
Oh hundred-harbored Maine."

And I stand here and want to go on record in this House as being opposed to this bill, which I consider to be even more vicious than the other and even more detrimental to the fishermen of this State.

We have seen in days gone by the shipping industry in this State; we have seen the great square-rigged vessels that used to sail out our ports to all parts of the world go by. We have seen the great schooners that used to carry ice in such quantities out of the Kennebec river pass away, and even the little coasting schooners in which so many of our people found employment, carrying lumber and other products along the coast disappear. Now I hope that it will not be necessary as a result of this bill to say of the lobster smack:

"In vain o'er Harpswell Neck
The Star of Evening guides Her in;
In vain for Her the lamp is lit
Within thy tower, Seguin."

Mr. WENTWORTH: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Vinalhaven, Mr. Smith, said this bill was improperly advertised. The Kennebec Journal, February 21st, shows the bill was properly advertised. No fishermen appeared before our committee against it. There were three dealers for it.

I want to reply to the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill. I want to state that if the Maine dealers are put out of commission, there will be less than twenty-eight hundred fishermen.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct my friend from Kenne-

bunk, Mr. Wentworth, I did give the impression in some of my talk outside that this bill was not properly advertised, and as fast as I could yesterday I went around and told everybody I could see that I was mistaken on that. The Superintendent of Printing had it scheduled for advertising. I could not find it in the Kennebec Journal for two days before the hearing. I wish to correct that impression, because I was somewhat mistaken on that. But when I say that the bill had no hearing, I am not mistaken, and I challenge any member of the committee to bring his note book here and show where anyone appeared for or against that bill.

Now I would like to say just a few more words on Canadian lobsters. There are some things that did not occur to me about Canadian lobsters. It is admitted all over the United States that Maine lobsters are the best on the whole Atlantic Coast. Now do we want to fill our pounds with inferior lobsters that can be advertised as Maine lobsters after they have been brought here and taken from our pounds? It is going to hurt the business in more ways than one.

Now about bringing in under-sized lobsters. As the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Hill) has said, it is true that they can send a smack to Canada and bring in nine-inch lobsters. It will be so profitable they can bring along with them the lobster of legal size. And, as I said before, they can absolutely control the market on lobsters and the fishermen will never get a price so he can catch them at profit. I tried to make that clear but the member from Portland (Miss Laughlin) said it was not a parallel case with potatoes. The fact is that it makes it possible to manipulate the market so that fishermen can never catch lobsters in Maine at a profit.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, the sincerity, the eloquence and poetry of the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Hill) seems to me to make his appeal more dangerous to a clear conception of this problem. Now what is it? Just this: Up in Canada there are crawling and swimming around in the water a great number of lobsters which are not legal for our fishermen to take. Those lobsters are on their way to market. They are being caught. This is a question of what course they shall take to market, whether

they shall be sold by the fishermen of Canada directly to dealers who will take them to Boston or elsewhere further south or west, or whether those lobsters may take another course on their way to market and stop a while and be impounded in the waters of Maine, be handled by Maine dealers, and then go on giving Maine dealers an opportunity to fill out rounded orders for different kinds of lobsters.

Now there is a definite supply of these lobsters. There is a definite demand for them. They cannot be marketed in the State of Maine. That is ruled out as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial, as our lawyer friends would say. It is just a question of these lobsters stopping a while to rest in the pounds of Maine and then being sold. The fact that a Maine dealer can fill an order for three different things and give the consumer those different items gives him an opportunity to do business. Further, it increase the market for lobsters caught in the waters of Maine, for this reason: People want Maine lobsters, as has been well cited here. They cannot get Maine short lobsters, presumably. Now if they can get, through Maine dealers, the Canadian short lobsters and the superior Maine lobsters of other kinds, their orders will be filled. Maine lobster dealers will do business; Maine fishermen will not be injured, but rather will be benefited. We have a beautiful unanimity here in what we want. We all want the same thing. It appears to me that it should appeal to the intelligence of this House and that clear thinking will follow that lobster from Maine to Indianapolis, or wherever he is going to be served, and on the way pay a short visit to the pounds of Maine and help a struggling Maine industry. I am for the minority report.

