

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

Saturday, April 6, 1935.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Milligan of Gardiner.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

(Mr. Flanders of Auburn assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tem, amid the applause of the House)

From the Senate: Majority report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting ought not to pass on bill an act relating to zone registrations. (S. P. 328) (L. D. 349)

Report was signed by the following members: Messrs. Burkett of Cumberland, Fernald of Waldo,—of the Senate. Gray of Presque Isle, Hill of So. Portland, Willey of Falmouth, Weatherbee of Lincoln, Philbrick of Cape Elizabeth—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members: Messrs. Burns of Aroostook—of the Senate. Vaughan of So. Berwick, Jacobson of Portland—of the House.

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

In the House, on motion by Mr. Jacobson the minority report was accepted in concurrence, and the bill received its two several readings; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the rules were suspended and the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Majority report of the Committee on Indian Affairs on bill an act relating to Indians (S. P. 187) (L. D. 138) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 710) (L. D. 888) under same title and that it ought to pass.

Report was signed by the following members: Messrs. Potter of Penobscot, Harmon of Hancock, McDonald of Washington—of the Senate. King of Orono, Kendrick of Litchfield, Parsons of Hartford, Stoddard of Eastport, Wallace of Sanford, Jandreau of St. Francis—of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following member: Mr. Clarke of Cooper—of the House.

Comes from the Senate the majority report accepted and the bill referred to the Eighty-eighth Legislature.

In the House:

Mr. CLARKE of Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my reasons for signing the minority report. I have always been willing to give my reasons for the faith that is in me, even though I stand alone. Sometimes I have been referred to as Jonah who was swallowed by the whale. They have swallowed me a number of times. You will remember that Jonah created quite a disturbance in the belly of the whale and the whale got rid of him and he lived to a ripe old age.

This bill, in the first place, as introduced, gave the Indians the right to free licenses to hunt, trap and fish anywhere in the State. In the executive session of the committee the word "trap" was cut out, so that at present it reads this way: "Indians to have free hunting and fishing. All Indians, of both the Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Tribes in the State, upon presentation of their certificate of registration shall be issued a hunting and fishing license without charge."

Now it seems to me that that would create quite a bit of jealousy and hard feeling upon the part of those who are already spending considerable money to keep the Indians at present. In the fiscal year beginning with July, 1933 and ending with July, 1934, the people of the State of Maine expended \$82,121.58 to keep less than eleven hundred Indians,—to be exact 1,080. It is estimated that the people of the State will expend in the fiscal year ending July, 1935, \$92,000 to keep those same Indians.

Under the present law the Indians have the right to hunt, fish and trap without a license upon their own reservation. It was thought by most of the members of the committee at the executive session that the Fish and Game Commissioner was in favor of this bill if the word "trap" was cut out. I thought differently and I had understood him differently. So after the bill was finally signed, that is, the report was finally signed by the majority, and minority report signed by myself, to

make sure I went to see the Commissioner and he says that he is against it. I asked him if I might quote him and how far I might quote him. He said I might quote him to this effect, that he thought it would create jealousy and ill feeling, and he thought it unfair to the guides to have to compete with the Indians with a free registration.

Now I have stated the matter, I think, exactly as it is. If not, the other members of the Indian Affairs committee can correct me; and if you think that the people you represent would be satisfied with giving the Indians free hunting and fishing everywhere, and so competing with the Whites, who are struggling hard, many of them, to help pay these bills, or if you think it would be wise to refer the matter to the Eighty-eighth Legislature, pass the buck along and do nothing now, leave the matter in your hands. I simply have explained my position and I will not make any motion. I thank you.

Mr. WALLACE of Sanford: Mr. Speaker, the reason I signed the majority report was this that these State charges I thought no more than right should have free fishing and hunting licenses.

Mr. MARTIN of Dexter: Mr. Speaker, I believe we have taken away enough from the Indians already and I move that we adopt the majority report.

The motion prevailed.

Thereupon the bill had its two several readings.

Mr. CLARKE: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order at this time to accept the recommendation of the Senate and refer it to the Eighty-eighth Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tem: It would be in order.

On motion by Mr. Clarke, a viva voce vote being taken, the bill was referred to the Eighty-eighth Legislature in concurrence.

Paper from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Senate Bill in First Reading

S. P. 719, L. D. 933: An act providing for a retirement system for State Highway police.

(Rules suspended and the bill given its third reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence)

From the Senate: Bill an act to provide for old age pensions, H. P.

1794, L. D. 816, which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 5.

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

In the House:

(Senate Amendment A read by the Clerk)

Mr. RICHARDSON of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adopt Senate Amendment A in concurrence.

Mr. BRAMSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be tabled until later in today's session.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Bramson, moves that bill an act to provide for old age pensions be tabled until later in today's session pending further consideration. All those in favor of the motion please say aye, contrary-minded no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Richardson of South Portland the House voted to reconsider its action of April 5 whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same gentleman Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Resolve protecting cod, haddock and other ground fish in certain waters of and adjacent to Hancock county, S. P. 642, L. D. 807, which was recalled to the Senate from the office of the Governor by Joint Order and which had been finally passed in the House on March 28th and had been passed to be engrossed on March 23rd.

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

In the House:

(Senate Amendment B read by the Clerk)

On motion by Mr. Graves of Mt. Desert under suspension of the rules the House voted to reconsider its action of March 28th whereby this resolve was finally passed; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the rules were suspended and the House voted to reconsider its action of March 23rd whereby this resolve was passed to be engrossed; Senate Amendment B was adopted in concurrence, and the resolve as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act relating to minimum wages for laborers, H. P. 1797, L. D. 840, which was passed to be engrossed in the House on March 28th as amended by House Amendment A.

Comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Chase of Baring, that body voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the bill.

From the Senate: Bill an act relating to the competency of witnesses to a will, H. P. 1142, L. D. 366, on which the House accepted the majority report of the committee on Judiciary reporting a new draft, H. P. 1847, on April 3rd and passed the bill to be engrossed on April 4th.

Comes from the Senate with the minority report of the committee reporting ought not to pass accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Vaughan of South Berwick, that body voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the minority report, ought not to pass.

From the Senate: Bill an act regulating the taking of ground fish by dragging, H. P. 1854, L. D. 907, which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 4th as amended by House Amendment A.

Comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. SLEEPER of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, as a previous bill will cover the situation just as well and perhaps better than the amended bill, I move that the House recede and concur with the Senate.

The motion prevailed, and the bill was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Final report of the committee on

Agriculture
Claims
Education
Indian Affairs
Manufacturers
Pensions
Pownal State School
Public Buildings and Grounds
Public Utilities
Sea and Shore Fisheries
State Prison
Taxation
Temperance

Come from the Senate report read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act to provide for the surrender by town of Kingman of its organization, S. P. 722.

Comes from the Senate received by unanimous consent in that body on April 5 and under suspension of the rules, given its several readings and passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee.

In the House:

Mr. DONAHUE of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill and the purpose of our committee in asking unanimous consent for the passage of this bill is because the original act did not grant retaining of the town organization. It failed to provide a method of levying taxes. Therefore, I would like unanimous consent of the House in this matter.

Thereupon the bill was received by unanimous consent, had its three several readings under suspension of the rules and was passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee in concurrence.

Orders

On motion by Mr. Burnham of Kittery, it was

Ordered, that the Superintendent of Buildings is hereby directed to assign at the close of this session room 64 for the use of the Revisor of Statutes until further order of the Legislature or either branch thereof.

Mr. THOMPSON of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, under suspension of the rules, and with the unanimous consent of the House, I would like to introduce a bill, amending the inheritance and State tax laws. I would like to say that the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs feels that we should have some sort of an overlay in the budget, and this bill will step up the different steps of the inheritance tax from one-half to one per cent, and we feel that it may bring in annually from seventy-five thousand to one hundred thousand dollars, in addition to what we already receive.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will accept this bill, and if it is accept-

ed, I make the motion that it be printed immediately.

(The bill was read at the request of Mr. Hobbs of Hope.)

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is there any objection to the reception of the bill?

Mr. VAUGHAN of South Berwick: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the reason for the introduction of this measure. It would seem to be a very serious proposition raising it one-half to one per cent on the inheritance tax. Then you make an exemption of five hundred dollars, which is no exemption at all. I am perfectly willing to try to understand it. It seems to me very late in the session, and there should be very grave reasons for putting it in now and changing the whole system.

Mr. GRAY of Brooksville: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it from the reading of the bill, the exemptions are exactly the same as in the Statute, the only difference being the change of rate.

The SPEAKER pro tem: If there are no objections the bill will be received.

Mrs. Forbes of Dover-Foxcroft objecting to the reception of the bill, the bill was not received.

Conference Report

Report of the committee on Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on bill an act relating to the time limit of adjustment and payment of all fire losses; penalty, H. P. 64, L. D. 20, reporting that the committee is unable to agree.

(Signed)

Messrs. Palmer of Island Falls
Ellis of Rangeley
Mace of Augusta
—committee on part of House.
Burkett of Cumberland
Hussey of Kennebec
Carl of York
—committee on part of Senate.

Report read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Reports of Committees

Mr. MacKenzie from the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting ought not to pass on bill an act relative to the repeal of bounties on porcupines and hedgehogs, H. P. 1270, L. D. 564.

Mr. Ellis from the committee on Ways and Bridges reporting same

on resolve in favor of a bridge at Brownville Junction, H. P. 878.

Reports read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. MacKenzie from the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting ought to pass on bill an act relative to the suspension of bounties on porcupines and hedgehogs, H. P. 1269, L. D. 563.

Mr. CARLETON of Alna: Mr. Speaker, I move this report be tabled until later in the day.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

Mr. MALLETT of Lee: Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen: In view of the fact that the State has paid out a large amount of money to reduce the hedgehog throughout the State, and they have been reduced to a small percentage of the original number, I think it would be too bad to not resume payment at some future day. As this bill calls for resuming payment on June 30, 1937, I move that we accept the committee's report.

The report was accepted, the bill had its three several readings under suspension of the rules, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

First Reading of Printed Resolve

(H. P. 1869) (L. D. 936) Resolve in favor of Charles H. Cutter Coal Company, of Boston.

(The rules were suspended and the resolve was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed.)

Mr. CONNOLLY of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move to table this resolve.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connolly, moved that we reconsider our action whereby resolve in favor of Charles H. Cutter Coal Company, of Boston, was passed to be engrossed. All those in favor of this motion will say aye, those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

Passed to Be Engrossed

(H. P. 1871) (L. D. 932) An act amending the charter of the city of Biddeford.

Mr. Donahue of Biddeford presented House Amendment A and moved its adoption, as follows:

House Amendment A to H. P. 1871, L. D. 932 entitled: "An act amend-

ing the charter of the city of Biddeford."

Amend said bill by striking out in Section 12 thereof the words: "this act" and inserting in place thereof the following words: 'sections 1 to 11, inclusive, of this act'.

Further amend said bill by inserting after section 12 thereof the following 2 sections:

"Sec. 13. **P. & S. L., 1933, c. 66, amended.** Chapter 66 of the private and special laws of 1933 is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section to be numbered 30-A and to read as follows:

"**Sec. 30-A. Board of fire commissioners.** The administration of the fire department of the city of Biddeford shall be under the jurisdiction of a board of fire commissioners consisting of 3 citizens of the city of Biddeford who shall constitute a fire board of said Biddeford and who shall be sworn before entering upon the duties of their office. The term of office of said members of the fire board shall be 3 years. All nominations shall be made and elections held under the laws which govern the nomination and election of mayor and councilmen of said city of Biddeford, provided, however, that after the acceptance of this section, the mayor shall appoint, subject to confirmation by the city council, 3 citizens as temporary members of said board to hold office until the members first elected under this section qualify. At the 1st municipal election held after the acceptance of this section, 3 members of said board shall be elected; the one receiving the largest number of votes, for a 3-year term, the one receiving the next largest number of votes for a 2-year term, and the one receiving the next largest number of votes for a 1-year term. Thereafter one member shall be elected annually to serve for a 3-year term. Vacancies in said board shall be temporarily filled by the city council and the member so chosen to fill said vacancy shall hold office until the 1st day of the January following and at the next annual municipal election occurring after said vacancy exists a citizen or citizens shall be elected to serve during the remainder of that term or terms. The board shall annually elect 1 of their number chairman and 1 of their number clerk, who shall be sworn and shall keep a record of all proceedings, issue all notices, and attest all such papers and orders as the board directs.

The salaries of the members of said board shall be voted annually by the city council of said city and paid quarterly from the treasury thereof, but the salary of any member of said board shall not be diminished during the term of office. Said board shall be provided with such rooms as shall be convenient and suitable for the performance of its duties by said city and at its expense.

All the expenses for the maintenance and all incidental expenses incurred in the administration of said department and all materials and supplies therefor shall be submitted by said fire board, upon its requisition, to the finance committee of the city, who, after approval thereof shall purchase such necessary materials and supplies as is provided for other departments of said city government. The number of firemen and their compensation shall be determined by the city council upon the advice of said board of fire commissioners.

Said board of fire commissioners shall make a report of its doings annually to the city council at the close of the fiscal year.

"**Sec. 14. Referendum.** The provisions of section 13 of this act shall be submitted for approval or rejection to the qualified voters of the city of Biddeford at an election to be held in December, 1936, or at such other time during 1936 as the city council may determine, and warrants shall be issued in such election in the manner now provided by law for the holding of municipal elections notifying and warning the qualified voters of said city to meet in the various ward meetings in the said city to cast their ballot on the following question: "Shall the provisions of section 13 of the act passed by the 87th legislature entitled 'An Act Creating a Board of Fire Commissioners for the City of Biddeford' be accepted?" Otherwise said ballot shall be in the form provided by law when a constitutional amendment is submitted to the voting of the people. The provisions of law relating to the preparation for the voting list for municipal elections shall apply to such election, and said election shall in all other respects be conducted as municipal elections in said city are now conducted by law and the results therefor shall be determined in the manner now provided by law in the case of the election of mayor.

The submission of the provisions

of section 13 to the voters of the city of Biddeford is hereby authorized, but section 13 shall not take further effect unless adopted by the voters of the city of Biddeford as herein-before provided.'

Thereupon the amendment was adopted, and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed.

Passed to Be Enacted

(H. P. 193) (L. D. 618) An act relative to smelt fishing.

(H. P. 1770) (L. D. 800) An act to amend the law relating to teachers' pensions.

Finally Passed

(H. P. 1793) (L. D. 820) Resolve providing for a State pension for Charles W. Shorey of Waldo.

At this point Mr. Flanders of Auburn resumed his seat on the floor of the House amid the applause of the members, and Mr. Devereux of Penobscot assumed the Chair.

Orders of the Day

Under Orders of the Day the Chair lays before the House the first matter tabled and today assigned, report A, ought to pass in new draft, H. P. 1859, Report B, ought to pass, and report C, ought not to pass of the committee on Judiciary on bill an act creating a State system of public employment, H. P. 1132, L. D. 357, tabled April 5 by Mr. Hastings of Bethel, pending acceptance of any report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS: Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Tupper.

Mr. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker, I move that report C, ought not to pass, be accepted. There are absolutely no funds to take care of this bill even if it were passed.

The motion prevailed, and report C was accepted.

The Chair lays before the House the second matter tabled and today assigned, majority report ought to pass in new draft and minority report ought not to pass of the committee on Judiciary on bill an act to permit national forests in Maine, new draft S. P. 715, L. D. 911, tabled April 5 by Mr. Mace of Augusta, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. MACE: Mr. Speaker, and members of the House: I make the motion, Mr. Speaker, that the majority report be accepted, and I wish to state in a very few words my reasons for making this motion. You will remember that this bill was presented to the House early in the session. I appeared before the great Judiciary committee and I made the observation at that time—and since then I have not changed my mind—that in my opinion this was a most important bill, affecting the prosperity, the welfare and the happiness of the people of this great State. The members of the Judiciary committee have given this bill careful consideration. They have patiently sat and listened to the proponents and the opponents of this measure for two afternoons, and I ascribe to the members who signed the minority report the same degree of adherence to the laws of the State and their honesty of purpose in signing that report; but to the eight members of that committee who listened to the arguments for the bill and listened to the opposition I must feel that if a majority report is of any consequence to the members of this Legislature, they should give that great consideration.

As I said before, the passage of this bill would, in my opinion, affect the prosperity and the happiness of all the people of this State. To simmer it down, this bill gives our government—and we are a part of the great government—just the right to come in here and buy from people who own forests, buy land, and compel them to sell out at a price agreed upon between the owners of those lands and the government, which would affect, as I have said, the entire State,—the disciple of Kent and Blackstone from Kittery, the dairy farmer from Calais, and the people who represent the great stretches to the north. It would affect, and favorably affect as I believe, the welfare, the happiness and the economic conditions of the State. Why happiness and why welfare! The government in buying those lands would employ Maine men and Maine labor, that is not otherwise employed, in clearing up those lands, cutting out the debris, building roads to the lakes and around the lakes; and after those roads are built, after that land becomes a thing of beauty to many people

who come in here and spend their money—as was told you yesterday \$85,000,000—they would have the opportunity to have all the benefits of those lands. They could go on to those lands, they could fish on the brooks, the streams and the rivers, under the direction of State officials. Perhaps later, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I might wish to make a few further remarks in regard to this measure. I move that the majority report be accepted.

Mr. MALLETT of Lee: Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my position on this question. I believe it is one of great importance to the State and to a majority of the towns, and that it would be a great benefit. But I have here a list of some of the towns in my district, in Penobscot county, that will probably be affected by this bill. I see here that one of them in the town of Winn, which now receives in taxes—or at least it did last year—\$15,380, and \$10,600 of this amount came from non-resident land that was owned principally by the American Realty Company, and they will undoubtedly sell at the first opportunity, and the town will be cut out of \$10,600, and it will be the death of the town. They will be unable to support their schools or make any improvements of any kind.

I shall certainly vote against this bill, but I do not ask anybody else to, because I think it is a great help to the people of the State as a whole. I do not want to be the murderer of the town of Winn, but I do not ask the rest of the members to vote against it, and I hope they do not.

Mr. HASTINGS of Bethel: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I and my father sold the first land that was sold in the State of Maine to go into the White Mountain Forestry District, which was in an unorganized town. Since the government has acquired that land, they have had a crew continuously working on that land, and they have hired all local people, from the towns of Bethel, Albany, Gilead, and Greenwood. They have built one automobile road eleven miles up Wild River, and the first of next June they will have a road completed from Gilead to the head of Cold River, which will be one of the

most scenic roads in the State of Maine.

