

# 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-Seventh Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1935

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Thursday, February 21, 1935.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Gessner of Augusta.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

From the Senate: Bill An act to provide for licenses and permits for outdoor advertising. (S. P. 334) (L. D. 643)

Comes from the Senate referred to the committee on Judiciary.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Tupper of Calais, tabled pending reference in concurrence.

The following petitions and remonstrances were received and upon recommendation of the committee on Reference of Bills were referred to the following committees:

**Education**

Petition of Carl E. Dunn of Greenbush and 109 others in favor of L. D. 56 relating to educational program. (H. P. No. 1445) (Presented by Mrs. Currier of Bangor)

Petition of Walter M. Cox of Orrington and 32 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1446) (Presented by same member)

Petition of W. B. White of Jonesboro and 44 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1447) (Presented by Mr. Drisko of Jonesboro)

Petition of Mrs. L. C. Ellsworth of Salem and 6 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1448) (Presented by Mr. Hammond of Strong)

Petition of Florence H. Bradbury of Norway and 3 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1449) (Presented by Mr. Heald of Lovell)

Petition of William Parkhurst of Plantation No. 3 and 13 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1450) (Presented by Mr. Noyes of Franklin)

Petition of F. W. Smith of Columbia and 47 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1451) (Presented by Mr. Shaw of Milbride)

Petition of B. H. Walker of Fryeburg and 25 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1452) (Presented by Miss Stickney of Brownfield)

Petition of Geo. M. Hanson of Machiasport and 20 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1457) (Presented by Mr. Lindsey of East Machias)

**Inland Fisheries and Game**

Remonstrance of Raymond Frost of Cooper and 56 others against increase in hunting and fishing license. (H. P. No. 1453) (Presented by Mr. Clarke of Cooper)

Remonstrance of Harry W. Bishop of Perry and 120 others against same. (H. P. No. 1454) (Presented by same gentleman)

**Judiciary**

Petition of Harry W. Bishop of Perry and 93 others in favor of H. P. 39, An act relating to fees for registration of motor vehicles. (H. P. No. 1455) (Presented by Mr. Clarke of Cooper)

Petition of Raymond Frost of Cooper and 43 others in favor of same. (H. P. No. 1456) (Presented by same gentleman)

**Orders**

On motion by Mr. Oliver of Bath, it was

Ordered, that the use of the hall of the House be granted to the Veteran Legislators' Association after the morning session of Wednesday, March 6th, also on the evening of the same day.

On motion by Mrs. Latno of Old Town, it was

Ordered, that the Clerk of the House be directed to convey the thanks of the members of the House to the Maine Central Railroad for a most enjoyable trip yesterday on the Flying Yankee to Pittsfield and return.

On motion by Mr. Hill of South Portland, it was

Ordered, that the Official Reporter of the House be authorized to procure the services of an Assistant Reporter, also the services of a typist for the Assistant Reporter, to aid in the preparation and completion of the Legislative Record.

**Reports of Committees**

Mr. Flanders from the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on bill An act relating to Bangs Disease (H. P. No. 1296) (L. D. No. 609) reported that the bill be referred to the committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Tupper from same committee on Resolve in favor of the town of Lincolnville (H. P. No. 1299) (L. D. No. 612) reported that same be

referred to the committee on Taxation.

Mr. King from the committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of the town of Lincoln (H. P. No. 981) reported that legislation is inexpedient as it is taken care of otherwise.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Earl W. Bishop of La-Grange (H. P. No. 983)

Mr. Lindsey from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Palermo (H. P. No. 772)

Mr. MacKenzie from the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on bill an act relative to Game Preserve in Franklin County (H. P. No. 192) (L. D. No. 59) reported that same be referred to the 88th Legislature.