At this point Mr. Smith was giving permission to address the House for the third time.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to explain to the House about the pounds. Perhaps the members do not understand it. The pound cove in the ocean and the water flows in and out just as if there was no objection, but there is a net put across which keeps the lobsters in this pound, and it is possible to store them there almost indefinitely, as long as they are fed. In this way you have complete control over them.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman has moved the previous question. Before that motion can be entertained one-third of the members present must give their consent. All those in favor of the previous question will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division was had, and a sufficient number arose.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is: Shall the main question be put now, of course without any further debate? All those in favor will say aye; contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the pending question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Peacock, to accept the majority report of the committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries reporting ought not to pass on Legislative Document 616. All those in favor of that motion will say aye; contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being doubted.

A division of the House was had.

Seventy-four voting in the affirmative and 55 in the negative, the motion to accept the ought not to pass report prevailed.

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

(H. P. No. 659) (L. D. No. 921)
An act to authorize the town of Cooper to withdraw from the Maine Forestry District.

(H. P. No. 1596) (L. D. No. 922)
An act to redraft the charter of the city of Biddeford.

(H. P. No. 1597) (L. D. No. 923)
An act to revise the charter of the city of South Portland.

(H. P. No. 1598) (L. D. No. 924)
An act providing for a purchasing agent for the town of Sanford.

(H. P. No. 1599) (L. D. No. 925)
An act to grant a Commission-Manager form of government to the city of South Portland.

(H. P. No. 1604) (L. D. No. 931)
An act relating to changes in location of any school legality established.

(H. P. No. 1605) (L. D. No. 932)
An act in regard to the Plantation of Allagash.

(H. P. No. 1606) (L. D. No. 933)

An act relating to personal examination of insurance agents and brokers in certain cases.

(H. P. No. 1607) (L. D. No. 934)
An act providing educational opportunities for the children of soldiers, sailors and marines who were killed in action during the World War.

(H. P. No. 1608) (L. D. No. 935)
An act relating to the shipping and transportation of clams beyond the limit of the State during closed time.

(H. P. No. 1639) (L. D. No. 936)
An act relating to exemption of certain property from taxation.

(Tabled by Mr. Littlefield of Alfred pending second reading).

(H. P. No. 35) (L. D. No. 937)
Resolve for the purchase of one hundred copies of "Sketches of Brooks History."

(H. P. No. 1603) (L. D. No. 938)
Resolve in favor of L. S. Dixon, of East Hampden.

Passed to be Engrossed

(S. P. No. 230) (L. D. No. 793)
An act to incorporate the Town of Lincoln School District.

(S. P. No. 298) (L. D. No. 513)
An act providing for branding of commercial fertilizers.

(S. P. No. 328) (L. D. No. 534)
An act to amend the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act.

(S. P. No. 329) (L. D. No. 535)
Uniform act to secure the attendance of witnesses from without the State in criminal cases.

(S. P. No. 579) (L. D. No. 872)
An act relating to abandonment of property or discontinuance of service by public utilities.

(S. P. No. 580) (L. D. No. 870)
An act relating to parole of prisoners.

(S. P. No. 581) (L. D. No. 873)
An act relating to commitment to and length of sentence at the Reformatory for Women.

(H. P. No. 73) (L. D. No. 40)
An act authorizing life insurance companies organized under the laws of Maine to pay pensions.

(H. P. No. 125) (L. D. No. 74)
An act requiring the filing and preservation of annual statements of insurance companies.

(H. P. No. 126) (L. D. No. 79)
An act relating to taxes on insurance premiums.

(H. P. No. 127) (L. D. No. 70)
An act relating to time limit for adjusting fire losses.

(H. P. No. 585) (L. D. No. 234) An act to amend the charter of Parsonsfield Seminary.