Now, for the last two years, the only industry the town of Gilead has had is the George R. Leighton Bobbin Mill, and since the depression came on that mill has been shut down. In that mill there are about thirty-five men employed. If it had not been for the White Mountain Forestry District and the U. S. Government, those men would all have been on the town, and as the town of Gilead is in very poor financial circumstances, the State would have to take care of those men. So I, for one, am going to vote for this bill.

Mr. MOSHER of Farmington: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I am speaking against the majority report of this committee. I am speaking against this bill on general principles. It looks to me like another opportunity for individuals and corporations to reap a harvest at the expense of the public.

I heartily agreed with the distinguished member of the House, Representative Mace, when he spoke on L. D. 79, and said we were elected last September for the purpose of representing all of the people of the State of Maine instead of a selected few.

Land owners, under this bill, if the price is all or more than the land is worth, will accept it, otherwise they will probably turn the offer down. So it seems to me like using the people's money to help individuals and private interests.

If this bill is passed, the State will lose 600,000 acres of taxable property.

We are told that to take care of the loss to the State in taxes which will result, if this bill is passed, we will receive thirty-five per cent of the gross receipts of the lumber which is taken from these holdings. That illustrates again the unbusiness-like policy which the proponents of this bill offer to get our support. As all of you members know, who have had anything to do with lumber, there is no such thing as thirty-five per cent profit in the business. So I hope you will consider this proposition which, in my judgment, is based on unsound business principles. I also believe that if we pass this bill, we will be sorry for our actions a little later. I hope this measure does not have a passage.

Mr. WEATHERBEE of Lincoln: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: As one of the younger members of the Legislature, I had not intended to inflict myself upon the members of this House any further this session. I feel that they have been very kind in listening to me as much as they have, but I feel that this measure is so important and that the future of the State is so tied up with the passage or rejection of it, that I would like to express myself very briefly, as a member of the committee which spent a great deal of time on consideration of the measure.

We had, as I remember it, two assigned hearings which lasted all of two afternoons, and several times during this session we have, in executive session, heard the proponents and opponents of this bill, for and against, because every member of this committee felt that this matter was of such great importance that he would not care to sign either report until he had exhausted every bit of information on the subject and had gone as far into the study of the subject as was possible to go, and after that study, and after going over all the information given at the hearing, eight of the members of the committee signed the majority ought to pass report, believing, I believe, to a great extent, that the future of the State depended very largely on the way we make use of the recreational opportunities.

Now I believe, and I think most all of the members who signed the majority report believe, that this act is part of a very definite and very proper governmental program of conservation and development of the natural resources of the country, in whatever State they happen to be located, and we feel that the rights of the State of Maine and of the people of the State are in no way injured.

Now as you all know, and I think most every one has studied this bill to some extent, at least, the Federal Government would permit the recreational activities, not only in these 600,000 acres which they take over, but in the entire State, and I believe that the benefit to the entire State would be very great. Consequently, they would employ skilled foresters and wardens in these sections to guard against fires, to study and fight ravages of dis-

ease in these forests, and this of course would benefit not only the lands which the Federal Government would take over, but the adjoining lands, and in effect their studies and their combating these diseases and fires would be a benefit to all the owners of timberland in the entire State.

Furthermore, the result would be to preserve a proper forest cover and protect the stream flow of our State, something which has not, unfortunately, been done in some of the states in this country. And it would—and I think this is not at all unimportant—provide a substantial amount of employment for the citizens of our State, the laborers and the woodsmen especially.

Now you may ask, why cannot the State do all this or why cannot private industry do all this? In the first place, the State of Maine has not got the money to spend on these activities at present; and if you want to ask why private individuals cannot accomplish the same result, the answer is that age old problem of economics. As everyone knows, when private concerns are competing against each other for their own living and their own existence, the result is inevitably lost to the people, and lost to the public, due to exploitation, and due to the waste of natural resources. This is not an indictment against private ownership, or private concerns. It is the inevitable result when the private concerns start battling for the natural resources of the people of this country.

Now it seems to me very strange that anyone should fear the Federal Government in this matter. They speak almost as though it were a foreign nation, a foreign institution coming here and trying to take something away from the people of the State of Maine. They speak of the loss to the State of Maine of these 600,000 acres. In the first place, I do not believe we have anything to fear from the Federal Government, no matter who happens to be in control of it, of any theft of property from the people of the State of Maine. Now we are a part of that Government just as the people of other states are, and we take great pride here in the State of Maine in the part we have played in the activities of the Government of the United States.

Now when that Government comes and asks, very properly, to

carry on a very proper and very worthwhile program of development of the natural resources for the benefit, of course, not only to the people of the State of Maine, but of the people of the entire country who would come here to enjoy it, I say this is no time to raise the hue and cry that the Federal Government is trying to take something away from us.

Now I do not intend to make any extended argument on this question, but I do want to point out that thirty states of this country have made use of the efforts of the Federal Government to develop and to care for the timberland of their respective states in this manner, and I have failed to hear any complaint from these states that the rights of the people have been taken from them.

I might point out further that this bill carries no right of eminent domain, that no person in this State could have his timberland taken from him against his will, but it carries only the right of the Federal Government to buy the timberland when the owner is willing to sell.

Now as to the matter of loss to towns in taxes which they would otherwise receive on property, I know in my own district that I represent there are two towns which would doubtless have land within the borders of those towns sold to the Federal Government as a part of this national forest. I am not afraid that this would result in any tremendous loss in taxes to these towns. In the first place, I know a good many of the taxes on these wild lands are already delinquent, and the towns are not receiving anywhere near the amount from taxation as you would think, in looking over the record of taxable lands in these sections. It seems that some of these towns are faced with the problem of giving this land back to the Indians or selling it to the Federal Government. Further, there is a provision that thirty-five per cent of the income from the sale of pulpwood on these lands, or whatever profit it is possible for them to furnish, should be turned back to the towns. I believe, in these two towns that I represent, it is very likely this income would be as great, or at least very nearly as great, as the amount of money that the people of the

towns are able to get from the owners of the land in taxes at the present time, beside the fact that there is inevitably a benefit to come to the people of the towns when these lands are developed and they are made more attractive to out-of-state people coming here to enjoy the recreational activities on the lands.

Now I am interested finally in this project because I believe that this is a very valuable link in the great program which was inaugurated and originated by Theodore Roosevelt, the former President of this Nation, and I believe it is a part of his program and ideas and plans, that the Federal Government should do all that it could in developing and conserving the natural resources of the country, to prevent our forests and our other natural resources from going the way of the Indians, and for this reason, and for all the other reasons, I believe it would be a wise thing for the members of this Legislature to vote for the majority report on this bill and allow the Federal Government the opportunity of better fitting the people of this State, along with the people of the entire Nation, by making our forests of the State of Maine as attractive as possible for our visitors. (Applause)

Mr. CLARKE of Cooper: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: It is with great regret that I oppose our friend from Lincoln, Mr. Weatherbee. I have worked with him shoulder to shoulder in many a campaign here, but today I cannot do it.

I am afraid of the bill. It is possible that my fears are ill founded, but I do not see anything in the bill to make me think otherwise. I come from a section which would perhaps be taken in by this proposed national forest, in fact, my town stands to lose probably five thousand acres or over of taxable property. Now we do not feel that would help the rest of us a bit. We do not feel that would help the rest of the people of Maine, when they have to pay the extra share of State taxes that it would be necessary for them to pay.

Are you going to vote to take away from the State of Maine its control of 600,000 acres of forest lands, control of all the streams, rivers and water resources, of logging and driving rights, within that

territory, and surrender it all to the Federal Government? Are you going to permit the Federal Government to take from the little towns and plantations within this territory all their forest lands from which they derive the greater part of their taxes? Are you going to take from our boys and girls, our men and women, their right to hunt and fish upon these lands and waters, in order that a few timberland owners may dump upon the Federal Government their forest lands which they say are no longer profitable, for the sole purpose of escaping a tax burden?

They tell us we will have the right to hunt and fish there. The bill does not say so, but even if we did for the present, we do not know when the Federal Government might change its mind and make hunting or fishing illegal. They will say, perhaps, that the Federal Government does not change its mind, but it has changed its mind in the past two years considerably in regard to promises made.

Do you believe that these timberland owners who introduced this bill and are fighting to carry it through the Legislature care anything about National Forests? Is it not their pocket-books they are thinking about?

Who do you think needs the aid and protection of this Legislature, the timberland owners or the little towns and communities that are struggling under a far greater burden than our timberland owners?

I want to quote from an editorial in the Lewiston Journal in the April 2nd issue:

"We are sure that, amid the constantly changing relationship of the Federal Government to the State Governments, it is the height of folly, almost a criminal act, for any state, much less the State of Maine, to give up any large sovereignty of the state to the Federal Government in exchange for any sum of money. The money is soon spent. The gift of our state rights is never recalled.

Maine does not intend to yield up her ownership of certain control over the rivers, streams, waterpowers and forests, we are sure. If she is awake, nobody shall get them away from her by special sums of money. We of today have no right in a moral way to rob our children."

Think it over carefully and vote

against a bill that will bring ruin upon these little towns and plantations; that will take from the State of Maine its control over its forests and water resources; that will take from our people the right to hunt and fish upon these lands and waters, rights which they have enjoyed for 115 years.

Stand by your State, your little towns and communities and let these timberland owners stand their burdens as all the rest of us have to do.

Mr. Speaker and members of the House, it has been my great privilege in the three sessions that I have been here, to note the actions of the honorable gentleman from Westbrook, (Mr. Scates) his duties as leader of the Democratic party, and I have observed his actions and listened to his remarks with a great deal of interest. I recall one remark he made the first session I was here. To me, it was quite a helpful one—and it was this.

In the course of some discussion upon a certain matter—I have forgotten what it was—he made this remark: "When in doubt, vote no."

Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I am in doubt upon this bill, and so I am going to follow the advice given me so long ago by the gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Scates) and I am going to vote no.

Mr. WOODBURY of Morrill: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I can see where the State would be benefited if this bill goes through, but I feel that the State must take care of the small towns which are losing their valuation, because the remainder of the people will have to make up the loss in taxes.

One of my towns which I represent, the town of Lincolnville, is expected to be made into a part of this Forestry District, and it will take one-third of its valuation. If this is so, they feel as though the remainder must be taken care of by some form of legislation.

I am in favor of this bill, but I do think, when we come back two years from now, we will have to take some action to take care of the small towns which are losing their property and valuation if this goes into the Federal Government.

Mr. McKAY of Drew: Mr. Speaker, this act, it seems to me, would seriously affect towns in my section. Now in my home town

the non-resident tax is three-quarters of the total tax, and this tax has been paid, with the exception of about \$230. The timberland in this town has been worked very lightly, and might remain unworked for several years. Undoubtedly, we would receive as much from this act as we receive in taxes, but the question which confronts us now is how we are going to exist until they do that, and we have no guarantee that they will. In the meantime, we have got to carry our schools, roads, and other expenses. At the present time we are in very good condition financially, but I feel that we would be obliged to come in and ask for the privilege of surrendering our organization, and have the State take us over.

Mr. DEERING of Hollis: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I want to say that I am very much opposed to this bill. To my mind, it means a good deal to the citizens of the State that this bill should be prevented from going through. I think it means a loss to the State of a large amount of taxes, and it also means a loss to the towns. I do not believe our Federal Government should be allowed to come in here and control our land. I am absolutely opposed to it.

I want to say this: According to this bill, as I have studied it, they would return back to us thirty-five per cent of what they receive.

Now there are no owners of forest lands in the State who are going to turn them over to the Federal Government if they produce enough lumber and pulpwood that they can sell to pay their taxes. If they can produce that amount of lumber and pulpwood, the man is willing to pay his tax. I have heard from a number of men who have made a deep study of this, and they are absolutely opposed to it. I have letters from out-of-state owners who are opposed to this bill. I hope the bill will not pass.

Mr. LEONARD of Hampden: Mr. Speaker, according to my best judgment I cannot vote for this bill. I could not vote for it unless the small towns were protected.

Mr. CROWELL of Weston: Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing ten towns in southern Aroostook county. If this bill goes through as presented, and the plans are carried out, it will take from fifty to seventy-five per cent of the

taxable property out of the ten towns I represent.

I know not what the future may have in store for those towns and revenue, but I know for the immediate results that this bill will be very disastrous. I say: "Vote no."

Mr. WEBBER of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, if my remembrance is correct, two years ago we passed this same bill, but with certain reservations. Those reservations were talked over by the House, by the committee, and everyone, and it was fixed so that the State was taken care of in the water rights. Now that bill passed and is on the statute books, and I do not see why we should pass this one. That bill protected the State, and why the Government should ask anything different I have not been able to find out.

Mr. PIKE of Lubec: Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the House from Washington county, and Washington county will be affected if this bill is passed. The county is not in a financial position to have a good many thousand acres of taxable property taken over by the Federal Government. We feel this bill should not be given a passage.

I was not present at the hearing before the Judiciary committee, but I have talked with many people in the county, common people who have no land to sell. They feel that they cannot afford to bear the taxes which are now being borne by these people who own forest land, but who will be the fortunate ones to sell to the Federal Government. I hope this bill will not have a passage.

Mr. CARLETON of Alna: Mr. Speaker, as I understand, a lot of these land taxes have not been paid for years, and the Government has to pay all back taxes before they can take the lands over, and they do not take any land against the owner's wishes. Now if I correctly understand, the Government will put in CCC camps, which take young men between eighteen and twenty-five, single men without direct dependents, and they are giving them thirty dollars a month, of which twenty-five dollars a month goes home to their parents, and they have five dollars a month for themselves. They are fed, clothed, and if they are sick, they are provided with hospital treatment, and they are under a certain amount of discipline which fits

them physically and morally and mentally for service as citizens.

Now this is no small matter for us to consider in regard to this bill. I want to speak of this, because it has not been brought out before.

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, as at this late hour the session draws to a close, it is not a pleasure for me to take any considerable length of time in addressing the House, and yet on a measure of such far-reaching importance as this, and one in which I feel that the interests of the State of Maine are so vitally concerned, I would feel grossly delinquent in my duty if I were not to set before the House in some detail those things which appear to me to be very grave and serious objections to the passage of this measure.

The bill is one which is directly in line with two policies of the Federal Administration in Washington, which policies, to my mind at least, are most extremely objectionable.

The first of these policies to which I refer is the ever growing tendency on the part of the Federal Government, which tendency is increasing by leaps and bounds, and encroaching upon the rights and the powers of the several states, and breaking down the lines of demarkation that have existed between that sphere of government which has been considered to belong to the Federal Government and that sphere of government which has been considered to belong properly to the several states.

Now in this bill it is not so much the transfer of land to the Federal Government to which I object—although I do object to that—but I object more deeply to the surrender by the State of Maine of its sovereignty over the land, the surrender of its right to legislate over the land, placing it beyond the control of the people of the State of Maine for all time to come.

Now I wonder if we realize how large an area is involved in this bill. Three hundred thousand acres of land in southern Aroostook county, three hundred thousand acres of land in Washington county and Hancock county and the easterly part of Penobscot county, two thousand acres of land in Cumberland county, together with some in Oxford county.

Now that area amounts in size to a piece of land larger than the total area of Cumberland county.

It is almost the size of York county, and it equals very nearly the combined areas of three of our counties, Lincoln, Knox and Sagadahoc. This bill would ask us to surrender all power to legislate over that land or deal with it in any respect in the future.

Now why, you say, should we have so great a fear of the Federal Government? The Federal Government is not a foreign nation. But I ask you members of the House whether you believe that in the future, when important questions concerning this land may arise, this question can best be answered for the interests of the people of Maine by this Legislature representing the people of Maine, and the people of Maine only, or can those interests be better served by the Congress of the United States, in which the State of Maine has a representation of only five members out of over five hundred? It seems to me, that at best, when the Federal Government represents as it does, all of the rest of these United States, Congress can have but one-forty-eighth of the interest concerning these lands that the Legislature of Maine would have.

We have heard some talk this session, some expression of grave concern, from members, particularly from Aroostook county, some fear as to what might be done in Washington with respect to a reciprocal tariff which it is said would mean recognition of the potato industry. Now the power to make such a reciprocal agreement is properly a Federal power. I make no criticism on that score, but it seems to me to be an illustration of the point I wish to make which is that when you turn something of that sort over to the Federal Government, you must remember that the State of Maine will lose its power to legislate for its best interests in the future in this connection.

Now in the Eighty-sixth Legislature, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Webber), a bill was introduced, which bill would permit the Federal Government to acquire lands in the State of Maine without limit and without restriction. And the Eighty-sixth Legislature considered that bill very carefully and decided that it would be highly improper to pass such legislation with certain reservations, restrictions being imposed; and so, in section 22 of chapter 123 of the public laws of 1933 reserva-

tions were inserted reserving to the State of Maine powers respecting the storage, the use or the development of water resources, or the Mill Act, so-called. Powers respecting the enjoyment of fishing and hunting over these lands, and other conditions, were inserted in that act, and it was passed. And now comes the Federal Government and says: "We cannot accept those lands if the State of Maine is to reserve such privileges as those."

The proponents of this bill say that it is not the purpose of the Federal Government to interfere in any way with our hunting or fishing, or interfere in any respect with the power rights or water rights; but if that be true, I ask why do they insist upon repealing those reservations?

It seems to me that it would be most unfortunate for the people of Maine to make it possible by such legislation as this for the Federal Government to engage in business, directly in business, in competition with our own industries, and that, I submit, would probably be done under this act.

I quote briefly from an address delivered by F. A. Silcox, Chief Forester of the United States, on January 28th, 1935, in which the then forester says in reference to these national forest projects:

"Where private initiative cannot be counted upon to maintain the forest industries that are essential to existing communities or to create permanent employment, the Federal Government or the State must undertake the logging, and if necessary the milling of its own timber."

That shows, I believe, what the intent is with respect to that point. And again Chief Forester Silcox, in the same address says:

"We need to strengthen the conservation provisions of the lumber code, and to extend them to cover all of the industries which exploit the forests. The substance of these provisions should be retained in one form or another, no matter what the fact of the codes may be. I am frank to say that I believe that the enforcement of these conservation provisions should be entrusted to public agencies, rather than left to the industries. I believe that many socially minded operators would gladly practice forestry if they could be assured that their competitors would not be permitted to cut by methods of destructive logging. This result, however, could only be at-

tained with effective regulations under public guidance.

"Public control over the use of private forest lands which will insure sustained yield is essential to stabilize forest industries and forest communities. The application of the required practices on private lands must be supervised by public agencies and not left to industry.

"The Federal Government or the states should undertake the logging, and if necessary the milling, of their own timber."

So my second objection to the bill is that it means more unfairness by the Federal Government in competition with private business. Now if the Federal Government acquires under this bill a strip of land, perhaps alongside of a river, perhaps on both sides of the river, it might very readily interfere with logging operations, perhaps, to be conducted there, or private industry, or it might be made impossible by the Federal Government for these industries to transport their logs across the national forests or construct piers, dams or sluices which might be needed. And such has been the case already in some of the other States. I am informed there is a case pending in court in the State of New York at the present time, brought by the Federal Government against private industries engaged in logging or transporting logs across the national forests.