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Coolidge from the committee on Claims reported ought not to pass on Resolve in favor of Poisson and Fortin of Lewiston (H. P. No. 41)

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Joe Adams of Oakfield (H. P. No. 972)

Mr. Devereux from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Elmo McNear of Leeds (H. P. No. 655)

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Mrs. C. R. McNear of Leeds (H. P. No. 654)

Mr. King from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of H. D. Carter of Etna (H. P. No. 656)

Mr. Ryder from the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported same on bill an act relative to Game Preserve in Franklin County (H. P. No. 564)

Mr. Davis of same committee reported same on Resolve relative to the screening of Tufts Pond (H. P. No. 438)

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Davis from the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported ought not to pass bill an act relating to fishing in Carrabasset River (H. P. No. 563)

Tabled by Mr. Ellis of Rangeley, pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. MacKenzie from the committee on Inland Fisheries and

Game reported ought to pass on Resolve relative to fishing in Greenlaw Brook (H. P. No. 570)

Report read and accepted and the resolve ordered printed under the Joint Rules.

Mr. Hescok from the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported ought to pass on bill an act relating to hunting rabbits (H. P. No. 559) (L. D. No. 155)

Report was read and accepted and the bill having already been printed was read twice under suspension of the rules and tomorrow assigned.

Mr. Flanders from the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported ought to pass on bill an act relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors (H. P. 688, L. D. 232)

Report read and accepted, and on motion by Mr. Tupper of Calais the bill was given its three several readings, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

**Passed to be Engrossed**

H. P. No. 601) (L. D. No. 644) An act relating to temporary loans by Penobscot County Commissioners

(H. P. No. 1415) (L. D. No. 633) An act to tax games of skill

(On motion by Mr. Willey of Falmouth tabled pending third reading)

(H. P. No. 9) (L. D. No. 645) Resolve in favor of O L. Veague of Castine

(H. P. No. 567) (L. D. No. 646) Resolve relative to closing Goddard Brook, Little,

(H. P. No. 569) (L. D. No. 648) Resolve relative to closing Goddard Brook, Big,

(H. P. No. 1439) (L. D. No. 649) Resolve in favor of Havener Webster of Orland

(H. P. No. 1440) (L. D. No. 647) Resolve in favor of Roscoe L. York of Medway

(On motion by Mr. McKay of Drew, tabled pending second reading)

(H. P. No. 1441) (L. D. No. 650) Resolve for screening Lake Thompson in the county of Oxford

**Passed to be Enacted**

(H. P. No. 301) (L. D. No. 73) An act to amend the charter of the Eliot and Kittery Mutual Fire Insurance Company.

(H. P. No. 325) (L. D. No. 96) An act relating to the powers and duties of superintendents.

(H. P. No. 327) (L. D. No. 98)  
An act relating to the exclusion of pupils from school on account of filth or disease.

(H. P. No. 340) (L. D. No. 101)  
An act relating to the Fryeburg Village Fire Corporation.

(H. P. No. 350) (L. D. No. 111)  
An act relating to evening schools.

(H. P. No. 450) (L. D. No. 126)  
An act to change the name of Maine Home for Friendless Boys to Maine Home for Boys.

#### Orders of the Day

The Chair lays before the House, the first matter tabled and today assigned, the majority report, ought not to pass, and the minority report, ought to pass, of the committee on Judiciary on Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution changing the date of the biennial election, S. P. 193, L. D. 147, which came from the Senate the majority report accepted, and which was tabled in the House on February 19th by Mr. Scates of Westbrook, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, I now move to accept the minority report in non-concurrence with the Senate.

I would say, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, that I am not going to speak but a very few minutes on this subject because, probably nothing I might say, or that any other member of the House might say, would change a single vote.

This matter of making the dates of our State election and National election conform has been discussed pro and con for twenty-five years. It should be considered purely on the grounds of economy and political expediency. We might just as well acknowledge this fact now as later on. The only real, valid, reason that the people have consented to have our State election at the time it is now held is this: First, that it has advertised the State of Maine. Now does any member of this House think for a moment that one outside resident is brought here, or one tourist, simply because the State of Maine has gone Republican or Democratic? That is an hallucination. There is nothing to it at all. Next, they say it is easier, better and more convenient to vote in September than in November; that you

get out a larger vote. Well let us look at that! Of course all of our campaigns are made in September. There is no great effort made in November. In 1932, in the September election, there were 241,095 votes cast after both parties had made a strenuous campaign. In the Presidential election in the following November there were 298,444 votes cast, or 57,349 more votes cast in November than there were in September after all the strenuous effort that both parties had made. In 1928 in the gubernatorial election in September, there were 213,625 votes cast, and in the Presidential election in November there were 261,170 votes cast, or 47,545 more votes cast in the Presidential election in November than there were in the previous September. So that argument has gone into the ash-heap.