(H. P. No. 592) (L. D. No. 238) An act exempting cities with more than seventy-five teachers from school unions.

(H. P. No. 593) (L. D. No. 239) An act relating to supervisory unions of schools.

(H. P. No. 618) (L. D. No. 183) An act creating an Art Commission.

(H. P. No. 821) (L. D. No. 682) An act relating to Superintendents of Schools.

(H. P. No. 862) (L. D. No. 304) An act to provide for the appointment of a Board of Commissioners of Police for the city of Augusta.

(Tabled by Mr. Hussey of Augusta, pending third reading.)

(H. P. No. 1065) (L. D. No. 452) An act relating to protection of quahaugs and mussels.

(H. P. No. 1080) (L. D. No. 434) An act to amend the charter of privileges of the West Bangor and Hermon Mutual Fire Insurance Company.

(H. P. No. 1090) (L. D. No. 577) An act relating to State aid for academies.

(H. P. No. 1127) (L. D. No. 590) An act relating to corrupt agreements by attorneys and others.

(H. P. No. 851) (L. D. No. 262) Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution raising the State debt limit.

Passed to be Enacted

(S. P. No. 89) (L. D. No. 102) An act relating to Fire Wardens.

(S. P. No. 90) (L. D. No. 855) An act relating to the pay of those drafted to fight fires.

(S. P. No. 108) (L. D. No. 854) An act to repeal the organization of the Plantation of Chesuncook.

(S. P. No. 208) (L. D. No. 277) An act relative to the conveyance of pupils.

(S. P. No. 260) (L. D. No. 827) An act relative to the Standish Game Preserve in the town of Standish, Cumberland County.

(S. P. No. 287) (L. D. No. 464) An act relating to disclosure proceedings.

(S. P. No. 357) (L. D. No. 512) An act to regulate the speed of motor vehicles.

(S. P. No. 485) (L. D. No. 792) An act relating to bids for supplies to institutions.

(S. P. No. 550) (L. D. No. 815) An act to revise the laws relating to Sea and Shore Fisheries.

(S. P. No. 551) (L. D. No. 814) An act to revise the Municipal Court Chapter of the Revised Statutes.

(S. P. No. 552) (L. D. No. 817) An act relative to the apportionment of State Aid to Agricultural Societies.

(S. P. No. 562) (L. D. No. 828) An act relative to fishing in the Saco River in the county of York.

(S. P. No. 563) (L. D. No. 829) An act relative to hunting licenses for residents, non-residents and fees therefor.

(S. P. No. 565) (L. D. No. 831) An act to regulate the speed of motor boats in certain waters in the Belgrade Lakes.

(H. P. No. 551) (L. D. No. 142) An act relating to trapping muskrats in Sourdabscook Stream.

(H. P. No. 689) (L. D. No. 359) An act relative to partridge or ruffed grouse.

(H. P. No. 883) (L. D. No. 424) An act relative to commitment of female juvenile delinquents.

(H. P. No. 1007) (L. D. No. 423) An act relating to the taking of land by the State Highway Commission, and the taking or discontinuing of a public highway.

(H. P. No. 1509) (L. D. No. 819) An act regulating the use of outboard motors on Kennebec Stream, in the county of Franklin.

(H. P. No. 1510) (L. D. No. 818) An act validating the existing form of government of the city of Eastport.

(H. P. No. 1511) (L. D. No. 820) An act imposing penalty for false representation made to the Overseers of the Poor, and requiring information by treasurers of deposit companies.

(H. P. No. 1514) (L. D. No. 822) An act relating to stamping of registered boilers.

(S. P. No. 1523) (L. D. No. 834) An act relating to the open season on beaver and muskrat; transportation and sale of beaver prohibited.

(H. P. No. 1524) (L. D. No. 835) An act establishing a Game Sanctuary in Piscataquis and Somerset Counties.

Finally Passed

(S. P. No. 205) (L. D. No. 830) Resolve appropriating money to pay the claim of Madawaska Company of Van Buren against the State of Maine.