A further objection which I have to this bill is that it binds the State of Maine absolutely to all of the terms and provisions of the Weeks Act, so-called, and not only to the terms and provisions of the Weeks Act, but to all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto. So the consent of the State of Maine would be required under this bill to whatever legislation might hereafter be enacted by the Congress of the United States, amendatory or supplemental to the Weeks Act.

Now if we vote here to transfer to the Federal Government sovereignty over this vast territory, as large as three of our counties, what do we get in return? In return, we get relief from the burden of taxation for a few land owners in certain parts of the State who would like to unload their lands upon the Federal Government, and that is about all we get in return.

The gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Weatherbee, indicated that the Federal Government provided fire pro-

tection for these forests. Maybe it would. I do not know about that. I know that there is nothing in this bill that requires it, and I know that if we pass this bill we cannot be certain what legislation the Federal Government will pass hereafter, and what the effect will be. I have been informed, in connection with that part of the New Hampshire National Forest which lies in Oxford county, that a great fire took place there, I believe in the town of Gilead, and when it was proposed that the men from one of the CCC camps be sent to fight that forest fire, the report came back that it was impossible for that CCC camp to do so without receiving orders from Washington.

There are two terms which I generally dislike to use, because I think they are so often misused, and so loosely applied. Those terms are class legislation and special privileges. But if ever there was class legislation, it is here; if ever there was special privilege, it lies in this bill, for the bill is of benefit to a small group of land owners, and not to the people of the State of Maine as a whole.

Why, I wonder, should persons owning certain wild lands be relieved of taxes by turning them over to the Federal Government any more than one who operates a hotel which is not profitable for the time being should be relieved of his taxes, in the same way—or anyone who operates a shoe factory or who owns any other kind of property. My friends, if this bill is desirable, if it is proper, why should it be limited to particular areas of the State? If it is desirable and proper to allow land owners to relieve themselves of taxation in that manner, why should not that privilege be extended to the land owners of Somerset and Piscataquis and Lincoln counties?

I should like to read from an editorial from the Bangor Daily Commercial of April 3, 1935. The editorial refers to this measure with which we are now concerned, and says in part: "This measure should be designated as a scheme to unload certain lands upon the Federal Government, for it attempts to restrict permission to the National Government to certain localities, a most extraordinary proceeding and one that violates every principle of fair play.

"If the National Government is to be permitted to purchase land

for national parks in Maine, a commission sharply opposed by George Otis Smith, former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, as subversive to State rights and an offense to State sovereignty, why should there be any restrictions of choice, why should not any land owners have the chance of disposing of their lands? Why should lands in Somerset, Piscataquis and Hancock counties and a great part of Penobscot be rendered unavailable, when some of the very best areas for park purposes are in these counties?

"To our mind, the bill is little other than a racket, its peculiar and unfair limitations giving some substance to the report heard at Augusta of large personal interests involved and the determination of promoters to unload certain lands rather than to leave the Federal Government free choice in selection.

"The bill as originally drawn would have permitted such choice. It now can be amended to make all areas open to the Government for selection, provided the assent of owners is secured. The report is now brought in, in the closing days of the session, as one lobbyist for the measure stated would be done, in order that the bill shall not be too carefully scrutinized.

"It is not too late for the lawmakers to look into this bill, learn all of its potentialities and turn down a measure that is unfair to Maine's interests and is pushed by a small coterie for personal reasons."

Now the question of taxes has been mentioned here by several of the gentlemen who have already addressed the House, and the question of how much would be lost in taxes. Some of the towns within the areas in which this Federal forest would lie—I think there were distributed in the House,—at any rate I found upon my desk—a list of the taxes on resident and non-resident property in some thirty towns included in this area. The town of Amity, in Aroostook county, has a total tax on all property of \$71,075, and the tax on non-resident property, presumably mostly forest lands, was \$4,427. If we pass this bill, what shall we say to the people of Amity when we take more than one-half of the taxable land from that town? And so on down through the list. I will not take

your time to speak of others, but town after town has a situation in which one-half or more than one-half of its revenue is from lands which would be turned over to the Federal Government under this bill.

It has been estimated that there would be a total loss of revenue to these towns of some \$152,226, leaving a balance of \$66,044 with which to run and operate those towns.

The advocates of this measure will say that the loss in taxes will be made up, will be repaid, because the Federal Government is to return to the State thirty-five per cent of the gross yield or income from these lands. Now the Weeks Act provided that the Federal Government should return five per cent of the gross yield, and, later, it was amended, and it may be amended tomorrow, returning it to five per cent or even cutting it down to nothing, for we place it within the powers of Congress to do so with respect to this land, if we pass this bill. Hence it is impossible to say how much money will be received from the bill, and how much the Government is going to return.

Perhaps the nearest I can come to it would be to look at the situation in that part of Oxford county embraced within the New Hampshire National Forest, and see what the situation has been there. There are 33,000 acres in Oxford county within that Forest District, and the revenue derived by those several towns in 1928 before the Forest District was established amounted to \$34,393. This is an estimate. I do not give it as being exactly accurate, but I went to one of the departments in the State House and obtained all available figures, and I believe that this estimate is certainly on the conservative side. There was a revenue from that land of \$5,732.26 which was lost when these lands were turned over to the Federal Government in 1929.

Now what have those towns received in return for that loss of revenue? They received in 1929, the first year, to replace \$57,000, \$1,416.-10; in 1930, they received \$1,822.90; in 1931, they received \$803.59. In 1932, those funds from the Federal Government had shrunk to \$308.76; in 1933, \$91.01; in 1934 \$438.18. Those latter figures are taken from the reports of the State of Maine Forest Commissioner. So for a

period of six years the amount lost in taxes in that 33,000 acres was approximately \$35,000. The amount received from the Federal Government was \$4,880.55, or a net loss of approximately \$30,000. For the sake of getting a rough estimate, if you figure the same proportion as applied to this territory of 600,000 acres, you would have a loss in six years of over a half million dollars in revenue in this State, after you had deducted the receipts from the Federal Government.

Now at the hearing, a gentleman from Washington county appeared, Mr. Cummings, one of the county commissioners, and stated that the county commissioners of that county were absolutely opposed to the passage of this bill, because of the loss in revenue that would be certain to follow.

Now let us look at the thing this way for just a moment: Suppose that in a town three-quarters of the land is wild land or forest land. Suppose the Federal Government, under this bill comes here and acquires that three-quarters and takes it as a part of its national forests. That relieves the owners of that three-quarters land from their duty to pay the taxes, but it is done at the expense of the remaining one quarter. The owners of that remaining one quarter are required to assume the burden of the expense of running that town. That has happened with some of these towns in Oxford county. That has happened, I am informed, with the town of Mason, in Oxford county, after their land was taken over from the town of Mason and put into this national forest. The owners of the remainder of that land found themselves overburdened with taxation and unable to run the town, and they have come here to this Legislature and presented a bill to be de-organized because it was the only course left open to them. And I venture to say, my friends, that if this bill is passed, it is the beginning of a de-organization parade in the State of Maine, and town after town will come here with bills like that.

We saw a similar experiment connected with the Auxiliary Forest Law by which the lands were relieved of taxation by legislation passed in the session of 1931, and the result was such in the town of

Mason that in 1933 we repealed that law on account of the tax situation.

Now, my friends, I have talked a long time—perhaps altogether too long, but I feel that this is a matter of tremendous significance and let us be sure that we make no mistake when we pass this bill, because if this bill is passed, our rights of sovereignty over that land are gone, and gone forever. Forever is a long time. We cannot come back here and repeal this if we find we have made a mistake because it will be too late. We come here, representative people, and I wonder how many of our constituents understand this bill. I wonder how many of them favor this bill. I wonder how many of them urge its passage.

I have no connection with any land owners who might be interested in this. I own no forest land myself. I have no connection with any corporation which might be opposed to it, and I have no direct personal interest in the bill in any way, shape or manner, but I do have at heart what I believe to be the best interests of the people of this State, and I urge you, my friends, to vote no on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta (Mr. Mace), and I believe that the time may come when the people of the State of Maine will like to look back in the record and see how we voted on a matter as important as this, and so, Mr. Speaker, I ask that when the vote is taken, it be by the yeas and nays.

Mr. SEABURY of Yarmouth: Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the Eighty-seventh Legislature: I hesitate slightly to take much of your time because the time is getting short and we have much to do, but so far during this session I have attempted to be very brief, and I will attempt to be very brief again, although the point which the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Hill), has just brought to our attention does open up a wide opportunity for at least a difference of opinion. I am not going to answer many, and perhaps I will fail to answer any of the objections which he has so well stated.

I agree with the gentleman that it is a very, very important measure, a most significant one, as he indicates, but I do not agree with him that his recommendation carries out the importance that I attach to this measure. He speaks of

the large area of land which the Federal Government is about to acquire or would like to acquire, and to my mind those figures are very misleading because they represent an almost imperceptible percentage of the total area of the State of Maine which, if I am informed correctly, is some 30,000 square miles, which is equal to 19,200,000 acres, and certainly 600,000 or even a million acres is not going to put us all out of the State. There is going to be plenty of room after the Federal Government acquires a million acres or three million acres.

Things are good or bad by comparison. I am very much in favor of the majority report, because I believe that the good points outweigh the bad points, and that is the only criterion by which we can weigh any proposition.

The fears that the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill, has stated are well taken, but the facts still remain that the advantages to be gained outweigh the disadvantages ten to one. Of course there are some disadvantages, but the good points outweigh the bad points. I further believe that some of the fears that have been suggested here are the product of the mind only. These men have pictured a situation which may exist, which might become a fact. They cannot prove it. I do not believe it. I might not be accused of being a man of any great faith, but I certainly have faith to believe that the sun will rise tomorrow morning, although I cannot prove it. Because of the ability of others here to go into these things a great deal better than I can, I am not going to use very much more of your time; but this proposition reminds me of a situation which existed in my home town twenty-five or thirty years ago, when a man wanted to build an electric railroad. His name was Gerald—probably many of you know him. He wanted to locate his track through a certain part of our town, and two corporations had very good reason for objecting to his contemplated location and attempted to prevent him from locating his electric railroad there. They were represented by one of the ablest lawyers that the State of Maine has ever produced—I mean the late Herbert M. Heath; and he went over the ground with the party and proved to them beyond any reasonable doubt that they could not put

a railroad there; it could not be done.

Mr. Gerald said: "You may know more law than I do, but when you come to building a railroad, you are not worth a damn. That railroad went right down where Mr. Gerald wanted it to.

Now I will acknowledge all of the members here know more law than I do, but I claim, if you want to build a great State, a glorious State, one which has a future in this direction, we will pass this bill. (Applause.)

Mr. BOUCHER of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. (Cries of no, no.)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Boucher, moves the previous question. In order for the Chair to entertain that motion, one-third of the members present must assent. All those in favor of the Chair entertaining the motion for the previous question will rise.

A division was had.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Obviously one-third of the members present not have arisen, the motion does not prevail. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bethel, Mr. Hastings.

Mr. HASTINGS of Bethel: Mr. Speaker, I shall have to disagree with my good friend Mr. Hill in regard to the fire at Gilead because I happened to be there at that fire, and if it had not been for the Government sending over CCC men, the whole unorganized town of Riley would have burned over. (Applause)

Now in regard to what he says about Mason, I happen to know about Mason Town. Mason Town has got only six families in the town, and there were two families that moved out of the town this last year, and they had to pay over \$3,000 for the poor in those other towns. That is the reason that Mason is coming down here and asking for de-organization because they have got only six families in town, and two families outside of the town that they have to pay poor expenses on of over \$3,000. (Applause)

Mr. PHAIR of Caswell: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to state my stand on this question. I am against this proposition. The able proponents have painted us a beautiful picture, but it is all in the future. It is an indefinite date.

Now we must deal with the immediate future. The fact remains

there would be a period of time when revenue would be lost to these towns. What will become of them in the meantime? I believe in the old adage: "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush."

Mr. VAUGHAN of South Berwick: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of reluctance and a good deal of fear that I get up to say anything in opposition to the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill. I am on the same committee with him, and I have more than respect for him, I have admiration, but I feel that you may misunderstand something of his reasoning. I do not doubt his facts, but you know the old theory, that you can do anything with figures. I can prove one thing by figures, and Mr. Hill can prove the opposite with the same figures. It is like a law case, because sometimes you have an accident case and you bring in a lot of experts, that is, the plaintiff does, and you draw up affidavits to prove your case. The defendant brings in perhaps the same number, or one or two more experts in affidavits to prove his case, and you do not get anywhere at all. So I believe figures are most misleading.

Now what is the experience throughout the country on these national forests? I do not think any man has intimated that they haven't been successful and have helped the states who had them. I have seen them in California and the western states. I have traversed all the states of the Union, and I understand what they talk about out there. I think, without exception, these national forests have been a tremendous benefit. They have attracted thousands and thousands of people from all over the country. The fact that some deorganization might take place in these towns,—I am not very clear about it—but I happen to know that there was a big Massachusetts concern that had a petition this year for de-organization simply because they were paying all the taxes anyway, and the people who did not pay taxes were running the town and making more taxes. So the de-organizing is on both sides.

The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill, made a point—an excellent point, as he always does—on the matter of why this land that is to be taken is restricted. The reason for that is this: That there were certain private indus-

tries that thought they might be hurt, industries that Maine wants to keep and encourage. They thought they might be hurt by a general law giving parks anywhere in the State. The objections of these industries were met by these restrictions, so they are not going to leave the State.

Then I do not think anybody mentioned what I am very much interested in. These parks are bird sanctuaries, and they would be the same for animal sanctuaries. You all know that Maine lost its caribou and a lot of other things. The canvas-back ducks are almost extinct now because there are no sanctuaries.

Oxford county, which was mentioned, is in a very different situation. At the hearing which I attended no one from Oxford county appeared. If they were having a devil of a time, why didn't they come in and say: "This is not working right". Not a bit of it.

Then the matter of the Legislature giving up its sovereignty is a little misleading, because in this so-called Weeks Act, which Mr. Hill said could be changed, the proponents of this bill, on the suggestion of the members of the Judiciary committee, were very careful to see that the jurisdictional authority was preserved to the State in the Weeks Act, so you can go on there and arrest people without civil or criminal process. Do you know what that means, that reservation to the states in the Weeks Act? We were afraid it might be changed or taken away, so we put a paragraph in this present bill making a reservation of that jurisdictional authority, so whatever happens in Congress, they cannot take that jurisdiction away from us. (Applause)

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: Just one word in reference to the remarks of my good friend from Cooper, Mr. Clarke. I will say that I am in no doubt on this matter. I am going to vote yes.

My friend from South Portland (Mr. Hill) made some reference to the lobby. I have had some experience in the Legislature, and in this matter, and I can see the hand of the most powerful lobby that ever infested the State House.

Now brushing aside all of the fog and the mist that is surrounding the bill, what is the meat of it?

It is just this: If I am the owner of any timberlands in this State, which I am not, it gives me the right, if I so desire, to sell it to the Federal Government for conservation purposes. This is a conservation measure, a conservation measure only. Are you afraid of the Federal Government? Are you afraid that they may put \$30,000,000 into the Quoddy project? Do you want that, or do you not? Do you want them to continue the \$11,000,000 that they have sent into this State in the last two years for relief and employment? Do you want that to continue or do you want it to stop? That is the question and the only question. (Applause)

Mr. DEERING: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: Just one more word. I believe no one in this country knows more about this subject than Dr. Austin Cary. He was born in Machias, and was and is a resident of the State of Maine, and is well known throughout the country for his forestry work. He is opposed to this bill. Who does not know the ability and integrity of Mr. George Otis Smith? He also is opposed to this bill, as you heard very emphatically at the hearing the other day. Let us make this a conservation measure for Maine and vote no.

Mr. YOUNG of York: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I had sworn I would not say anything in regard to this measure, but I have changed my mind.

Two years ago a similar bill was presented to this Legislature. I fought that bill from the time it came in until it was passed against my vote. I took the stand then, and I still stand in the same place, that I will oppose any measure that will remove from this Legislature their power to legislate. I will oppose any measure that will in any way throw any additional tax burden on any people of the State of Maine; and I will oppose further any measure that will give the Federal Government any right in any way to go into business against private business. (Applause)

Mr. SHAW of Milbridge: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Milbridge, Mr. Shaw, now moves the previous question. Before the Chair can en-

tain this motion, there is required 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 of the House was had.

The SPEAKER pro tem: More than one-third of the members having obviously 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.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill, 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 pro tem: More than a sufficient number obviously having arisen, a yea and nay vote is ordered.

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Will the Speaker state the question?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Mace, to accept the majority report in new draft. The Clerk will call the roll.

YEAS—Alden, Allan; Austin, Parkman; Belaire, Boucher, Bramson, Brown, Burgess, Burrill, Bushey, Carleton, Carswell, Churchill; Clark, Plymouth; Connolly, Cook, Cote, Crosby, Cummings, Currier; Davis, Newfield; Demers, Desmond, Donahue; Dovie, Caribou; Doyle, Skowhegan; Drisko, Eddy; Ellis, Castle Hill; Ellis, Rangeley; Eveleth, Findlen, Flanders; Fogg, Rockland; Forbes; Forgue, Lewiston; Fortin, Gibbons; Gray, Presque Isle; Harriman, Prospect; Hastings, Hathorn, Heald, Hearn, Hescocock, Hobbs, Jacobson, Jandreau, Kilroy, Labbee, Lancaster, Latno, Lausier, Lebel, Leclair, Lindsey, Mace, MacKenzie, Maheu; Martin, Dexter; Martin, Oakland; Newton, Philbrick, Poulin, Proctor, Rush, Ryder, Sawyer, Scates, Seabury, Sleeper; Smith, Van

Buren; Stoddard; Thompson, Belfast; Thurston, Vaughan, Wallace, Weatherbee, Wentworth, Wheeler, Willey, Worthen, Wright.

NAYS—Austin, Exeter; Ayer, Bragdon, Bubar, Burnham, Cambridge, Campbell; Chase, Baring; Chase, Limington; Chase, Sebec; Clarke, Cooper; Cole, Coolidge, Crowell; Davis, Fairfield; Deering, Dennett, Devereux, Dorr, Dow, Elliot, Fowles, Gleason, Goss, Graves, Hagan, Hall, Hammond; Harriman, Gardiner; Haskell, Higgins, Hill, Kendrick, King, Leonard, Mallett, Mason, McKay, Mosher, Noyes, Oliver, Palmer, Parsons, Patterson, Phair, Pike, Roach, Russ, Sennett, Sewall, Shaw, Sprague, Stickney, Stillphen, Story, Tupper, Webber, Woodbury, Young.