Now as to the expense! I am not very fussy about expense if you get results. That is what has always interested me. If I can invest a dollar and get a dollar and a quarter in return, I am interested; but if I invest a dollar and only get seventy-five cents in return, I think I have made a mistake.

Now take my little city of Westbrook—and by the way it is one of the best little cities in this State and one of the best managed. We are not up to our five per cent limit—we conduct our affairs in a business-like way. Now I have just received this morning a letter from the treasurer of our city informing me of the expenses of our election last year. With us, and with the most of you, there is the primary election in June. Then comes the State election in September. Then there is the National election in November and along in December our municipal election, four elections in six months. It keeps us in a turmoil, more or less, all the time. What is the result? What is the cost of it to the city? I am not talking about the extra cost that comes upon the State, but to our city. Our treasurer writes me that each one of those elections cost the city of Westbrook \$779.50, or a total of \$3,118.00 just for election purposes in the city of Westbrook. Now we would like to use a part of that money for something else.

Well, as I said before, it is probable that what I might say here, or what anyone else might say, will

not change a vote; but the Lord has been good to us Israelites during the past few years, and, so far as anyone can foresee, He will continue to be good to us. We shall bathe in His sunshine for the next six years. I do not think there is any doubt about that whatever, and I imagine—I am only imagining—I don't know anything about it—but I assume that those Israelites here in the House will vote somewhat the same as I do, but let me carry this message to you.—think well of it—if you vote my motion down, remember that Rachel will not weep at the well. (Laughter and applause).

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill.

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, when I observed upon the calendar of the House the circumstances under which this report of the committee came to the House, the majority report, ought not to pass, having been read and accepted in the Senate, I hoped and rather assumed that under the circumstances it would not be necessary to debate the question here. Inasmuch, however, as the gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Scates) has seen fit to enter upon a discussion of the question, perhaps it becomes my duty, as a member of the Judiciary Committee and as one of the members of that committee who signed the majority report, ought not to pass, to set forth to some extent the considerations which led nine members of that committee to that conclusion.

Now I agree with what the gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Scates) said that this measure ought not to be considered purely from the point of view of whether a September election would promote the political advantage of one party, or whether that party would be politically benefitted by holding it in November. I believe there are other considerations upon which our determination of this question should be based. It is simply a question of whether, taking into consideration the argument of reduction of expense that is advanced by the proponents of this resolve on the one hand, and the several arguments advanced by the opposition on the other hand, we can best benefit the people of the State by the passage of such a resolve or by its rejection.

Now upon that point, as I say, I do not disagree with the gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Scates), but I fear that I must disagree to some extent when he says that the parties are aligned upon this question simply with regard to the benefit that each may derive from it, for I think it is to the credit of the Democratic party that while it urged this change to November for years when it was in the minority in every respect, and while the Republican party was in control nationally, and while it might have been felt that the holding of the election in September would be a benefit for that reason to the Republican party, the Democratic party repeatedly opposed the change of election to November.

Now that situation has been altered: the shoe is on the other foot. For the time being the Democratic party is in control in Washington; and yet, notwithstanding the amazing transformation and reversal of the traditional Democratic National policies, that party in the State of Maine continues to support the proposal to change to November and embodies it again in its platform. In other words, the party within the State on this particular issue sticks to its guns in fair weather or in foul, and, as far as I have yet been informed, the Republican party has not changed its position upon this issue, notwithstanding the change in the political considerations.

Now the one argument that is urged for changing the election to November seems to be that it will bring about a reduction in expense through eliminating the September election. That is not to be denied: there would be a reduction to some extent in the expense. But I wonder how much that would amount to, and I wonder whether there are not other considerations that far outweigh that.