(S. P. No. 241) (L. D. No. 856) Resolve authorizing release of State's interest in certain lands.

(S. P. No. 535) (L. D. No. 799) Resolve providing for a pension for Laura Witham, of Lisbon.

(S. P. No. 564) (L. D. No. 832) Resolve regulating fishing for Pickerel in Oxford and York Counties.

(H. P. No. 660) (L. D. No. 847) Resolve authorizing release of State's interest in certain land.

(H. P. No. 807) (L. D. No. 848) Resolve in favor of Charles Hadley, of West Sumner.

(H. P. No. 928) (L. D. No. 849) Resolve authorizing the Forest Commissioner to lease an island.

(H. P. No. 1526) (L. D. No. 844) Resolve regulating fishing in Libby Brook, in Fort Fairfield.

(H. P. No. 1534) (L. D. No. 852) Resolve authorizing the sale and conveyance of State's interest in certain lands.

(S. P. No. 569) (L. D. No. 858) Resolve to reimburse the city of Bath, for support and burial expenses of Mrs. William A. Griffin, formerly a resident of Malaga Island.

(Tabled by Mr. Wright of Bath, pending final passage).

(Emergency Measure)

H. P. 875, L. D. 312, An act authorizing Knox County to issue bonds.

The SPEAKER: This being an emergency measure, it is necessary that it have the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire membership of this body. All those in favor of the passage of the bill to be enacted will rise and stand until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and nineteen voting in the affirmative and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

(Emergency Measure)

S. P. 286, L. D. 463. Resolve proposing Amendment to the Constitution to authorize the use of voting machines in elections.

The SPEAKER: This being an emergency measure, it is necessary that it have the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire membership of this body. All those in favor of the final passage of this resolve will rise and stand until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and eleven voting in the affirmative, and none in the negative, the resolve was finally passed.

(Emergency Measure)

S. P. 590, L. D. 918, An Act for the protection of savings banks and depositors therein.

Mr. TOMPKINS of Houlton: Mr. Speaker and members of the House, when this legislation was first proposed, it was understood that the Governor should have ample time to review it. Under our system of government the Chief Executive has the power to revise a measure as important as this emergency measure and the next succeeding measure which so seriously affect the people of the State of Maine. The Governor should have ample opportunity to examine both bills, and, if he has any amendments or suggestions to make, it is within in province to make them. For that reason and the fact that he has been busily engaged, in order to give him more time to consider these measures, I move that S. P. 590, L. D. 918, be tabled.

The motion prevailed, and the bill was tabled pending passage to be enacted.

(Emergency Measure)

S. P. 589, L. D. 919. An act for the protection of trust companies and depositors therein.

(On motion by Mr. Tompkins of Houlton, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

The SPEAKER: In accordance with the action taken this forenoon at the request of the Governor, it will be necessary to have a session this afternoon, and the Chair understands that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Carleton, now moves that the House recess until 4:30 this afternoon.

The motion prevailed, and the House so recessed.

(AFTER RECESS 6 P. M.)

Called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The greater part of the day has been devoted to a series of conferences with His Excellency, the Governor, as to Legislative Document 919, an act for the protection of trust companies and depositors therein on which we are now prepared to take some action. The House is proceeding under Orders of the Day and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Tompkins.

Mr. TOMPKINS: Mr. Speaker and members, I move to take from the

table Senate Paper 589, Legislative Document 919, an act for the protection of trust companies and depositors therein, tabled by me this morning, the pending question being passage to be enacted; and I now yield to the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Scates.

On motion by Mr. Scates the House voted to reconsider its action of yesterday whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, and that gentleman presented House Amendment B. as follows:

House Amendment B to L. D. 919 to bill An Act for the Protection of Trust Companies and Depositors Therein.

Amend said bill by deleting the present Section 9, and substituting in place thereof, the following:

Sec. 9 Authority of Court in Safeguarding Rights of Depositors.