ABSENT—Donovan; Gray, Brooksville; Jillson, Lewis, Payson, Richardson; Smith, Bangor; Thompson, Chelsea.

83 yes.

59 no.

8 absent.

Mr. Martin of Dexter addressed the Chair during the roll call as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refrain from voting on account of personal interest.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may not be excused while the roll is being called.

Mr. MARTIN: Then I vote yes, Mr. Speaker.

Eighty-three having voted in the affirmative and 59 in the negative, the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Mace, to accept the majority report prevailed.

Mr. MACE: Mr. Speaker, I move that under suspension of the rules, the bill have its three several readings and be passed to be engrossed.

Mrs. LATNO of Old Town: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recess until 1.30.

Mr. BURNHAM of Kittery: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a second reading for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. MACE: Mr. Speaker, I insist upon my motion that the rules be suspended.

The SPEAKER pro tem: It is not necessary to suspend the rules for the first two readings.

Thereupon the bill had its two several readings.

Mr. MACE: I now move that it have its third reading under suspension of the rules and be passed to be engrossed.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer House Amendment A.

The SPEAKER pro tem: A two-thirds vote is required for suspension of the rules. The question before the House is on the motion of Mr. Mace of Augusta that the rules be suspended and the bill receive its third reading at this time, and such a motion requires a two-thirds vote. All those in favor will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had. Seventy-eight voting in the affirmative and one in the negative, the rules were suspended and the bill given its third reading.

Mr. BURNHAM of Kittery: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A and move its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to S. P. 715, L. D. 911.

Amend said bill by adding after Section 3, a new section numbered 4 as follows:

"That no land shall be acquired under this act until the town or plantation in which the land is located has voted by a majority ballot at a legal meeting called for that purpose, its assent to purchase."

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, I am opposed entirely to that amendment because it would practically kill the bill. Now this House has voted, and why not be sportsmen-like and take your medicine. (Applause)

Mr. PROCTOR of Naples: Mr. Speaker, I intended to address the House relative to this matter before the vote was taken, but was unable to be recognized until the previous question was called for.

We have already practically legislated one town out of existence by passing the State Park Commission bill. I understand that in the little town of Camden more than half the taxable property has been acquired by the Federal Government on this park bill, permitting it to be made a National Park.

As I understand the opposition here was addressed to the unfairness to these towns where large areas of this land would be acquired by the Federal government. It seems to me only fair and right that these towns should have a local option in the matter with the right to decide whether or not the benefit derived from this measure through any expenditure by the

Federal government will offset their perpetual loss of revenue on their taxable property. It seems to me that there might be sufficient wild lands and unorganized territory for the Federal Government to accomplish its purpose under this measure without imposing it upon the towns which, as a whole, are opposed to the measure.

Mr. THOMPSON of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, I rise to differ with the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Burnham, because this bill to permit National Forests does not take away one-half of the taxable property from the town of Lincolnville.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am only quoting from what I understood at the time of the hearing.

Mr. THOMPSON: Under the present plan, it might be one-third.

Mr. FORTIN of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I was told last night that in case the bill passed this House there would be one and perhaps two amendments presented aimed at killing the bill. The first one is objectionable and I think there is another amendment somewhere in this House at the present time equally objectionable. I move that this amendment be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. VAUGHAN of South Berwick: Mr. Speaker, as I understand this amendment before any inhabitant of a town or plantation can sell his own property, he will have to have the consent of the town to do so. (Laughter) If I want to move somewhere to get warm and sell my property and go South, I would have to have this consent under the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Fortin, to indefinitely postpone the amendment. All those in favor will say aye, contrary minded, no.

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

Thereupon the bill was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mrs. Latno of Old Town

Recessed until 1.45 p. m.

Afternoon Session

Speaker pro tem Devereux in the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tem: We are still proceeding under Orders of

the Day, and the Chair lays before the House the third matter tabled and today assigned, House Amendment A to bill an act relating to licenses for retail stores, H. P. 609, L. D. 180, tabled April 5 by Mr. Lebel of Brunswick, pending adoption; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. LEBEL: Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House: It is not my intention or desire to take much of your time, but I think I should explain somewhat my remarks of yesterday pertaining to this amendment. I feel that the present law is not right, and I have the opinion on that score of high officials in charge of the administration of the law. I do not wish to quote anybody, but I understand it would not make any new revenue to pay for the administration of the law.

I would like to show you the effect of this amendment in dollars and cents. The chain stores now pay a fee of \$7.00 for two stores. In the first place the annual fee for one store will not be affected. They will still pay \$1.00 a store. A chain of two stores will be increased from \$7.00 to \$10.00 or \$20.00 for the two stores; a chain of three stores would pay \$25.00 each or \$75.00 in all. A chain of four stores would pay \$40.00 each or \$160.00 in all. A chain of five stores, up to and including twenty-five, would pay \$50.00 for each store. In a chain of over twenty-five in number, they would pay \$100.00 for each store.

Now I have a list here of all the chain stores in the State, over five in number. The Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company pay over \$9,000 for 206 stores; the First National with 198 stores pay nine thousand and some dollars; twenty-one F. W. Woolworth stores pay \$306.50. Under the amendment they would pay \$1,050.00 for twenty-one stores. Three hundred and six dollars is a very small tax. The sole purpose of the amendment is to increase the rate established in the higher bracket, and the total increase in revenue would be \$40,790.00 from the chains alone. By "chains" I mean stores more than two in number.

For the benefit of the House, I would like to have the Clerk read the first section of the amendment. (The Clerk reads)

Mr. LEBEL continuing: You see it exempts stores where they have less than \$25.00 in stock and trade

and also takes in places where they sell gasoline, oil and so forth. I think that in justice to the local merchants this tax should be raised a little in the higher brackets, and I have worked out this amendment, as I told you yesterday after consulting with the Bureau of Taxation; and I feel that it is only fair and just. After talking with most of the members of the House, I have found very few who were not in favor of it. I move that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. MASON of Mechanic Falls: Mr. Speaker, two years ago the Eighty-sixth Legislature enacted a law known as the Chain Store Law. In order to make it constitutional, a nominal fee of \$1.00 was placed on one store, graded up to the point where the larger chains paid \$50.00 per store. There was considerable question at the time as to the equity of this law. However, it was passed, and now, as some of us would expect, it is assumed that it is entirely just. But I would call your attention to the fact that the same arguments are existent at this time as two years ago.

I have heard a great many in this House express their sentiments on a sales tax, and a great many who subscribed to a sales tax recommended that food, fuel and clothing should be exempted from it. Now this is a sales tax, and as far as practical workings are concerned in the State of Maine, it is almost entirely confined to food. With these larger chains, when this tax is assessed upon them their business methods are such that it is passed along directly to the consumer in price advances. It does not seem to me that this House would subscribe to an increased sales tax of this nature.

If necessary, I feel that there are a number of the members of this House, myself included, who are entirely willing to argue this to its completion. This is the last day, we hope, of this Legislature, and I hope that this will not be necessary. I trust that the members of this House will recognize that, if they change these rates in this chain store tax, they are effecting interests and a number of people that they do not know about. Two years ago when these rates were established, it was found necessary to change them a number of times. Small merchants who have more than one store, perhaps have two

stores, a branch in a small town, were affected in that way; but when the hearing was advertised they came here to Augusta and stated their position, and even the most enthusiastic supporters of this Chain Store Bill revised the rates to try and take care of these various conditions. Now if we increase those rates and change them at this time no member of this House knows who will be affected nor how they will be affected; and I hope that the House supports my motion to indefinitely postpone this amendment.

Mr. WILLEY of Falmouth: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted to give the gentleman from Weston, Mr. Crowell, permission to offer an amendment solely for the purpose of arguing that bill. And later on the question of whether or not we would adopt the majority report of the committee, ought not to pass, on a combined income and sales tax, I voted against it.

Two years ago I was here at the hearing on this very question, and Mr. Adams of Boston, a representative of one of the chain stores, came before the committee and told that committee that any tax that might be levied on the stores would be ultimately borne by the taxpayer and consumer, and that is true. There are only three taxes known that are not borne by the tax bearer; and I mean by that the man who ultimately pays the tax. One is the inheritance tax, another is the poll tax, and the third is the tax on the monopolistic articles. If this amendment is adopted it just faces a tax on the people who can least afford to pay it, because all the merchants do is to increase the price of the groceries or whatever the products may be that they sell. I am in entire sympathy with the motion of the gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Mason, and I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lebel, will be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is the House ready for the question? The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mechanic Falls, Mr. Mason, to indefinitely postpone the amendment. All those in favor will say aye, contrary-minded no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had, Thirty-one voting in the affirmative and 66 in the negative the mo-

tion to indefinitely postpone failed of passage.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question is now on the adoption of the amendment.

A viva voce vote being taken, the amendment was adopted.

Thereupon the rules were suspended, the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended.

Mr. GOSS of Poland: Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to address the House briefly.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may do so if there is no objection.

Mr. GOSS: Mr. Speaker, with regard to my objection of yesterday on outline of plan for relief, rehabilitation, protection and enhancement of agriculture and dairying in the State of Maine, I still object to the bill; but in order that I may give the proponents of this measure an opportunity to discuss the matter I will offer a bill and ask unanimous consent of the House for its acceptance. This bill is identically the same as the one which I objected to yesterday. Because of the Rule I am unable to move reconsideration of our action of yesterday whereby we refused unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Mr. Goss of Poland moves to suspend the rules that he may present a bill.

Mr. FINDLEN of Fort Fairfield: Mr. Speaker, do we have a chance to discuss this bill before its presentation?

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to address the House?

Mr. FINDLEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. (Permission was granted the gentleman to address the House)

Mr. FINDLEN: Mr. Speaker, gentlemen and ladies of the House: I wish to thank the gentleman from Poland (Mr. Goss) for giving me this chance to explain this proposition to the House of Representatives.

This is an emergency measure and I hope that you will pardon us for introducing it at this time, but it is a very, very necessary thing for the health, happiness and prosperity of this State. This is a State-wide bill and gives an opportunity not only for potato men but for dairymen and orchardists and any other agricultural group in the State of Maine to borrow funds from the National government.

Now, as you can readily see in today's paper, the Government has passed its relief measure of \$4,880,000,000. We feel in our county that certain groups of our people are up against it, that we have only limited facilities for credit. Hundreds of men will use this credit in the ordinary way. They will come from the banks or from credit corporations that are now in existence. Small men will get their loans from the government loan agencies, but there is a group in the middle there that has exhausted its credit and is now on the verge of complete ruin. Now we do not ask you to give us anything, we just ask you to give us the opportunity to carry on. I do not believe there is a man in this House who wants to go on record as kicking the last block out from under the farmers of Aroostook county or any other county of the State. We do not ask you to appropriate money; we are just asking you to give us the chance to form a corporation to distribute funds that the government says we can have for this purpose. Our men need credit. Our men need money to carry on with, and we are merely asking you to give us the chance to form this corporation of business men to distribute these funds on a per acre basis, or on any other basis that may be necessary in the dairy business, in the apple business or in any other agricultural business.

In the first part of this session, if you will remember, you gave the plowmen a boost. You also gave them a little money to carry on with. We are not asking you for loans; we are just asking you for a chance to live, a chance to give our men an opportunity to plant a crop again; and if this year pans out half decently, those men will come across, they will pay their bills and they will take their place where you would like to have them. If you do not give them this chance, you will just create another group of paupers on the hands of the State. If you do give them a chance, you will save them from going into bankruptcy, and I think you ought to do it.

Now we are asking that you set up the sum of five thousand dollars for administrative purposes. That is a very small amount of money when you consider that Aroostook county does not even plow its winter roads. We saved this State

from ten, twenty to thirty thousand dollars just by that fact. Now if you will just loan us—we are not asking you to give us five thousand dollars, we are just asking you to loan it to us for the purpose of setting up this corporation, just for a time. We will pay back every cent of it.

The Warren bill is a bill that is being started in Congress, has been in there for several months. I don't know whether it is going to pass this session or not; it is a control measure, so that perhaps in the future we will not be over-producing as we are at the present time.

As you know, we have had in the last four years only one good one, that is what puts us down—three or four poor years and only one good one—and in that year the Federal government loaned us through the Relief Agency set-up here quite a sizable sum of money. That was paid back in full. Last year we formed a Protective Credit Association to take care of credit. That association loaned us money and we have paid back a certain amount of that but we cannot pay it all back this year not with thirty or forty cent potatoes.

This bill allows us to borrow money through the Federal government in such an amount as these men may see fit to loan to the farmers. I think we have contributed in Aroostook county generously toward the taxes of this State. We have contributed generously toward the processing tax on bags and hogs and what not. We have not asked for anything and I think we ought to have a chance to live.

Now I am not pleading for myself or for hundreds of other farmers who can finance themselves. I am pleading for the farmers who are right on the edge and who are going to get kicked off. What happens to this land that they had? This land goes back to the big corporations and those big corporations grab up this land, drive the ordinary farmer off and then he has to go on the town for support to have a chance to live.

I think you ought to consider it carefully before you turn down this opportunity to give not only Aroostook county but every other farmer in the State to win back for himself that place on his own farm.

Mr. PAYSON of Brooks: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tem: For

what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PAYSON: I was going to speak on this same subject.

Thereupon the rules were suspended and the gentleman given permission to speak.

Mr. PAYSON: Mr. Speaker, what I was going to say was that I do not see why any one of us here should refuse to have that bill come before us at that time. If there is any way by which you can help out these people, I should think we ought to do it. If we do not, we shall have to come back here in Special Session and raise money, the same as we did at the first of the session.

Unanimous consent was given Mr. Goss to introduce his bill under suspension of the rules, entitled bill an act for the relief, rehabilitation, protection and enhancement of agriculture and dairying in the State of Maine, H. P. 1873.

(Bill read by the Clerk)

On motion by Mr. Findlen, the rules were suspended, and the bill was given its three several readings and passed to be engrossed.

Conference Report

The Committee on Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on bill an act requiring owners of certain motor vehicles and trailers to furnish security for their civil liability on account of personal injuries and property damage caused by their motor vehicles and trailers, H. P. 1848, L. D. 905, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report that the committee recommends the acceptance of Report B, ought not to pass of both branches, the report being signed by the following members of the committee:

(Signed)

Messrs: Willey of Falmouth
Hill of South Portland
Jacobson of Portland
—Committee on part of House
Burkett of Cumberland
Fernald of Waldo
Blaisdell of Hancock
—Committee on part of Senate

Report of the committee was accepted.

Thereupon the House voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, and also voted to reconsider its action whereby it voted to accept report A, ought to pass in new draft.

Thereupon the House voted to accept Report B, ought not to pass. Sent up for concurrence.

Passed to be Enacted (Emergency Measure)

H. P. 1072, L. D. 406: An act establishing in the town of Sanford a representative town government.

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

A division being had,

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

Passed to be Enacted (Emergency Measure)

S. P. 702, L. D. 927: An act to create and allocate a general highway fund for state road, state aid, and third-class highway construction, and to temporarily suspend certain statutes.

Tabled by Mr. Thompson of Belfast, pending passage to be enacted, a viva voce vote being taken, until later in the day.

S. P. 717, L. D. 926: An act appropriating moneys for anticipated overdrafts for which no legislative appropriation has been made, and for obligations for which no appropriations were made.

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

A division being had,

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

Passed to be Enacted

S. P. 190, L. D. 140: An act relative to the making of local regulations for fishing by the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game

(S. P. No. 390) (L. D. No. 426)
An act to amend the law relating to Loan and Building Associations

(S. P. No. 714) (L. D. No. 910)
An act relating to the practice of chiropractic

(S. P. No. 716) (L. D. No. 917)
An act relating to tenure of office of Town Manager of Fort Fairfield

(H. P. No. 218) (L. D. No. 919)
An act to acquire the American portion of the International Bridge at Baring in Washington County, and to provide for its maintenance

(H. P. No. 1197) (L. D. No. 498)
An act decreasing the subsidy contributed by the State relative to education

H. P. 1849, L. D. 914: An act relative to bounty on bears.

Mr. WORTHEN of Corinth: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill.

I have been requested by several sportsmen to oppose this measure and it is my wish, briefly, to explain the situation in regard to this bill. It seems that the proponents of this bill complain that the bear are destroying a few sheep in some of the outlying sections, and for that reason are asking for a bounty on bear. Perhaps some of you think this is of no particular importance, but it seems to me that it may mean a great deal in dollars and cents in our State as well as involving the possibility of lowering our prestige as a great game section. Not many years ago we had large herds of buffalo in the West which we recklessly slaughtered just for the sake of killing. Many of you can remember that the moose and caribou were once plentiful in this State. Now the caribou are gone forever and the moose are rapidly diminishing. Statistics also show that the bear, which is our most valuable game animal are also on the decrease and now a move is being made to wipe out from our State one of the greatest game animals in North America.

In reference to the damage done to the sheep, there are many months in the year when the bear do no damage whatever. As a rule they den up in the fall, generally the last of November and remain there until some time in March. This means that there are at least four months in the year that they will do no damage whatever to property. As a rule, sheep are not turned out to pasture by the farmers until some time in June and this makes about

six months that they will do no damage to sheep.

In talking with many resident and non-resident hunters in the past few years, I find that they are unanimously agreed on the fact that bears are one of our greatest game animals. What will happen if we pass this bill? A few trappers will get all the bear and they can trap their game in any section of the State and collect the bounty. It will mean a disgraceful racket. As an illustration, a few years ago I knew of one particular trapper who captured from twenty-five to thirty bears all over the State of Maine and hauled them into this particular section and collected this bounty. I do not believe we should pass any bill to permit any such situation as that. Now many of our leading industries are gradually slipping away, and I believe that the greatest asset in the State of Maine today is its recreational advantages, which include hunting and fishing; it seems to me that a majority of our citizens are working to make our fishing and hunting conditions better in Maine.

Mr. AYER of Union: Mr. Speaker, this bear proposition was threshed out at a hearing before the Fish and Game committee especially with reference to its bearing on agricultural conditions. All those who were here were in favor of establishing a bounty of twenty dollars—the old bounty I believe was twenty-five dollars—and it was unanimously believed by that Joint committee that this was the amount that we should recommend.—twenty dollars bounty on bear. There was no opposition to it at the hearing that I recall, and it seems to me that these Joint committees were about as well able to speak on this subject as one individual.