If the State election is to be held in November, we must not forget that the expense of the November election in presidential years is certain to be increased and added to. There will be further expense for the printing of ballots, further expense for the hiring of additional clerks; so that the proposed saving would not be, I think, as much as the proponents of this measure advocate. Then I wonder how many of the members of the House, in connection with this item of ex-

pense, have taken into consideration the fact that, if this resolve proposing to amend the Constitution is passed, it will be absolutely necessary to call a special session of the Legislature for the purpose of amending statutes to conform to that resolve? If the resolve should receive a two-thirds vote on its final passage in each branch, it then goes to the people, and if the people should ratify it, change the Constitution in that respect, it would certainly be necessary for the Legislature to go through the many statutes and pick out the many instances in which those statutes refer to the September election and in which they are built around and based upon the fact that the election is held in September, and to amend those statutes to correspond with the constitutional change. Now, you say, why could that not be done now, at this regular session of the Legislature? The answer to that is that the proposed constitutional change, if passed here, would be dependent for its effect upon the action of the people, and the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine, in answer to a question propounded by this Legislature in special session of September, 1933, ruled that the Legislature cannot pass an act to take effect upon the contingency of popular ratification of a proposed constitutional amendment at a subsequent referendum. Therefore, the only way that could be brought about would be by the calling of a special election at a very considerable expense to the voters of Maine.

So the expense argument for the resolve is whittled down and reduced when that is taken into consideration.

There is one other consideration which, it seems to me, merits a good deal of weight, and that is the question of the weather that usually obtains in this climate in November. We know in September we are likely to have clear, mild, weather, which makes it easy for the voters to get out to the polls, and we know that in November the weather is very likely to be inclement, we are very likely to have northeast storms or snow covering many portions of the State.

Now the gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Scates) replied to that by the figures that he has quoted, to show that a larger vote has been cast in some years in November

than was cast in September. But let us bear in mind that those figures which he quotes are necessarily confined to presidential years and to presidential elections in November. We know that it has always been the experience throughout the country that, other things being equal, the vote is naturally larger when the question before the voters is the election of a President of the United States, and so they do come out in November of presidential years. But if this resolve is passed and adopted by the people, the State election is changed to November not only in presidential years but in other years, and I wonder, in an off-year, when there is no presidential election and the State election is held in November, how the vote cast in November under those conditions might compare with the vote cast in September today. Wouldn't it be far less? We have throughout the State many people who are aged or infirm, who find it difficult to get out to the polls and cast their ballots, especially difficult to do so in the inclement weather of November. It seems to me that is one very strong consideration for keeping the election where it is.

Now this measure proposes altering the Constitution of Maine. I believe it is sane, sound policy, as a general matter of principle, that we go slowly in amending and altering our fundamental law, that we add Constitutional amendments only when there is a real necessity for it or when there is a real popular demand for the change.

Now what has been the demand in connection with this? Many of you have received letters from constituents in relation to other measures that are pending before the Legislature. I have received letters upon other issues, but not one word in favor of changing the State election to November. When the hearing was held before the committee, there was only one person who appeared there to advocate amending the Constitution of Maine, and he was the author of this resolve.

Now there is really, when we come down to it, only one real reason for holding elections at all, and that is to ascertain the will of the people; and it seems to me, certainly, that the will of the people of Maine in connection with State issues, the election of State officers, can best be ascertained in September.

Back in 1820, when the State of Maine was set off from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and took its place as an independent State, the framers of our Constitution believed that the people of the State could best express themselves upon State issues by voting at a time different from the National election. I think that same reason exists today just as strongly as it did one hundred and fifteen years ago. I do not think we can reasonably deny the fact that, when November comes along in a presidential year and people go to the polls, they are in those instances pretty well agitated, pretty vitally interested, in connection with the election of the President, and would it not follow from that that our State issues would be almost wholly obscured and submerged by the national issues presented in November?