The petition filed by the Bank Commissioner addressed to any Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court shall not be granted without hearing, or if objected to in writing by a majority in amount of the time and demand depositors of said Trust Company. If objection to the granting of said petition is made in writing at or prior to the date of hearing on said petition, the said Justice may grant reasonable time to obtain the written objection of a majority in amount of said depositors before granting. Any depositor may be permitted to intervene as party plaintiff in any bill in equity filed hereunder and may be heard thereon. Any depositor or party in interest may present in writing a plan of reorganization. The Bank Commissioner may file his plan of reorganization. A majority in amount of the depositors may present in writing to said Justice a plan of reorganization and if said plan is the most feasible, it shall be adopted. Final decree of reorganization shall be made by said Justice after submission of plans and hearing thereon. The right of appeal is hereby granted.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Scates, House Amendment B was adopted; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill as amended by House Amendment A and House Amendment B was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

The SPEAKER: While the House is waiting for the return of these

papers from the Senate, which may be twenty or twenty-five minutes, are there any other matters that can be taken up under Orders of the Day.

On motion by Mr. Mack of Veazie, it was voted to take from the table the second unassigned matter, House Report ought not to pass of the committee on Claims on resolve in favor of the town of Veazie to reimburse said town of Veazie for support of Archie L. Mishis and family, State paupers, H. P. 804, tabled by that gentleman March 14, pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. MACK: Mr. Speaker, I have conferred with the Chairman of the committee on Claims, and I now ask that this resolve be recommitted to that committee, and I make that motion.

The motion prevailed and the resolve was recommitted to the committee on Claims.

On motion by Mr. Shaw of Milbridge, it was voted to take from the table the third unassigned matter, House report ought not to pass of the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on bill an act closing Pleasant River and tributaries to trapping, H. P. 199, L. D. 108, tabled by that gentleman March 14, pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was recommitted to the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game.

The SPEAKER: Are there any other matters that can be taken up under Orders of the Day?

On motion by Mr. Farris of Augusta, it was voted to take from the table the twenty-third unassigned matter, bill an act for the regulation of and practice of hair-dressing and beauty culture, H. P. 1513, L. D. 823, which was passed to be engrossed in the House on March 9th as amended by House Amendment A, as amended, and which came from the Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in non-concurrence, and which was tabled by Mr. Farris on March 16 pending further consideration.

Mr. FARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment B in non-concurrence and move its adoption.

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action of March 9 whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, now offers House Amendment B and moves its adoption, and the Clerk will read the amendment.

House Amendment B to H. P. 1513, L. D. 823, An act for the Regulation of and Practice of Hair-dressing and Beauty Culture.

Amend said bill by striking out from the seventh and eighth lines of section two thereof the following words: "The removal of superfluous hair from the body of any person is prohibited." (Laughter and applause.)

Thereupon, House Amendment B was adopted and the bill as amended by House Amendment B and House Amendment A as amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Mr. MARTIN of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I am doubtful in my own mind as to whether we did adopt Senate Amendment A. If we did not adopt it, I move that we do so now.

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action just taken whereby this bill, as amended, was passed to be engrossed.

Senate Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Are there any other matters under Orders of the Day?

The Chair has in its possession H. P. 942, an act to re-name the bridge between Richmond and Dresden which was referred to the committee on Ways and Bridges on February 2nd and which is now in the hands of the House, having been recalled from that committee. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wiscasset, Mr. Hagggett.

Mr. HAGGETT: Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw this bill.

The SPEAKER: If there is no objection, the Chair rules that unanimous consent is given and that the bill is withdrawn.

Are there any other matters under Orders of the Day?

Paper from the Senate out of Order.

Ordered, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet Monday, March 20th, at 4.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

Comes from the Senate, read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: May the Chair request the members to remain until we have finally enacted the Trust Company bill, provided it comes back from the Senate in proper form? A bill of this kind, having an emergency clause attached, requires one hundred and one members. Will the members please remain within hearing of the gong so as to be ready when this matter comes back to us? The House may be at ease.

AFTER RECESS 7 P. M.