Mr. RUSS of Woodstock: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to oppose this bill. I come from a section where bears do damage. The gentleman speaks of the bear as a game animal. That is true, I will agree; but the places where the bounty would be put on them sportsmen do not go into those sections hunting bear for sport. It might induce a few trappers to go in and help catch some of the bears that are doing damage. I have seen in my own section my own flock of sheep completely wiped out. I kept twenty-five to thirty sheep, very

good ones. I turned them out in the spring and the bear got among them and killed them off so that I only had four or five left. I sold them as soon as I could and have not kept any sheep since, and that was eight or ten years ago. It is true that the State pays for what sheep the farmers can find, and prove were killed by bear; but there are many that they cannot find that are driven out of the pastures and they lose a great many of them. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Corinth (Mr. Worthen) will prevail.

Mr. PROCTOR of Naples: Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the postponement of this bill. I feel that a great many of us would be willing to give \$25 to shoot a bear. There may be some sections where bears are too thick, but it looks to me like class legislation, and I am not in favor of it.

Mr. CLARKE of Cooper: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I am sorry to feel that I have to rise to oppose the postponement of the bill. I did not suppose it would be necessary to have any further discussion after the Fish and Game committee and the Agriculture committee, the combination of the two, unanimously reported it ought to pass.

It is true that bears do damage. Not all bears are sheep-killers, but some are, and once they get started, they are very bad. A bear is a game animal, but so is a bobcat.

Now this bounty on bears does not apply all over the State. It simply applies in portions of the State, "when bears are destroying sheep, cattle, or any other kind of valuable domestic animals in any town, plantation or unincorporated place. The assessors of such town or plantation may petition the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game to place a bounty on bears killed within such town or plantation or in any adjoining town, plantation or unincorporated place or places, and in the case of unincorporated places a similar petition may be filed by the assessors of any adjoining town or of the nearest incorporated town where there are none adjoining . . ."

Now upon such a petition the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game sends a representative who investigates and holds a hearing in the town to see whether

damage is really being done by bears, and if so, a bounty may be placed on bears shot in that place.

We think it is a good thing, and it is an absolutely necessary thing if we are going to raise sheep. The bounty has been reduced under this law from \$25 to \$20; and I might say in regard to the bounty that it is paid from the receipts from dog licenses; it does not come out of appropriations from the State at all, but it is paid by the money which is sent in from dog licenses. I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone will not prevail.

Mr. WORTHEN: Mr. Speaker, a few years ago we had a bounty on bears, and it was not satisfactory, and in June, 1933, this bill was suspended for two years. I understand that the Department of Fish and Game thought that this policy that has been adopted in the past two years is much better than that in previous years.

I have just a few statistics here: In 1932-33, the last year they paid a bounty on bear, the total amount paid by the State of Maine for sheep killed by bear was a little over \$2,000. The amount paid out by the State of Maine for bounty on bear during the same year was a little over \$18,000. There is about \$16,000 in bounties over and above what the amount paid would have been.

Now we have just passed legislation here raising the hunting and fishing licenses. The hunters do not care to go out just for the sake of hunting; they like to get some game; and I am sure ninety per cent of the hunters prefer to shoot a bear rather than any other animal. It was brought out in the committee that there were two kinds of bear in Maine, good ones and bad ones. There may be a few bad bear in the country, but I believe the most of them may be in New York City. I think the bear in the State of Maine are good ones, and I hope they will have your protection.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Corinth, Mr. Worthen, to indefinitely postpone H. P. 1849, L. D. 914, an act relative to bounty on bears. Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the motion will say aye, contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,
A division of the House was had.

Twenty-nine voting in the affirmative and so many voting in the negative that the Chair was not in doubt, the motion to indefinitely postpone failed of passage.

Thereupon the bill was passed to be enacted.

Passed to be Enacted (continued)

H. P. 1850, L. D. 913: An act relative to the planting of fish in inland waters

(H. P. No. 1851) (L. D. No. 915) An act relating to assessors of Ellsworth

(H. P. No. 1853) (L. D. No. 906) An act relating to the registration of motor vehicles

(S. P. No. 649) (L. D. No. 832) Resolve appropriating money to pay the claim of Frank D. and Evelyn C. Goodwin of Hermon, against the State of Maine.

(S. P. No. 691) (L. D. No. 853) Resolve appropriating money to pay pauper claims heretofore approved by the Committee on Claims

(H. P. No. 783) (L. D. No. 908) Resolve relative to season and bag limit on smelts

Papers from the Senate, out of order.

From the Senate: Resolve in favor of Harry E. Rowell of Saco, S. P. 723.

Comes from the Senate received by unanimous consent, and under suspension of the rules, given its several readings and passed to be engrossed, without reference to a committee.

In the House, unanimous consent was given to receive the resolve, it had its two readings under suspension of the rules, and was passed to be engrossed, without reference to a committee, in concurrence.

Senate Bills in First Reading

S. P. 721, L. D. 934: Bill an act to create the Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District.

(Under suspension of the rules, the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence)

S. P. 720, L. D. 935: Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing funds necessary for maintenance, interest and retirement of bonds Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District.

(Under suspension of the rules, the resolve had its second reading

and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act relative to resident fishing and hunting licenses, S. P. 132, L. D. 79, which was passed to be engrossed in the House yesterday as amended by House Amendment B in non-concurrence.

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

Mr. WILLEY of Falmouth: Mr. Speaker, I move we concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment A; and by way of explanation I will only say that inadvertently when this amendment was offered yesterday only "fishing" was included where it was intended to include both hunting and fishing to raise the exemptions to eighteen years.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it the pleasure of the House to reconsider our action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed?

The motion prevailed.

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

On motion by Mr. Leonard of Hampden, it was voted to take from the table the first unassigned matter, communication from the State Highway Commission in regard to metal culverts tabled April 1 by that gentleman, pending consideration; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. LEONARD: Mr. Speaker, I asked for this report because salesmen living in this State wrote me asking why, when their products were of the same quality and price, they were unable to sell to the State. There was quite a delay in getting this report out.

From this report I find that there was no denial that prices and qualities of culverts submitted were not the same. The large amount of culverts purchased by towns by third-class roads are not included in this report.

In 1927, \$41,177.56 was paid for metal culverts. Of this amount, two companies received \$37,016.21, about evenly divided. In 1928, these same companies received \$37,054.29 of the \$43,426.20 worth

bought by the State. In 1929, \$69,007.81 worth was purchased, \$54,602.90 going to these same two companies. In 1930, \$118,932.21 worth was purchased, \$100,734.05 going to one of the favorite companies. In 1931, \$110,559.00 worth was purchased, and \$100,124.92 was bought from the same company that got the lion's share the previous year. In 1932, \$110,326.11 was paid for culverts. This year it was more evenly divided with other companies, but an apparently outside company got \$48,791.65, or nearly half. In 1933, \$56,261.56 worth was purchased, \$47,241.26 purchased from the two favorite companies, splitting about even. In 1934, the amount purchased was \$51,803.40, and these same companies got \$44,734.46.

You will have to form your own conclusions, for in the short time I have had since the report was received, I cannot show cause why these purchases were not more evenly divided.

The SPEAKER pro tem: What action did the gentleman wish to take on this communication?

Mr. LEONARD: Mr. Speaker, I move that this communication be placed on file.

The motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it the pleasure of the House to take up the second unassigned matter, House report ought to pass in new draft of the committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act to regulate the practices of professional engineering and land surveying; creating a board of State registration for professional engineers and land surveyors, H. P. 1220, L. D. 462, new draft H. P. 1864, L. D. 918, tabled on April 4th by the gentleman from Mt Desert, Mr. Graves, pending motion of the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Deering, to indefinitely postpone; and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mt. Desert, Mr. Graves.

Mr. GRAVES: Mr. Speaker, this new draft has been on our desks for a day or so, and I think it clears up some of the opposition which has been raised. The principal opposition to this bill has been on the land surveying clause, and under section 17 of the new draft we have made this grandfather clause, you might say, and under this clause all those who are now practicing land surveying come under this act; they cannot be excluded. If they

are doing the work in the manner they should, they cannot be excluded.

I want to say about the introduction of this bill that there were meetings held in Bangor and Waterville, in Augusta, Lewiston and Portland, and we advertised twice in the local papers, and they got all of the engineers and land surveyors in these meetings that they could. In nearly all of these meetings there were eighty or eighty-five per cent in favor of the introduction of a bill such as this, in fact, in Augusta, ninety-five out of a hundred were in favor of it.

At the hearing held before the Legal Affairs committee there were seventy-five to a hundred people in favor of this bill, such as Dean Evans of the civil engineering department of the University of Maine and Mr. Barrows, chief engineer of the State Highway Department. Prominent men came down and appeared for this measure. We had but one opponent. I feel that this matter was thoroughly advertised, and that ample notice of the hearing on this bill was given.

Since the bill came up, a slight opposition on the land surveying part of the bill has developed. I feel this is unfounded, as under the grandfather clause a man now practicing can come in under this bill inside of one year. One of the features of this bill is reciprocity with other states. There are twenty-eight states that have this same bill. An engineer going from this State to another state now has to go before their board and take an examination before he can practice in that state. If this bill is passed, he merely shows his card, and that allows him to practice in that state. This is quite an item, as Maine is an exporter of engineers. The engineer in charge of the Quoddy Dam is a Maine engineer. I feel this would be a very worthwhile thing, and probably, not for a while, but gradually, it will make it better for all of these engineers in their work, and take some of the litigation out of the courts. Everyone has had runnings which have been made by men which were not accurate,—in fact I know of someone who has a brick house, and one wall of that house is on somebody's else property.

I think this would be a great benefit to the public as well as to

the engineers in the future, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the motion of the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Deering, will not prevail.

Mr. DEERING of Hollis: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I did not realize what this bill was, not having read it over carefully. The bill was only called to my attention Thursday morning, and when I read over the bill I was really surprised to think a bill of this kind should be put in here, and, for fear someone has not read all this bill, I would like to read a few sections:

"The term 'land surveyor' as used in this act shall mean a person who engages in the practice of land surveying as hereinafter defined.

"The practice of land surveying within the meaning and intent of this act shall be held to mean surveying of areas for their correct determination and description and for conveying, or for the establishment or re-establishment of land boundaries and the plotting of lands and subdivisions thereof."

Now another section as to qualifications:

"As a professional engineer:

a. Graduation from an approved course in engineering of 4 years or more in a school or college approved by the board as of satisfactory standing; and a specific record of an additional 3 years or more of active practice in engineering work, and indicating that the applicant is competent to be placed in responsible charge of such work."

Now we have many lines to run in the country. Every year or every little while we have to have lines run, and if this bill is passed we have got to go outside and get a professional engineer and pay him his price to do that surveying. Now, after studying the matter carefully, the thought suggests itself to me that this is just another scheme to get everyone under control. I have in my possession here several petitions signed by engineers of this State, who are opposed to this bill. Here is one from Portland:

"While we now realize that a public hearing was held on this bill, a large number of these signers, together with many of our brothers in the State, did not at that time know the date of the hearing, and many did not know of the bill at all. Some who did know could not arrange to attend or were pacified by

the proposal that the fees were to be small and that all now employed or employable in engineering and land surveying would have no difficulty in being duly enrolled as licensed practitioners.

"We wish to call attention to the fact that there is no popular demand for this bill.

"It is our contention that this bill was introduced through the efforts of a group which represents but a minority of the men affected; and that it can only mean hardship, and possible loss of employment and income to many, and an added expense to the citizens of our State. We ask that this bill be reported out 'ought not to pass' or be indefinitely postponed."

This petition is signed by seventy-three engineers from Portland, headed by Edward L. Lynch.

I also have another petition here of the same kind, signed by Neal M. Dow, Saco, who is the grandson of Neal Dow of Portland. This petition has the same wording.

I have another one here, signed by Frank W. Clark of Sanford, and nine others. This makes a total of 110 signers, engineers who are opposed to this bill. I also have a telegram from Portland, saying that if this bill passes, they will secure a referendum. That is signed by various engineers of Portland. I hope my motion to indefinitely postpone will prevail.

Mr. MARTIN of Oakland: Mr. Speaker, it seems very strange that all these engineers should sign petitions after having been given due notice and the matter brought before the Legal Affairs committee and reported ought to pass. The petitions in the Legal Affairs committee office all tend to be different from those petitions which Mr. Deering has just read to you.

There is one article he failed to call your attention to in this bill, and that is section 17: "Practitioners at time act became effective." You will notice, if you read that article, that surveyors and engineers already doing business now are continued in that position for at least one year following the enactment of this law if it becomes enacted. That does not put anyone out of business at all. That was taken into consideration by the engineers who have sponsored this bill. I think this will work no hardship upon anyone. It is a matter of protection to the profession of engineer-

ing, and it is protection to the public when they employ engineers.

I might call to your attention the contention between the towns of Readfield and Fayette, as to the difficulties people may get into by having incompetent engineers or surveyors run wrong lines. We have not settled that contention yet, if I understand it correctly. I think that is a very good illustration to the gentlemen and ladies of the House that we need protection for the profession of engineering, and that is all they are asking for. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Hollis (Mr. Deering) will not prevail.

Mr. JACOBSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this bill, but it is pretty hard for me to sit here and listen, especially to the last gentleman who spoke so much in favor of this bill, when he so strongly opposed a drug bill, which he classified as class legislation; and if this is not class legislation, I do not know what is. I am heartily in favor of the motion of Mr. Deering.

Mr. MACE of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I rise to oppose this bill, as some of the proponents are good friends of mine, but early in the session I told the proponents of this bill that if the land surveyors were not omitted from this bill, I should oppose it in my feeble way on the floor of this House.

Land surveying is a peculiar industry, with peculiar qualifications. For many, many years we have had land surveyors in the country towns who were intuitively surveyors. They knew the land; they knew the history of the land, and those men could go there and define the lines accurately with small expense to the farmers and to the owners of wood lots.

At the present time, when the blight has struck especially the owners of timberlands and woodlands, when a question comes up in regard to the lines between neighbors, there are land surveyors in those sections that will go there and, for a few dollars, define the lines and fix up the difference between the two people.

If this law is passed, with the proposed qualifications for the examinations, then what will happen?

After a few years a question comes up in regard to the difference of lines. They have to go to the

city and employ a man who is licensed. He has to go there and take his log man and chain man with him, and when that line is defined, the bill for the surveyor will be more than the land is worth. It is an unjust proposition, and if that provision is not withdrawn, I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Hollis (Mr. Deering) will prevail.

Mr. DESMOND of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I have had telephone calls in Portland, and communications and personal contacts with civil engineers in the city of Portland, and they are all against this bill and have requested that I vote against it. It is not necessary for me to go on and express myself further, as the matter has been well covered. I want to go on record as against this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Oakland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clear up one statement my brother Jacobson made in regard to my position on the drug bill. If you will refer to the Record, you will find that I did not object at any time to the professional end of the drug bill. That was not the matter in question. Neither do I object to the professional end so far as applies to engineers. If the gentleman from Augusta (Mr. Mace) will refer to the petition of the engineers of Augusta before the Legal Affairs committee, he will find that ninety per cent of the engineers in the city of Augusta signed the petition to have this bill passed and only two opposed it. I think the gentleman from Augusta ought to watch his constituents more closely than that.

Mr. MACE: Mr. Speaker, in reply to my friend from Oakland, I wish to state to the House at this time that I have truly, in my own mind at least, represented a majority of the citizens of Augusta and not a certain class. (Applause) And, I will say further, Mr. Speaker, on all matters under consideration in this Legislature, my vote has been governed by the same considerations.

Mr. JACOBSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Jacobson, moved the previous question. To entertain this motion there is required the consent of one-third of the members present. All those in favor of the Chair enter-

taining the previous question will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Obviously more than one-third of the members having arisen, the previous question is ordered. The question now before the House is shall the main question be put now? As many as are in favor of the Chair putting the main question now will say aye, contrary-minded no.

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Deering, to indefinitely postpone this bill. Does the House understand this question? All those in favor of the motion of Mr. Deering to indefinitely postpone will say aye, contrary-minded, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had,

Fifty-nine voting in the affirmative and 48 in the negative, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Scates of Westbrook, it was voted to take from the table the fourth unassigned matter, House order relative to appointment of a special committee to amend H. P. 1842, L. D. 900, an act to equalize taxation, tabled April 5 by that gentleman, pending passage.

Mr. SCATES: Mr. Speaker, simply to clarify the Record I would move the indefinite postponement of this order. It is simply an order to provide a committee to take care of any technical objections to a bill which has already been killed.

Thereupon the order was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Donahue of Biddeford, it was voted to take from the table the third unassigned matter bill an act to repeal an act entitled an act to incorporate the town of Mason, S. P. 697, L. D. 859, tabled April 4 by that gentleman, pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Hill of South Portland, it was voted to take from the table the fifth unassigned matter House report ought to pass of the committee on Judiciary on resolve creating a Recess Committee

on compulsory liability insurance for motor vehicles, H. P. 207, L. D. 67, tabled by that gentleman April 5, pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. HILL: Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that this morning the committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature relative to the bill providing for compulsory insurance reported recommending that the House accept the ought not to pass report of the committee, which was done. The members of the committee of Conference felt that inasmuch as this disagreement existed at this time between the two branches, so that it was not possible at this time to enact such legislation, it would be advisable for this Legislature to pass this resolve setting up a recess committee which might study the entire question and report to the Eighty-eighth Legislature.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the committee report has not yet been accepted. I would, therefore, move that the report ought to pass be accepted.

The motion prevailed.

Mr. JACOBSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the statement made by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill, and I also hope that every member who voted for the Compulsory Insurance bill will likewise endorse this Recess Committee.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Hill, the rules were suspended and the resolve had its two several readings.

Mr. HILL: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment A and move its adoption as follows:

House Amendment A to H. P. 207, L. D. 67, on resolve creating a Recess Committee on compulsory liability insurance for motor vehicles.

Amend said resolve by inserting after the word "House" in the fifth line thereof the following "and three citizens of the State, not members of the Eighty-seventh Legislature, to be appointed by the Governor, with the approval of the Council."

Thereupon House Amendment A was adopted, and the resolve as amended was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Hill of South Portland, it was voted to take from

the table the sixth unassigned matter, Senate Amendment A to bill an act relating to settlement of children, S. P. 692, L. D. 858, tabled April 5 by that gentleman, pending adoption in concurrence; and on further motion by the same gentleman, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence.

Thereupon the bill was given its third reading under suspension of the rules and passed to be engrossed as amended in concurrence.

Conference Report

The committee on conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on bill an act relating to the exemption of personal property from attachment, H. P. 1324, L. D. 577, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report that the Senate recede and concur with the House in the adoption of House Amendment A. The conference report being signed by the following members of the committee.

Messrs. Sawyer of Brunswick
Hill of South Portland
Mace of Augusta
—Committee on part of House
Burkett of Cumberland
Bodge of Kennebec
Blaisdell of Hancock
—Committee on part of Senate
The report was accepted.

Papers from the Senate, out of order, under suspension of the rules.