It is true that national issues creep into our State elections in September to some extent now, but I am wondering if it would not be very much more so in November, so that our State issues might not be given as much consideration as they really merit and deserve. Another thing, if we vote in November, that prolongs the State campaign for a time. The candidate for office has to start in with his primary campaign in January, or thereabouts, and campaign up to September. If you change it to November, he has to keep on for two months more.

The question of the value of advertising the State by this election is a question upon which we may reasonably entertain different views. I do not know that it can be proved one way or the other how much effect that has on the rest of the country insofar as bringing residents to the State of Maine is concerned, but I do feel that this is true: The State of Maine, because of the growth of other states, has from time to time gradually been losing its influence in Washington. Our congressional delegation has necessarily been decreased, until now we have but three Representatives to speak for us in the House of Representatives. But by this September election the State of Maine has an opportunity which no other State in the Union enjoys to speak its sentiments and make itself heard throughout the nation. Are we ready yet to surrender that opportunity?

I note that in September, in presidential years particularly, newspapers are sent forth from this State to many sections of the country in response to the demands of our people who are interested in the campaign taking place here. In these newspapers they read not only of the election campaign, but they read other items and advertisements in regard to the State of Maine. It seems to me that it would be unfortunate to make a change for that reason also.

I hope the State may continue to be the guiding political light in September of each presidential year. Let the rest of the country look northward and eastward to the State of Maine in September for the first resplendent rays of the rising political sun, and let us continue to preserve for the people of Maine the opportunity, when future issues may arise which may be vital to them, to send forth a ringing political message that will sweep across the western prairies and thunder among the peaks of the distant Rockies, for such a message cannot but have its National influence and its National effect. Let the rest of the country continue to question and debate, doubt if they will, and discuss, and affirm, or deny, the question of whether or not it is literally true that as goes Maine so goes the Nation. (Applause)

Mr. ELLIS of Rangeley: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as everybody, I assume, had his or her mind made up before coming in here how he or she was going to vote, and inasmuch as the question has been very ably explained by the two speakers, I now move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rangeley, Mr. Ellis, now moves the previous question. To entertain this motion requires the consent of one-third the members present. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the previous question will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division was had.

The SPEAKER: More than one-third of the members obviously having arisen, the previous question is ordered. The question now before the House is shall the main question be now put. As many as are in favor of the Chair putting



the main question now will say aye, contrary-minded, no.

The motion prevailed.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I move that when the vote is taken it be by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Calais, Mr. Tupper, has moved that when the vote is taken, it be taken by the yeas and nays. Before the yea and nay vote can be ordered, it is required that one-fifth of the members present shall signify their desire that the vote be taken by roll call. Those in favor of the roll call will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: More than a sufficient number obviously having arisen a yea and nay vote is ordered. In order that there may be no misunderstanding about the question on which you are voting, the Chair will make this announcement: It is on the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Seates, that the House accept the minority report in non-concurrence with the Senate. Are you ready for the question? The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Allan, Belaire, Bramson, Brown, Burgess, Burrill, Bushey, Carswell, Clarke, Cooper, Connolly, Cote, Crosby, Demers, Desmond, Donahue, Donovan; Doyle, Caribou; Doyle, Skowhegan; Drisko, Eveleth, Forbes; Forgue, Lewiston; Fortin; Gray, Brooksville; Harriman, Prospect; Hastings, Heald, Hearn, Hobbs, Jandreau, Jillson, Kilroy, Labbee, Latno, Lausier, Lebel, Leclair, Lindsey, Mace, Maheu, Martin, Dexter; Oliver, Poulin, Proctor, Rush, Sawyer, Seates; Smith, Van Buren; Stoddard; Thompson, Belfast; Thurston, Wallace, Wheeler, Wright.