The SPEAKER: The House has in its possession several matters which are not on the Calendar but which we can act upon while we are waiting for the Bank Bill to come in, thus enabling us to speed up the work a little.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Rounds from the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of the city of Eastport (H. P. No. 829) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1633) under the same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Fenlason from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to School Unions" (H. P. No. 594) (L. D. No. 176) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1634) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Fernald from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act exempting from Registration certain Vehicles owned by Non-residents" (H. P. No. 1048) (L. D. No. 479) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1635) under title of "An Act relating to Certain Non-resident Operators and Exempting from Registration Certain Vehicles owned by Non-residents," and that the new draft "Ought to pass."

Mr. Bushey from the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act relating to the Forty-eight Hour Law" (H. P. No. 1060) (L. D. No. 450) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No.

1636) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Miss Martin from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Personal Property" (H. P. No. 1169) (L. D. No. 504) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1637) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Same member from same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to Elections in the city of Biddeford" (H. P. No. 219) (L. D. No. 123) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1638) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Wentworth from the Committee on Maine Publicity on Bill "An Act relating to Publicity" (H. P. No. 1143) (L. D. No. 565) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1639), under same title, and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Peacock from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act relating to Regulation of buying, selling and transportation of Clams" (H. P. No. 10) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1640) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Littlefield from the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation on Bill "An Act concerning the Improvement, Protection and Preservation of Shade or Ornamental Trees" (H. P. No. 1156) (L. D. No. 603) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1641) under title of "An Act concerning the Improvement, Protection or Preservation of Shade, Forest or Ornamental Trees," and that it "Ought to pass."

Mr. Graves from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on Resolve in favor of the Road leading from Greenville to Rockwood (H. P. No. 682) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1642) under same title and that it "Ought to pass."

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

Mr. Webber from the Committee on Library reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve in favor of the Purchase of One Hundred Copies of "The History of Oxford County" (H. P. No. 643).

Mr. Richardson from the Committee on Pensions reported same on Resolve providing for a State Pension for Fred E. Hilton of Pittston (H. P. No. 387).

Reports read and accepted and

the resolves ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. Thomas from the Committee on Library reported "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act for the Preservation of Academic Records" (H. P. No. 1012) (L. D. No. 428).

Mr. Bailey from the Committee on Pensions reported same on Bill "An Act providing for Pensions for Call-Firemen in Augusta" (H. P. No. 879) (L. D. No. 315).

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

On motion by Mr. Carleton of Portland, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby it accepted the report of the committee on Library ought to pass on resolve in favor of the purchase of one hundred copies of the history of Oxford county, House Paper 643.

Mr. CARLETON: Mr. Speaker, we have no money for this, and I will state to the members here tonight that we have been checking up on our budget and we are a hundred thousand dollars short. Therefore it will be impossible for us to think of laying out any more money for non-essentials.

On motion by Mr. Mason of Mechanic Falls, tabled pending acceptance of the report of the committee.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to take up out of order bill on its passage to be enacted?

(Emergency Measure)

S. P. 589, L. D. 919, An act for the protection of trust companies and depositors therein.

The SPEAKER: This being an emergency measure, it is necessary that it have the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the entire elective membership of the House. All those in favor of the passage of this bill to be enacted will rise and stand until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and nine voting in the affirmative, and none in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

Committee Report

Majority report of the committee on Legal Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Eligibility of Members of

City Governments to certain offices" (H. P. No. 1061) (L. D. No. 490).

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Blaisdell of Hancock, Page of Somerset, Farnsworth of Aroostook, of the Senate. Tompkins of Bridgewater, Sargent of Brewer, Chase of Sebec, Miss Martin of Bangor, of the House.

Minority Report of same committee on same bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1632) under same title and that it "Ought to pass".

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Plummer of Portland, Quine of Bangor, Chase of Baring, of the House.

On motion by Mr. Hill of South Portland, tabled pending acceptance of either report.

On motion by Mr. Bailey of Woolwich,

Adjourned until Monday afternoon, March 20, at 4.30 P. M.