Senate Bills in First Reading

S. P. 252, L. D. 201: An act to repeal Chapter 117 of the Private and Special Laws of 1933 relating to the Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District.

(The rules were suspended and the bill was given its third reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.)

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Final report of the committee on
Federal Relations
Judiciary
Legal Affairs
Towns
Comes from the Senate, read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act relating to licenses for retail stores, H. P. 609, L. D. 180, on which the bill was substituted for the report and passed to be engrossed in the House on April 6th as amended by House Amendment A.

Comes from the Senate with the report of the committee on Taxation, reporting ought not to pass, accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. LEBEL of Brunswick: Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I want to take this opportunity to thank every one who supported me on this bill this morning. However, the upper branch of this bicameral system has not seen fit to concur. I was going to move to insist and, with my friend from Auburn, Mr. Flanders, ask for a committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the Chair understand that the gentleman ask that a committee of Conference be appointed?

Mr. LEBEL: I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WENTWORTH of Kennebunk: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Wentworth, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to speak on this matter very briefly. Now every one of us have come here with one thought in mind, and that is that we would like to see an old age pension law enacted at this session of the Legislature. When we had the conference with the committee on Appropriations and the committee on Taxation, the Governor said that this was one of the propositions which he hoped we would enact, because it would enable us to have some money with which to meet the old age pension.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is up to you. I want the responsibility to rest on your shoulders. If you do not propose to enact any laws that will give us revenue, the responsibility will be up to you, and that is all I have to say.

Mr. WILLEY of Falmouth: Mr. Speaker, it was only a little while ago that some members of this House sought, in the early days of the session, to provide what the gentleman now asks for, and I recall seeing him vote against it in no uncertain terms.

This measure, if it accomplishes what he says it would accomplish, would take the revenue right out of the pockets of the poor people of Maine. It is the worst measure I have seen here of its type. It attempts solely to legislate against chain stores, that is the face of it, but it legislates against poor people because they support the stores. This tax is not on the storekeepers; it is passed on to the poor people. I am very glad we have two branches in this Legislature to stop such legislation as this, and I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Wentworth, prevails.

Mr. MASON of Mechanic Falls: Mr. Speaker, I do not care to argue this question further. I may be mistaken but by the remarks of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Flanders, I feel that this House might assume that in a conference between the Taxation committee and the Appropriation committee and the Governor that this was suggested as a means of providing revenue for an old age pension. I thought I had been present at all of these conferences, and I fail to remember where that suggestion was made. I would like to have some other member who was at that conference correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. FLANDERS: Mr. Speaker, there were two suggestions made by the committee, and if I am wrong, I hope someone will correct me. We had a meeting of the Governor and the Taxation committee and the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, and one of the suggestions was that there be a general reduction in the salaries, and the other one was that there be a revenue law passed and it was suggested on these stores in this bill of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lebel, that the license fee be increased from \$1 to \$5. That would hit every store, excepting any store doing less than a \$1,000 business; and it has different brackets so that chain stores would be in the bracket of \$100 and not less than \$50.

Now, answering Mr. Willey's criticism, I do not think for a minute it would drive any chain store out of the State of Maine by putting it in the bracket up to \$100, and I do not think it would drive the smaller merchant out of business by putting him in the bracket of \$5,

\$10 or \$15. That is as I understood it, and if I am wrong, I will be glad to be corrected.

Mr. MASON: Mr. Speaker, I remember very distinctly of these suggestions that were made at that conference, and agree with Mr. Flanders that they were made there, but nowhere did I hear the suggestion that this money was to be used for old age pensions.

Mr. ALLAN of Topsham: Mr. Speaker, being one of the members of the House who was present at that conference, I want to say this: That if there was any mention of this fund being used for old age pensions, it must have been when I was not at this conference, and I was there most of the time.

Now I will tell you the situation as I understood it. The situation was this: We were called in because the budget officer and the Governor thought they should have a little emergency fund up their sleeve for something that might happen in the future. The suggestion was made not to raise the higher brackets but to put a \$10 tax on the stores in the lower brackets. The bill of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lebel, as I understand it, would increase the revenue to the State something like \$40,000, and this suggestion of putting \$10 on the stores in the lower brackets, would bring in additional revenue of \$120,000, and that was something, I think, towards the \$200,000 they wanted. I may be wrong, but that was the impression I got at that time. As I say, I left before the conference broke up.

Mr. SHAW of Milbridge: Mr. Speaker, I guess that I was present at all of those conferences, and I remember it just as Mr. Allan does.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunk, Mr. Wentworth, that we recede and concur with the Senate. Is the House ready for the question? All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce being taken, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question now before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lebel, that we insist and ask for a committee of Conference.

The motion prevailed.

Recess

After Recess—5 P. M.

The Speaker pro tem Mr. Devereux in the Chair.

Conference Report

Report of the Committee on Conference on disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on bill an act relating to the Hancock-Sullivan Bridge, H. P. 1016, L. D. 307 reports that they have had the same under consideration and that they are unable to agree.

(Signed)

Messrs. Noyes of Franklin
Devereux of Penobscot
Mace of Augusta
Committee on part of House
Hathaway of Piscataquis
Friend of Somerset
Burns of Aroostook
Committee on part of Senate
Report read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Reports of Committees

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules.)

Mr. Hescock from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on the following bills:

Bill an act relating to bounty on bobcats (H. P. 191) (L. D. 58)

Bill an act relative to bounty on bobcats, loup cervier and Canada lynx (H. P. 431) (L. D. 115)

Bill an act relating to bounties (H. P. 1127) (L. D. 303) reporting a consolidated bill (H. P. 1874) under title of "An act relating to bounty on bobcats" and that it ought to pass.

Report accepted, and under suspension of the rules, on motion by Mr. Hescock of Monson, the bill had its three several readings and was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Same gentleman from same Committee on the following resolves:

Resolve relative to screening of North Pond (S. P. 280)

Resolve for screening Howard's Lake, in the town of Hanover (S. P. 315)

Resolve in favor of the construction of a screen at the outlet of Lake Wassookeag in Dexter (H. P. 1057)

Resolve for screening Boyden's Lake in the county of Washington (H. P. 784)

Resolve relative to the screening

of Rangeley Lake, in the county of Franklin (H. P. 437)

Resolve for screening Cedar Lake in the county of Penobscot (H. P. 1204)

Resolve relative to screening Shin Pond in Penobscot County (H. P. 793)

Resolve for screening the outlet of Pleasant Pond, in Turner in the county of Androscoggin (H. P. 439)

Resolve relative to screening the outlet of Balch Pond (H. P. 786) reporting a consolidated resolve (H. P. 1875) under title of "Resolve for screening certain lakes and ponds in the State" and that it ought to pass.

Reports read and accepted.

Mr. SEWALL of Bath: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. SEWALL: I wish to address a few remarks to our temporarily unemployed Speaker. During this session of the legislature we have all been called upon to perform certain individual tasks in connection with our being here. Some of those tasks have been difficult; some of those tasks have even been unpleasant. Other tasks have been very definitely pleasant. Fortunately, I rise now on a pleasant task.

It was said yesterday by a gentleman in this House that when we all came here at the first of the session, we might have had some doubts, or wonderment, in our minds as to the fundamental character of our Speaker. Some of us wondered whether he in fact would be friendly; we wondered whether he would be sympathetic to our individual problems, whether possibly even some of his decisions might not be slightly colored by political considerations. As we draw to the close of our session, however, I feel that all those doubts have been dissipated,—possibly all but one. As I remember, it has been discussed along the back row here as to whether his voice would last during the season, and I am still wondering whether it will. But I have also thought that in the final analysis that may be a wonderful example of his generosity for I can think of no greater gift that any politician can make to his country than to give his voice.

"Than". I feel that I voice the sentiments of the entire membership

of this House when I say that you stand before us as a veritable symbol of sympathetic friendship and even as a symbol of integrity of both mind and purpose. It is, therefore, a very deep pleasure for me to present to you at this time, from all the members of this House, a watch which I feel represents the profound friendship,—yes, love,—that we all feel for you. (Prolonged applause, the members rising.)

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a matter of personal privilege. The Eighty-seventh Legislature is drawing to a close, the day is about done, and in a few hours we will be on our way home to take up our ordinary avocations; and I want to pay this tribute to the Speaker. It has been my privilege for the past twenty-five or thirty years to be a member of this House many, many times, and I will say that never have I seen a more courteous, a more fair Speaker than our present Speaker. (Applause)

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve in two Legislatures with our present Speaker, to serve with him in the Eighty-sixth Legislature as a member of the same committee and to serve here in this House under his administration of the office of Speaker. As I have come more and more to know and get better and better acquainted with him, I feel that words are inadequate to express my feeling of deep respect and high esteem for the Speaker of this House. (Applause)

**SPEAKER TOMPKINS:
MEMBERS OF THE EIGHTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE:**

I deeply appreciate this gift that you have presented me. I know that you are carrying out the customs of previous Legislatures, but I sincerely hope this gift carries with it your respect and confidence, which to my mind is the greatest gift that man can receive from his fellow men.

The estimate of the members of this Legislature that I made to you on the opening day has not failed my expectations. You have met the responsibilities of this session resolutely and determinedly and to my mind have reached the right solution in all important matters.

I desire to express my appreciation of the hearty cooperation that I have received from every member

of the House in the performance of my duties. For my part, I shall leave this Hall with a profound feeling of friendship for every member of the House, and I trust that the members will each and every one of them depart with that same cordial feeling toward one another. (Prolonged applause, the members rising)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Philbrick.

Mr. PHILBRICK: I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. PHILBRICK: Throughout this session we have watched with wonder the alert manner in which our Clerk, Harvey Pease, has handled the most difficult situations which a sometimes unruly house could create for him. Ever ready to aid any member, from the Speaker to the greenest member, by steering him through the mazes of House Amendment A to Senate Amendment A or vice versa, his courteous and cheery help to us all has been as unflinching as his voice. We are deeply indebted to him for his able work in facilitating the business of this House.

During the last few days I have gazed with admiration at the bright, spring-like dazzling costume Harvey has been sporting. I refer to his new spring suit and more particularly to his gay neckties. His wardrobe is so extensive, I am sure he will need additional luggage for the journey which I presume he is about to take, back to Wiscasset, but which I trust will also be used for many a trip back to Augusta.

Harvey, on behalf of the members of this House, I am pleased to present you with this token of our regard. (Applause, the members rising)

CLERK HARVEY R. PEASE: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: Two years ago, realizing that there was a certain custom that must be complied with before a House of Representatives would be permitted to go home, I went down to the State Librarian and told him that I was awfully busy and asked him if he would write me a speech of acceptance. He did and I brought it up and put it in my portfolio and carried it around for several days, and then the House of the Eighty-sixth Legislature made me a gift.

I walked out here as I am standing now and said something to the House, forgetting all about the speech that had been written for me.

Boys and girls whom I have worked for and sometimes joined in their play,—just to say “I thank you” would not fill the bill. If I have been of assistance to you—and I hope I have—in your work here, I hope that you will not give me the entire credit for any assistance that may have come from the Clerk’s office, because without the wonderful cooperation and the valued services of my Assistant, Mr. Wing, my Secretary, Mrs. Chapman, the Legislative Docket Clerk, Mrs. Strout, the Secretary to the Speaker, who works for me a good deal of her time, Miss Farris, and the Assistant Legislative Docket Clerk, Miss Adams,—without their cooperation and assistance you would not have received the service you did receive and a service which I hope was satisfactory. When I start home to Wiscasset with this magnificent bag, and when I journey I hope back many times to Augusta to attend sessions of the Legislature, when I look at that bag, I not only shall remember you all but I shall remember as well my associates who have made it possible for me in some small way to merit this gift from you.

I do not wish to pass without expressing my appreciation to all the House officers and to the officers of the Senate for their hearty cooperation at all times in our work, to the Superintendent of Building’s Department for meeting our rather exacting requirements promptly and well, to the Printing Department that has permitted the placing on your desks printed matter promptly. I want to express my appreciation of all that they have helped me do. It is with a feeling of deep regret that we are approaching the final adjournment of the Eighty-seventh Legislature. It has been a pleasure to serve you and really I don’t want to quit and go home. (Prolonged applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Mace.

Mr. MACE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may state his question.

Mr. MACE: Mr. Speaker, I am entrusted with making a few re-

marks to the House and, if you will allow me, I will state at the beginning that it is with a feeling of sadness, as well as a mixture of pleasure. We have been here now for fourteen weeks. Our casual acquaintance has developed into firm friendship. I heartily endorse the remarks of the gentleman from Bath (Mr. Sewall), the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Hill), and the gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Scates), in the kind words that they have used with reference to the Speaker.

We are soon to go back home, to go back into the different hamlets, the different cities and the different towns. Twenty-five years ago I had the great privilege of serving as a member of the Seventy-fifth Legislature, and in that Legislature there was a man who then was a veteran legislator. He was helpful to me and he was helpful to the new members at that time. Since that time he has served in five Legislatures of the State of Maine. He is loved not only by the members of his own party but by every member of any Legislature in which he has served. He is known throughout the length and breadth of this State as the father of the great highway measure that gave good roads to Maine. It would take me probably at least two hours to enumerate his splendid and lovable qualities, and I know that each and every member of this House endorses all the kind words that I utter, or that I might utter, in regard to him, and I know that you will endorse the small gift we give to him, not on account of its intrinsic value, but on account of the love, the admiration and the regard that we have for this man. I take great pleasure at this time in presenting to the minority floor leader of this House this little token that we pass to him. Please accept it, Mr. Scates, not for its value but for the love we bear you. (Prolonged applause)

Mr. SCATES: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I want to thank not only the Democratic members but all the members of this House for this gift. During the session I have tried to be helpful to all. How far I have succeeded, I know not; but I shall always cherish this memorial to my efforts. I thank you. (Applause)

Mrs. LATNO: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The lady may state her question.

Mrs. LATNO: It is with extreme pleasure that I present Mr. Wing, our Assistant Clerk, with this small token of our appreciation for his many courtesies to every member of the Eighty-seventh Legislature.

ASSISTANT CLERK WING: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: It certainly takes the breath away from me. I was not expecting this. It calls to my mind an early Convention that I attended. My family were always friends of John P. Swasey of Canton, many times candidate for Congress. It happened that I attended the Convention wherein he was nominated. After he was nominated he came on to the platform and said: "I have no speech. I have been here a great many times before and have never needed one and today I have none." I am certainly a whole lot more surprised than he was. I, however, greatly appreciate this gift. I have enjoyed the work here and I have enjoyed every one of you people here. I thank you. (Applause)

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I think we are all enjoying this little interlude. I wish to present George, our floor leader, with a little token of our esteem and friendship for the good job he has done for our party. (Prolonged applause, the members rising)

Mr. MACE of Augusta: I would like to offer an amendment to the statement of the gentleman from Calais (Mr. Tupper) by adding the words "not only to his party but to the people of the State of Maine." (Applause)

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I appreciate very deeply this gift. Serving here among you throughout this session, I do not know that I have been able to make any great contribution, but I have worked with a sincerity of purpose and I am particularly pleased to be able to feel, as I do, when this Legislature is drawing to a close, that although we assembled here with many differences of opinion upon issues of importance concerning the State, not only have we been able to heal differences of opinion in many cases, but we have been able to deal with those differences without acrimonious debate, but without, so far as I

know, the engendering of any ill-feeling. I wish to express my esteem for the distinguished gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Scates, and for all the members of both parties in this House. I assure you that this gift will be treasured by me for the remainder of my life, and I shall look back with the greatest pleasure upon the Eighty-seventh Legislature and the friendships formed here. (Prolonged applause)

Mrs. FORBES of Dover-Foxcroft: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The lady may state her point.

Mrs. FORBES: It gives me great pleasure to have been selected to present to our very courteous and always efficient Assistant Floor Leader, Mr. Thompson, this gift from his colleagues. (Applause)

Mr. THOMPSON of Belfast: Two years ago the members of the minority party very kindly presented me with a wrist watch, and I thought we had it understood this time that they were not going to do that again. But if I have helped in any way the minority party, I am very much pleased, and I want to thank them very, very much. (Applause)

Mr. SCATES: Mr. Speaker, I rise again to a matter of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. SCATES: While my hair perhaps has been whitened by many winters, I still feel a great love and respect for the ladies. (Applause) The evening before the Legislature convened I met some of the ladies at the Augusta House and I asked them if it would be pleasing for them to select their seats. They said that it would and I said perhaps I can help you in that way. When I came in on the morning the Legislature convened I saw them parked all around me. (Laughter) I have here a little memento which it is a pleasure for me to present first to Mrs. Kilroy, Miss Smith, the beautiful young lady from the North, (Applause) Mrs. Forbes, and also to the lady from Old Town (Mrs. Latno) although she was not here in time to be parked. (Laughter and applause)

Mr. YOUNG of York: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may state his point.

Mr. YOUNG: During the work of this Legislature I think we all realize that we have received valuable assistance from the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Tupper; and at this time I take pleasure in presenting to him in behalf of his friends—and when I say friends I mean all of us—this token of our esteem. (Applause)

Mr. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker and members: I am very grateful for this gift. I really have made a great many good friends here. I can't say anything more. (Applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair appoints on the Conference committee on the disagreeing action of both branches of the Legislature on bill an act relating to licensing of retail stores: Messrs. Lebel of Brunswick, Flanders of Auburn and Haskell of Windham.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it the pleasure of the House to suspend the rules and give H. P. 1875, resolve for screening certain lakes and ponds in the State its several readings at this time.

Thereupon the resolve had its several readings and was passed to be engrossed, and sent up for concurrence.

(At this point Mr. Devereux of Penobscot resumed his seat on the floor of the House, amid applause, and Mr. Scates of Westbrook assumed the Speaker's Chair, the members rising and applauding.)

Reports of Committees

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules.)

Mr. Hescoek from the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on the following resolves:

Resolve relative to screening Bauneg Beg Pond (H. P. 1045)

Resolve relative to screening Moosehead Lake at Indian Pond Township (H. P. 573)

Resolve relative to repairing screen on Sheepscot Lake (H. P. 1062)

reported a consolidated resolve (H. P. 1876) under title of "Resolve for screening certain lakes and ponds in the State" and that it ought to pass.

(Report read and accepted, and the resolve having already been

printed under suspension of the rules was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.)

Mr. Thompson from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported ought to pass on bill an act relative to the making of local regulations for fishing by the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game in Franklin County (H. P. 1126) (L. D. 302)

Mr. ELLIS of Rangeley: Mr. Speaker, as another bill has already gone over the last hurdle, that covers the entire State, I move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion prevailed.