NAY—Alden; Austin, Exeter; Austin, Parkman; Ayer, Bragdon, Bubar, Burnham, Cambridge, Campbell, Carleton; Chase, Baring; Chase, Limington; Chase, Sebec; Churchill; Clark, Plymouth; Cole, Cook, Coolidge, Crowell, Cummings, Currier; Davis, Fairfield; Davis, Newfield; Deering, Dennett, Devereux, Dorr, Dow, Eddy, Elliot; Ellis, Castle Hill; Ellis, Rangeley; Findlen, Flanders; Fogg, Rockland; Fowles, Gleason, Goss, Graves; Gray, Presque Isle; Hagan, Hall, Hammond; Harriman, Gardiner; Haskell, Hathorn, Hescocock, Higgins, Hill, Jacobson, Kendrick, King, Lancaster, Leonard, Lewis, MacKenzie, Mallett; Martin, Oakland; Mason, McKay, Newton, Noyes, Palmer, Parsons, Patterson, Payson, Phair,

Philbrick, Pike, Richardson, Roach, Russ, Ryder, Seabury, Sewall, Shaw, Sleeper; Smith, Bangor; Sprague, Stickney Stilphen, Story; Thompson, Chelsea; Tompkins, Tupper, Vaughan, Weatherbee, Webber, Wentworth, Willey, Woodbury, Worthen, Young.

ABSENT—Boucher, Gibbons, Mosher, Sennett.

Yes—54.

No—93.

Absent—4.

Fifty-four having voted in the affirmative and 93 in the negative, the motion that the House accept the minority report in non-concurrence with the Senate did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill.

On motion by Mr. Hill, the majority report ought not to pass was accepted.

On motion by Mr. Thompson of Belfast it was voted to take from the table the second matter assigned for today. Memorial to Congress requesting passage of the Frazier-Lemke Refinancing Bill, H. P. 1416, tabled by that gentleman February 19th, pending the motion of Mr. Hill of South Portland to indefinitely postpone.

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe this matter should be given more study, but I do not care to argue the proposition. The motion is that of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill, to indefinitely postpone, and I would say that, if that motion is defeated, I will move that this matter be referred to the committee on Agriculture for further consideration.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the indefinite postponement of the second matter specially assigned for today, the Memorial to Congress requesting passage of the Frazier-Lemke Refinancing Bill, and the motion before the House is that of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill, to indefinitely postpone this matter. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the indefinite postponement of this Memorial will say aye, contrary-minded, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Eighty-three voting in the affirmative and 45 in the negative, the motion to indefinitely postpone prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Fortin of Lewiston, it was voted to take from the table the fourth unassigned matter, bill an act to create a Milk Control Board, H. P. 1414, L. D. 632, tabled by that gentleman February 19th, pending first reading; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill had its two several readings; and on further motion by the same gentleman the rules were suspended, the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Eveleth of Portland, it was voted to take from the table the first unassigned matter, bill an act relating to the use of steam boilers, H. P. 66, L. D. 22, tabled by that gentleman February 5th, pending third reading; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Tupper of Calais, it was voted to take from the table bill tabled by that gentleman earlier in this morning's session, S. P. 334, L. D. 643, bill an act to provide for licenses and permits for outdoor advertising; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was referred to the committee on Judiciary in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Ellis of Rangeley the rules were suspended, and that gentleman presented, out of order, the following order, and moved its passage:

Ordered, that the use of the hall of the House be granted to the committee on Mercantile Affairs

and Insurance on Thursday, February 28th, at two o'clock in the afternoon.

The order received passage.

On motion by Mr. Ellis of Castle Hill, it was voted to take from the table the seventh unassigned matter, bill an act to provide a Town Council and Manager Form of Government for the town of Ashland in the county of Aroostook, H. P. 1196, L. D. 378, tabled by that gentleman February 20th, pending passage to be enacted.

On further motion by the same gentleman, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, and that gentleman offered House Amendment A as follows:

House Amendment A to H. P. 1196, L. D. 378, bill an act to provide a Town Council and Manager Form of Government for the town of Ashland in the county of Aroostook.

Amend said bill by striking out at the end of Paragraph two of Section two thereof, the following words: "at the next annual meeting for the unexpired term." and inserting in place thereof the following: "for the unexpired term at the next annual meeting or at a special meeting called for that purpose."

House Amendment A was adopted and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A.

On motion by Mr. Hammond of Strong,

Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.