Mr. DONAHUE from the Committee on Legal Affairs reported ought to pass on bill an act relating to caucus law of Biddeford (H. P. 287) (L. D. 840)

Report read and accepted and the bill having already been printed was read three times under suspension of the rules, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Thompson of Belfast, out of order and under suspension of the rules, presented resolve in favor of the chaplains of the House of the Eighty-seventh Legislature and asked unanimous consent for its reception.

Unanimous consent being given, the resolve had its two several readings, under suspension of the rules, and was passed to be engrossed, and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Allan of Topsham, the House

Recessed until 7.30 this evening.

Evening Session

Speaker pro tem Scates in the Chair.

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

From the Senate: Final report of the committee on

Inland Fisheries and Game.

Comes from the Senate, read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Resolve in favor of clerks, stenographers and messengers of the several committees of the Eighty-seventh Legislature (S. P. 729)

Comes from the Senate received by unanimous consent, under sus-

pension of rules, given its several readings and passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee.

In the House, temporarily tabled to correct an error.

Paper from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

(At this point Mr. Scates withdrew from the Chair, amid applause, and Miss Smith of Van Buren assumed the Chair, the members rising and cheering.)

From the Senate: Resolve on the payroll of the Senate of the Eighty-seventh Legislature (S. P. 728)

Comes from the Senate received by unanimous consent, under suspension of the rules, given its several readings and passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee.

In the House, received by unanimous consent out of order and under suspension of the rules, given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act to regulate the practices of professional engineering and land surveying; creating a State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors (H. P. 1864) (L. D. 918) which was indefinitely postponed in the House earlier in the day.

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

In the House:

(Senate Amendment A read by the Clerk)

Mr. JACOBSON of Portland: Madam Speaker, is there a motion before the House?

The SPEAKER pro tem: There is no motion before the House.

Mr. JACOBSON: I move that we adhere to our former action. We have voted on this measure once today and this is not the time to start the procedure all over again. Therefore, I hope the motion will prevail.

Mr. GRAY of Presque Isle: Madam Speaker, the words "land surveying" have been eradicated and I believe it should go through as it is now.

Mr. MARTIN of Oakland: Madam Speaker, I move that we recede and concur.

Mr. WILLEY of Falmouth: Madam Speaker, I move that the House reconsider its action taken this afternoon whereby we voted to indefinitely postpone this measure.

On motion by Mr. Deering of Hollis temporarily tabled.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Maine Publicity reporting ought to pass on bill an act relating to State publicity, S. P. 424, L. D. 516.

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

In the House:

Mr. WENTWORTH of Kennebunk: Madam Speaker, I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the report of the committee. It is with some fear and trepidation that I speak in behalf of this bill for fear perhaps that the members of the House may realize that this is an expenditure instead of an investment. This bill really is an investment. Take it at the present time in the state of Idaho: They are spending one hundred thousand dollars along this line. Two or three weeks ago we had a potato grading bill. That gave us something to work on because we know we are going to have a product to advertise which we have not had before. At the present time the State of New York has raised two hundred and fifty thousand dollars for a similar purpose. We are in competition with the other states of the Union, particularly the northern states, the eastern seaboard in this recreational industry, and I believe that the State of Maine should raise one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to support our recreational industries. The fifty thousand dollars is that much in excess of what the budget figures call for and you are all going to ask where the money is coming from. At the time the budget was made up it was estimated that the Liquor Commission would take in about \$500,000, but it is now estimated that it will take in \$1,100,000. There is no estimate made of the amount of money that will be taken in by the Liquor Commission from the increased amount of advertising. I would be willing to bet, take it on our gas tax alone, that the amount of revenue from gas tax will increase in proportion to the amount we raise for publicity. I hope that my motion prevails.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Madam Speaker, I dislike very much to oppose this measure; I think it a very worthy one and a good thing for Maine. At the same time we have not the money at present to appropriate for it. We have set up in our budget one hundred thousand dollars and we have no more. We have cut the University of Maine a certain amount and we have cut Health and Welfare. We have cut various other things that demand money; and, Madam Speaker, although I really think that the bill should pass, we have no money to support it. I hope we do not pass it on the chance that we may get the income. I do not like to pass things that we have no money for and that we do not know where the money is coming from to take care of it. Therefore, I hope this motion will not prevail.

Mr. FINDLEN of Fort Fairfield: Madam Speaker, this is a very worthy measure, and I do not believe it ought to be considered as in the nature of an appropriation but rather as in the nature of an investment. We have passed a raise in our tax on fishing and hunting. We have the finest recreational possibilities of any state in the Union. We also have some agricultural products that we are very proud of that need to be advertised. I believe this bill is a step in the right direction. We raise some of the finest corn produced in the world and we have the finest potato fields that there are in any section of America. We produce almost as many potatoes as any two states in the Union. Idaho has appropriated one hundred thousand dollars for the advertising of its potatoes alone. With twice as many potatoes as Idaho, we ought to furnish for advertising potatoes at least fifty thousand dollars, and that is not the half of it. This certainly ought to be worth one hundred thousand dollars as an investment. I think you are making a great mistake if you do not pass this bill as is.

Mr. CARSWELL of Gorham: Madam Speaker, I am sure that if we seriously consider what this bill means, every member of this House will vote in favor of it. A large proportion of this is to be devoted to advertising our agricultural products. The great northern county of Aroostook is now selling its potatoes at thirty-five cents a barrel. I

hear that they are selling the Idaho potatoes for five cents each. Their system of advertising makes it possible for their products to be advertised in all the papers and in all the magazines and on the bills of fare of all the hotels and restaurants. The State of Maine surely should advertise its products in a like manner. When you realize that a large proportion of this is for that purpose, I am sure you will realize the value of the bill. I learned this afternoon that while the liquor stores originally anticipated a profit of four hundred thousand dollars it was now estimated that that profit will reach one million, one hundred thousand dollars before the year is over, and that funds will be available. Everybody knows that it pays to advertise. The State of Maine has advertised everything else now let us vote to advertise its possibilities in these directions. (Applause)

Mr. PATTERSON of Freeport: Mr. Speaker and members of the Eighty-seventh Legislature: I wish that the members could understand the situation that we are in at the present time on the financial program as laid out. The Budget Committee has recommended, and we have appropriated, as far as the Appropriations committee is concerned, \$100,000 for publicity. We have also taken a part of the money from the liquor stores to keep down your tax assessment to seven and a quarter mills. I say this because I want you to understand the situation that we are in, so that you will not go home and say that you did not know before you appropriated this money what the conditions were.

We have had to cut down the Welfare Department, and we have had to cut down the hospitals, and we have had to cut out hospitals, and we have had to cut out welfare and relief in a great many places, in Portland and other places, which we deemed necessary but for which we did not have the funds.

Therefore, not because I want to hurt any part of the agricultural development or the publicity department, but I want to understand before you vote what you are doing. If we knew where the money was coming from, we would have voted on these things, but at the present time you have only two or three measures to take care of these things. You have tried to take

care of the old age pension, therefore you have not left us anything to spend on this department to carry on their work, but we must leave them exactly where they were, and the expenses must be kept as close as they can be figured.

Now there is the situation. I am not trying to hurt agriculture or the publicity, I simply want you to understand the situation so that you cannot go home and say that you did not understand the situation before you voted.

Mr. FORTIN of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of interest to every member of this House. I appeal, in the name of the serious men and women of this House, to maintain the dignity of the powers entrusted to us and keep order in the House until the final moment of adjournment. If there are any boys who want to play, let them go out in the hall and play. This is serious business, and we are passing laws for the people of the State of Maine. If you are going to throw paper around, come outside with me and throw it around. Let us maintain dignity; let us maintain order, please. (Applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Madam Speaker, we have no question that the measure with which we are concerned is one of very great merit. I should like very much to see it pass, if it could be properly done, but the committee on Appropriations comes here and tells us that we haven't the money. I believe that the members of the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs are far more familiar with the financial situation of the State than are most of the rest of us. It does not seem to me to be good business to appropriate money that we have not yet received, or that we cannot be certain of receiving, and it seems to me that we should stand behind the committee on Appropriations in this matter.

As I understand the situation, the budget provides for \$100,000 for this purpose, but this bill, calling for \$150,000, would exceed that budget. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Kennebunk (Mr. Wentworth) will not prevail. (Applause)

Mr. CHASE of Sebec: Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the Appropriations committee, we considered this matter very care-

fully, and I assure you we have done the best we could with all the money we had.

Mr. DOYLE of Skowhegan: Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to what the report of the committee is on that measure?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The report of the committee was ought to pass.

Mr. DOYLE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Madam Speaker, you mean the Senate report?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The report of the joint committee was ought to pass, and it was accepted in the Senate.

Mr. WENTWORTH: Madam Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the report of the committee on Maine publicity was for \$150,000 in which the Senate concurred. They voted this afternoon for \$150,000.

Mr. TUPPER: Madam Speaker, if we wish to pass this bill and others we have turned down which may come up again tonight, we must be prepared to raise more money, for the State has not the money at the present time.

Mr. PATTERSON: Madam Speaker, I will say we put in over an hour this afternoon on this one question. We studied it thoroughly, and we figured every available way and means to find money to take care of this situation. We were trying the best we knew how to take care of that case and to provide the extra \$50,000, but we could not find it in any spot or place. If you raise it over the amount of \$100,000 which has been appropriated, I do not see any place where you can get the money. I am telling you honestly, and telling you straight.

Mr. THOMPSON of Belfast: Madam Speaker, as has been said by the two previous speakers, we are all in sympathy with this bill, but there is no money, and I do not see how this House can pass this bill, knowing that fact.

Mr. SEWALL of Bath: Madam Speaker, I rise with the greatest reluctance to say that I am going to vote against this measure. Frankly, I believe it is sound from a business angle, and I firmly believe Maine is a natural for the tourist trade. It merely needs the spark of advertising to set it off. But I tell you with equal sincerity that we have tried as best we might to find

funds to finance this. We had had demands from many other sources, welfare, relief, and so forth, and in the final analysis it boiled down to the question of: Shall we adjourn with a balanced budget or shall we not? Personally, I have accepted a balanced budget, and I have receded from many things I believed in which came here and which I hoped would pass, but I felt they must be sacrificed and that order must be maintained. (Applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the acceptance of the ought to pass report in concurrence with the Senate. Is the House ready for the question? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

Mr. TUPPER: Madam Speaker, may I ask what the question is?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may.

Mr. TUPPER: What is the question?

Mr. CONNOLLY of Portland: Madam Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tem. The question before the House is on the acceptance of the ought to pass report in concurrence. All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

Mr. FINDLEN of Fort Fairfield: Madam Speaker, I move that we have a division of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Findlen, has asked for a division of the House. All those in favor of the acceptance of the ought to pass report in concurrence with the Senate will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

Thirty-seven having voted in the affirmative, and 80 in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Calais, Mr. Tupper, now moves the indefinite postponement of the bill. Is that the pleasure of the House.

Mr. TUPPER: Madam Speaker, could I ask through the Chair if we should indefinitely postpone this, would it kill the bill? We have set up in the budget \$100,000 that we want them to have. What effect will that have, may I ask?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The effect of indefinite postponement is to kill the bill.

Mr. TUPPER: Madam Speaker, will this still hold good for our appropriation we are making?

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Madam Speaker, I should say no. You would indefinitely postpone the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Calais, Mr. Tupper, moves the indefinite postponement of the bill. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill.

Mr. HILL: There appears to be some confusion and misunderstanding here in this matter. It was my understanding at first that the \$100,000 appropriation which had been allowed by the committee on Appropriations would be otherwise taken care of, but apparently that is not the case. It would seem, therefore, that this bill should be so amended. For the purpose of making it possible to offer an amendment which now apparently is necessary to carry out the \$100,000 appropriation, I move that the House reconsider its vote.

(At this point Miss Smith retired from the Chair amid the applause of the House, and Mr. Carswell of Gorham took the gavel.)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hill, moves that the House reconsider its action recently taken whereby it refused to accept the Senate report on L. D. 516.

The motion prevailed, and on further motion by the same gentleman the report was accepted in concurrence.

Thereupon the bill had its three several readings under suspension of the rules.

On motion by Mr. Hill, the bill was tabled for the purpose of preparing an amendment.

From the Senate: Final report from the committee on State Sanatoriums

Comes from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House read and accepted in concurrence.

Conference Report

Report of the Committee of Concurrence on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on bill an act relating to licenses for retail stores (H. P. 609) (L. D.

180) reporting that the Committee is unable to agree.

(Signed)

Messrs. Lebel of Brunswick
Flanders of Auburn
Haskell of Windham
Committee on part of House
Blanchard of Franklin
Pillsbury of Kennebec
Burkett of Cumberland
Committee on part of Senate.
Report of committee accepted
and sent up for concurrence.

Conference Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on bill an act relating to fees of jurors (H. P. 314) (L. D. 75) reporting that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the majority report and pass the bill to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A.

(Signed)

Messrs. Flanders of Auburn
Findlen of Fort Fairfield
Hastings of Bethel
Committee on part of House.
Ashby of Aroostook
Winn of Androscoggin
Committee on part of Senate.

Mr. DAVIS of Fairfield: Mr. Speaker, as a result of our vote on this report of the committee of Conference, I would like to say that this rate would be increased from four dollars to four dollars and a half a day and it includes holidays and Sundays. I move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. FINDLEN of Fort Fairfield: It excludes Sundays and holidays. It is four dollars and a half a day excluding Sundays and holidays.

Mr. VAUGHAN of South Berwick: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question: Why?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from South Berwick, Mr. Vaughan, has asked the gentleman from Fairfield, Mr. Davis, a question. The gentleman may answer if he wishes.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, I think there may be others in this House more qualified to answer that question. However, I have made the motion, and I think I am in duty bound to stand by it. I do not think this is the proper time to increase any fees, either by counties, towns or the State. I feel that four dollars a day is sufficient to pay

our jurors, and I feel we can get well qualified people to serve on our juries today without putting an added burden on our counties, our towns or our State. That is the reason I move the indefinite postponement of this bill. (Applause)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the indefinite postponement of the bill. All those in favor of that motion will manifest it by saying aye; all those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it now the pleasure of the House to take from the table resolve in favor of clerks, stenographers and messengers of the several committees of the Eighty-seventh Legislature. (S. P. 729)

The motion prevailed and the resolve was passed to be engrossed.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Thompson from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported ought not to pass on resolve in favor of the Opportunity Farm (H. P. 1121) as subject matter is taken care of in another bill.

Mr. Smith from same Committee reported same on bill an act relating to appropriations for private and public hospitals (H. P. 820) (L. D. 235) as subject matter is cared for in another bill.

Mr. Tupper from same Committee reported same on resolve appropriating money for carrying out the purposes of Chapter 297, Special Session of 1934, entitled an act for the protection of cattle from Bangs Disease as subject matter is taken care of in another bill, and that the accompanying petition be placed on file.

Mr. Flanders from same Committee reported same on resolve in favor of Knox State Arboretum (H. P. 575)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on resolve for an appropriation for the construction of a State wharf at Popham Beach (H. P. 1119)

Mr. Sewall from same Committee reported same on resolve in favor of charitable and benevolent institutions for the care and support of children (H. P. 1118) (L. D. 309)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on resolve in

favor of Presque Isle General Hospital (H. P. 1120)

Mr. Graves from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on petition in favor of H. P. 1231 in favor of Butler's Ferry Bridge (H. P. 1541) reported that same be placed on file.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on petition in favor of the Andover-Upton Road (H. P. 364)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on petition in favor of L. D. 13 an act relating to snow removal. (H. P. 1743)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on petitions in favor of Martin Stream Road. (H. P. 1228 and 1392)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on petition in favor of an increase in the personnel and equipment of the State Police. (H. P. 1437)

Mr. Tupper from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on resolve for the publication of the vital records of the town of Phippsburg (H. P. 317) reported that same be referred to the next Legislature.

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to be Enacted
(Emergency Measure)

H. P. 1826, L. D. 885: An act to provide for the issuance of State of Maine improvement bonds and the allocation of the proceeds from sale.

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

A division being had,

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

Passed to be Enacted

(S. P. 328) (L. D. 349) An act relating to zone registrations.

(S. P. 699) (L. D. 864) An act relating to highways.

(H. P. 1820) (L. D. 872) An act to define the powers of the State Liquor Commission.

(H. P. 1861) (L. D. 920) An act

relative to establishing a fishway patrol on the Penobscot River.

(H. P. 1862) (L. D. 921) An act relating to semi-trailers.

(H. P. 1863) (L. D. 922) An act relating to the Presque Isle Sewer District.

(H. P. 1865) (L. D. 923) An act to provide for supervision of repairs and construction on State owned property.

(H. P. 1866) (L. D. 924) An act relating to measurement of lobsters.

Finally Passed

Resolve providing for a State pension for Ashley J. Keene of Canaan (H. P. 1868) (L. D. 931)

Passed to be Enacted

(S. P. 719) (L. D. 933) An act providing for a retirement system for State Highway Police.

(S. P. 721) (L. D. 934) An act to create the Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District.

(S. P. 715) (L. D. 911) An act to permit National Forests in Maine.

Passed to be Enacted
(Emergency Measure)

S. P. 722: An act to provide for the surrender by town of Kingman of its organization.

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

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty-four voting in the affirmative and none in the negative the bill was passed to be enacted.

Mr. Tupper of Calais by unanimous consent presented resolve on the payroll of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-seventh Legislature, H. P. 1879.

Under suspension of the rules the resolve was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed.

Communication from the Executive

The following communication:

STATE OF MAINE

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

Augusta, Maine, April 6, 1935.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

I return without my approval H. P. 1776, L. D. 811, An Act Relative

to Qualifications of Applicants for Admission to the Bar.

The Act substantially requires the applicant for admission to the Bar to have completed a two years' course in a college or university of the State.

It seems unwise to me at this time to increase the scholastic requirements of the applicant for admission to the bar. I dislike to see the State of Maine legislate in any way that will remove from our future citizens the right to aspire to labor in an honorable calling or profession in life.

Many of our boys and girls may be prevented from obtaining an education beyond the teachings of the public schools, due to the present economic conditions.

I recommend to the aspirant for admission to the Bar the obtaining of a college course, if possible, but to say that the failure or inability to obtain a college course precludes a citizen of Maine from becoming an attorney, seems to me creates a class distinction, and denies equal opportunity.

I do not believe this bill is necessary to safeguard the public interests and its effect might be to deny a fundamental right to many young men and women.

Some of the ablest jurists and attorneys this State and Nation have ever produced come from the ranks of the common school graduates, from the small farm in remote communities and from very humble beginnings.

I call the Legislature's attention to the concluding sentence in Section 28 of Chapter 176 in the Public Laws of Maine for 1931 which reads as follows:

"The board shall, however, have power to establish such higher grades of standing as to them may seem proper."

It would seem to me that under this section, the Legislature had entrusted to the Board of Examiners of applicants for admission to the Bar all the powers now necessary to establish a proper standard for admission to the Bar.

I regret very much being obliged to differ with the expressed intention of the Legislature.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) LOUIS J. BRANN,
Governor.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is: Shall this bill become a law notwith-

standing the objections of the Governor. The vote must be taken by roll call.

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the parliamentary situation correctly, this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays. I would suggest at the present time that the Sergeant-at-Arms close the door. Those who desire to pass the bill over the Governor's veto will vote yes, and those who want to sustain the Governor in his veto will vote no.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is there any further discussion? The question before the House is shall this bill become a law notwithstanding the objections of the Governor? The vote must be taken by roll call. A two-thirds vote of those voting is required to pass the bill over the Governor's veto. The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Burnham, Chase, Baring; Chase, Limington; Chase, Sebec; Churchill, Cummings, Davis, Fairfield; Hearn, Higgins, Hill, Pike, Tupper, Vaughan, Weatherbee, Young.

NAY—Alden, Allan, Austin, Exeter; Austin, Parkman; Ayer, Belaire, Boucher, Bramson, Brown, Bubar, Burgess, Burrill, Bushey, Cambridge, Campbell, Carleton, Carswell, Clark, Plymouth; Clarke, Cooper; Cole, Connolly, Coolidge, Cote, Crowell, Currier, Davis, Newfield; Deering, Demers, Dennett, Desmond, Devereux, Donahue, Donovan, Dorr, Dow, Doyle, Caribou; Doyle, Skowhegan; Drisko, Eddy, Elliot, Ellis, Castle Hill; Ellis, Rangeley; Eveleth, Findlen, Flanders, Fogg, Rockland; Forbes, Forgue, Lewiston; Fortin, Fowles, Gibbons, Gleason, Goss, Graves, Gray, Brooksville; Gray, Presque Isle; Hagan, Hall, Hammond, Harriman, Gardiner; Harriman, Prospect; Haskell, Hastings, Hathorn, Heald, Hescocck, Hobbs, Jacobson, Jandreau, Jillson, Kendrick, Kilroy, King, Labbee, Lancaster, Latno, Lausier, Lebel, Leclair, Leonard, Lindsey, Mace, MacKenzie, Maheu, Mallett, Martin, Dexter; Martin, Oakland; Mason, Newton, Noyes, Oliver, Palmer, Patterson, Payson, Phair, Proctor, Roach, Rush, Russ, Ryder, Sawyer, Scates, Seabury, Sennett, Sewall, Shaw, Smith, Bangor; Smith, Van Buren, Sprague, Stickney, Stilphen, Stoddard, Story, Thompson. Belfast; Thompson, Chelsea; Thurston, Wallace, Webber, Wentworth, Wheeler, Willey, Woodbury, Worthen, Wright.

ABSENT—Bragdon, Cook, Crosby,

Lewis, McKay, Mosher, Parsons, Philbrick, Poulin, Richardson, Sleeper.

15 Yes, 124 No, 10 Absent.

Fifteen voting in the affirmative and 124 in the negative, the Governor's veto is sustained. (Applause)

Bill an act relating to State Planning and Development (H. P. 1852) (L. D. 916) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 4th as amended by House Amendment A.

Comes from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A as amended by Senate Amend B thereto in non-concurrence.

In the House:

(Senate Amendment B read.)

Mr. DAVIS of Fairfield: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I want to thank every member of the House for the loyal manner in which you stood by me yesterday in the presentation of House Amendment A to this bill. You are now confronted with Senate Amendment B to the House amendment, and I feel that the Senate amendment in a measure nullifies the effect of our House amendment. I therefore move that we insist and ask for a committee of Conference.

The motion prevailed, and the Chair appointed as such committee: Messrs. Davis of Fairfield, Hill of South Portland and Tupper of Calais.

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether the House is proceeding under Orders of the Day?

The SPEAKER pro tem: If the gentleman does not believe it, will he kindly make a suggestion of how we shall proceed? (Laughter)

Mr. HILL: If I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take from the table Senate Paper 424, Legislative Document 516, bill an act relating to State publicity.

The motion prevailed.

Mr. Hill offered House Amendment A and moved its adoption, as follows:

House Amendment A to Senate Paper 424, Legislative Document 516, an act relating to State publicity.

Amend said bill by striking out in the second line of the third paragraph thereof the figures "\$150,000"

and by inserting in lieu thereof the figures '\$100,000.'

Thereupon, House Amendment A was adopted.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I offer House Amendment B and move its adoption. This Amendment B takes care of the extra \$50,000 which the Commission is asking for. Now I want it thoroughly understood that the Appropriations committee was not against this bill. They were in favor of it, but they did not have the money to appropriate. Therefore I hope this amendment is adopted.

House Amendment B to Senate Paper 424, Legislative Document 516, an act relating to State publicity.

Amend said bill by adding thereto the following:

'Sec. 2. If, in the opinion of the Governor and Council, the sum of \$50,000 shall hereafter become available for the purposes of this act, said sum shall be added to the amount hereinbefore appropriated.'

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt House Amendment B? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division was had.

Ninety-five having voted in the affirmative and one in the negative, House Amendment B was adopted and the bill as amended by House Amendments A and B was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Reports of Committees

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

Mr. Graves from the committee on Ways and Bridges on the following resolves:

In favor of the town of Abbot, H. P. 496

In favor of the town of Acton, H. P. 117

In favor of the town of Addison, H. P. 641

In favor of the town of Albion, H. P. 243

In favor of the town of Alexander, H. P. 716

In favor of the town of Alna, H. P. 501

In favor of the town of Andover, H. P. 248

In favor of the town of Andover, H. P. 247

In favor of the town of Andover, H. P. 246

- In favor of the town of Anson, H. P. 349
- In favor of the town of Appleton, H. P. 230
- In favor of the town of Arrowsic, H. P. 166
- In favor of the town of Athens, H. P. 58
- In favor of the town of Atkinson, H. P. 223
- In favor of the town of Avon, H. P. 616
- In favor of the town of Baldwin, H. P. 721
- In favor of the town of Bar Harbor, H. P. 82
- In favor of the city of Bath, S. P. 371
- In favor of the town of Beals, H. P. 74
- In favor of the city of Belfast, H. P. 137
- In favor of the town of Belgrade, H. P. 736
- In favor of the town of Belmont, H. P. 359
- In favor of the town of Benton, H. P. 241
- In favor of the town of Berwick, H. P. 54
- In favor of the town of Bethel, H. P. 169
- In favor of the town of Bingham, H. P. 622
- In favor of the town of Blaine, H. P. 43
- In favor of the town of Bluehill, H. P. 392
- In favor of the town of Boothbay, H. P. 232
- In favor of the town of Boothbay, H. P. 231
- In favor of the town of Bowdoin, H. P. 386
- In favor of the town of Bowdoinham, H. P. 382
- In favor of the town of Bradford, H. P. 176
- In favor of the town of Bremen, S. P. 169
- In favor of the city of Brewer, H. P. 113
- In favor of the town of Bridgton, H. P. 615
- In favor of the town of Bridgewater, H. P. 41
- In favor of the town of Bristol, H. P. 395
- In favor of the town of Brooklin, H. P. 158
- In favor of the town of Brooks, H. P. 407
- In favor of the town of Brooks-ville, H. P. 273
- In favor of the town of Brownfield, H. P. 922
- In favor of the town of Brownville, H. P. 494
- In favor of the town of Brunswick, H. P. 57
- In favor of the town of Bucksport, H. P. 22
- In favor of the town of Burlington, H. P. 928
- In favor of the town of Burnham, H. P. 739
- In favor of the town of Buxton, H. P. 378
- In favor of the town of Byron, H. P. 924
- In favor of the city of Calais, H. P. 356
- In favor of the city of Calais, H. P. 357
- In favor of the city of Cambridge, H. P. 518
- In favor of the town of Camden, H. P. 228
- In favor of the town of Canaan, H. P. 517
- In favor of the towns of Skowhegan and Canaan, H. P. 521
- In favor of the town of Canton, H. P. 911
- In favor of the town of Cape Elizabeth, H. P. 56
- In favor of the town of Caribou, H. P. 118
- In favor of the town of Caratunk, H. P. 733
- In favor of the town of Carmel, H. P. 508
- In favor of the town of Casco, H. P. 556
- In favor of the town of Castle Hill, H. P. 90
- In favor of the town of Caswell Plantation, H. P. 132
- In favor of the town of Chapman, H. P. 711
- In favor of the town of Charleston, H. P. 418
- In favor of the town of Charlotte, H. P. 718
- In favor of the town of Chelsea, H. P. 245
- In favor of the town of Cherryfield, H. P. 640
- In favor of the town of Chester-ville, H. P. 237
- In favor of Chesuncook Plantation, H. P. 276
- In favor of the town of China, H. P. 887
- In favor of the town of Clifton, H. P. 544
- In favor of the town of Clinton, H. P. 242
- In favor of the town of Columbia, H. P. 639
- In favor of the town of Columbia Falls, H. P. 76
- In favor of the town of Concord, H. P. 900
- In favor of the town of Connor, H. P. 131

- In favor of the town of Cooper, H. P. 715
- In favor of the town of Corinth, H. P. 175
- In favor of the town of Cornish, H. P. 873
- In favor of the town of Cornville, H. P. 264
- In favor of the town of Cranberry Isle, H. P. 79
- In favor of the town of Crawford, H. P. 713
- In favor of the town of Crystal, H. P. 910
- In favor of the town of Cumberland, H. P. 743
- In favor of the town of Cumberland, H. P. 742
- In favor of the town of Cushing, H. P. 121
- In favor of Cyr Plantation, H. P. 916
- In favor of the town of Dayton, H. P. 377
- In favor of Dallas Plantation, H. P. 18
- In favor of the town of Damari-scotta, S. P. 172
- In favor of Dead River Plantation, H. P. 1088
- In favor of the town of Dedham, H. P. 509
- In favor of the town of Denmark, H. P. 1515
- In favor of the town of Detroit, H. P. 880
- In favor of the town of Dexter, H. P. 128
- In favor of the town of Dixfield, H. P. 226
- In favor of the town of Dixmont, H. P. 376
- In favor of the town of Dover-Foxcroft, H. P. 124
- In favor of the town of Dresden, H. P. 136
- In favor of the town of Durham, H. P. 612
- In favor of the town of Eagle Lake, H. P. 85
- In favor of the town of East Machias, H. P. 533
- In favor of the town of Easton, H. P. 709
- In favor of rebuilding Ebeme Road, in Piscataquis County, S. P. 310
- In favor of the town of Eddington, H. P. 548
- In favor of the town of Edgecomb, H. P. 287
- In favor of the town of Edmunds, H. P. 541
- In favor of the town of Eliot, H. P. 221
- In favor of the city of Ellsworth, H. P. 393
- In favor of the town of Embden, H. P. 729
- In favor of the town of Exeter, H. P. 254
- In favor of the town of Fairfield, H. P. 164
- In favor of the town of Fairfield, H. P. 45
- In favor of the town of Falmouth, H. P. 415
- In favor of the town of Fayette, H. P. 624
- In favor of the town of Flagstaff, H. P. 1086
- In favor of The Forks Plantation, H. P. 623
- In favor of Fort Fairfield, S. P. 143
- In favor of the town of Frankfort, H. P. 32
- In favor of the town of Franklin, S. P. 312
- In favor of the town of Freedom, H. P. 162
- In favor of the town of Freeman, H. P. 379
- In favor of the town of Freeport, H. P. 283
- In favor of the town of Frenchville, H. P. 907
- In favor of the town of Fryeburg, H. P. 921
- In favor of the town of Garland, H. P. 129
- In favor of the town of Georgetown, H. P. 385
- In favor of the town of Georgetown, H. P. 384
- In favor of the town of Gilead, H. P. 168
- In favor of the town of Glenburn, H. P. 525
- In favor of the town of Gorham, H. P. 222
- In favor of the town of Grand Isle, H. P. 919
- In favor of the town of Gray, H. P. 286
- In favor of the town of Greene, H. P. 512
- In favor of the town of Greenville, H. P. 277
- In favor of the town of Greenwood, H. P. 895
- In favor of the town of Guilford, H. P. 495
- In favor of the town of Hampden, H. P. 527
- In favor of the town of Hanover, S. P. 372
- In favor of the town of Harmony, H. P. 519
- In favor of the town of Harpswell, H. P. 917
- In favor of the town of Harrison, H. P. 725
- In favor of the town of Hartford, H. P. 738

In favor of the town of Harrington, H. P. 633

In favor of the town of Haynesville, H. P. 267

In favor of the town of Hebron, H. P. 632

In favor of the town of Hermon, H. P. 524

In favor of Highland Plantation, H. P. 1087

In favor of the town of Hodgdon, H. P. 269

In favor of the town of Holden, H. P. 546

In favor of the town of Hollis, H. P. 882

In favor of the town of Hope, H. P. 229

In favor of the town of Houlton, S. P. 441

In favor of the town of Howland, H. P. 173

In favor of the town of Hudson, H. P. 931

In favor of the town of Jackman, H. P. 734

In favor of the town of Jackson, H. P. 538

In favor of the town of Jay, H. P. 270

In favor of the town of Jefferson, H. P. 1232

In favor of Jerusalem Township, H. P. 380

In favor of the town of Jonesboro, H. P. 884

In favor of the town of Kenduskeag, H. P. 613

In favor of the town of Kennebunk, H. P. 413

In favor of the town of Kennebunk, H. P. 642

In favor of the town of Kennebunkport, H. P. 414

In favor of the town of Kittery, H. P. 220

In favor of the town of Knox, H. P. 163

In favor of Lambert Lake Township, H. P. 872

In favor of the town of Lamoine, H. P. 80

In favor of the town of Lebanon, H. P. 500

In favor of the town of Lee, H. P. 235

In favor of the town of Leeds, H. P. 870

In favor of the town of Levant, H. P. 374

In favor of the town of Lexington, H. P. 621

In favor of the town of Liberty, H. P. 744

In favor of the town of Limerick, H. P. 877

In favor of the town of Limington, H. P. 875

In favor of the town of Lincoln, H. P. 929

In favor of the town of Lincolnville, H. P. 930

In favor of the town of Lisbon, H. P. 261

In favor of the town of Litchfield, H. P. 902

In favor of the town of Livermore, H. P. 21

In favor of the town of Livermore Falls, H. P. 20

In favor of the town of Long Island Pl., H. P. 78

In favor of the town of Lovell, H. P. 728

In favor of the town of Lowell, H. P. 927

In favor of the town of Lubec, H. P. 740

In favor of the town of Lyman, H. P. 881

In favor of the towns of Machias & Machiasport, Libby Brook Bridge, H. P. 532

In favor of the town of Machiasport, H. P. 272

In favor of the town of Madawaska, H. P. 170

In favor of the town of Madison, H. P. 933

In favor of the town of Madrid, H. P. 617

In favor of the town of Manchester, H. P. 130

In favor of the town of Mapleton, H. P. 708

In favor of the town of Marshfield, H. P. 531

In favor of the town of Mars Hill, H. P. 42

In favor of the town of Masardis, H. P. 89

In favor of the town of Medford, H. P. 77

In favor of the town of Mercer, H. P. 48

In favor of the town of Mexico, H. P. 225

In favor of the town of Milbridge, H. P. 635

In favor of the town of Milford, H. P. 906

In favor of the town of Milo, S. P. 104

In favor of the town of Milton Plantation, H. P. 50

In favor of the town of Minot, H. P. 400

In favor of the town of Monmouth, H. P. 904

In favor of the town of Monroe, H. P. 284

In favor of the town of Monson, H. P. 896

In favor of the town of Montville, H. P. 643

- In favor of the town of Morrill, H. P. 553
- In favor of the town of Mt. Desert, H. P. 81
- In favor of the town of Mt. Vernon, H. P. 627
- In favor of the town of Naples, H. P. 634
- In favor of the town of Newburg, H. P. 375
- In favor of the town of Newcastle, S. P. 140
- In favor of the town of Newfield, H. P. 115
- In favor of the town of New Gloucester, H. P. 171
- In favor of the town of New Limerick, H. P. 651
- In favor of the town of Newport, H. P. 253
- In favor of the town of New Portland, H. P. 282
- In favor of the town of New Sharon, S. P. 369
- In favor of the town of New Sharon, H. P. 236
- In favor of the town of New Sweden, H. P. 549
- In favor of the town of New Vineyard, H. P. 161
- In favor of the town of Nobleboro, H. P. 244
- In favor of the town of Norridge-wock, H. P. 278
- In favor of the town of Norridge-wock (Butler's Ferry Bridge), H. P. 1231
- In favor of the town of North Berwick, Bauneg Beg road, H. P. 499
- In favor of the town of North Kennebunkport, H. P. 745
- In favor of the town of Northport, H. P. 250
- In favor of the town of North Yarmouth, H. P. 353
- In favor of the town of Oakfield, H. P. 652
- In favor of the town of Oakland, H. P. 737
- In favor of the town of Old Orchard Beach, H. P. 746
- In favor of the city of Old Town, H. P. 281
- In favor of the town of Orland, H. P. 24
- In favor of the town of Orneville, H. P. 75
- In favor of the town of Orrington, H. P. 547
- In favor of the town of Otis, H. P. 404
- In favor of the town of Otisfield, H. P. 724
- In favor of the town of Owls Head, H. P. 122
- In favor of the town of Palmyra, H. P. 263
- In favor of the town of Paris, H. P. 52
- In favor of the town of Paris, H. P. 51
- In favor of the town of Parkman, H. P. 498
- In favor of the town of Palermo, H. P. 417
- In favor of the town of Parsonsfield, H. P. 876
- In favor of the town of Patten, H. P. 534
- In favor of the town of Pembroke, H. P. 717
- In favor of the town of Penobscot, H. P. 25
- In favor of the town of Perham, H. P. 552
- In favor of the town of Perkins Plantation, S. P. 368
- In favor of the town of Perry, H. P. 712
- In favor of the town of Phillips, H. P. 389
- In favor of the town of Phippsburg, H. P. 706
- In favor of the town of Pittston, H. P. 723
- In favor of the town of Plymouth, H. P. 373
- In favor of the town of Poland, H. P. 514
- In favor of the town of Porter, H. P. 923
- In favor of the town of Pownal, H. P. 240
- In favor of the town of Prentiss, H. P. 908
- In favor of the town of Presque Isle, H. P. 515
- In favor of the town of Princeton, H. P. 372
- In favor of the town of Prospect, H. P. 31
- In favor of the town of Randolph, H. P. 885
- In favor of the town of Raymond, H. P. 172
- In favor of the town of Readfield, H. P. 1517
- In favor of the town of Readfield, H. P. 1089
- In favor of the town of Richmond, H. P. 890
- In favor of the town of Ripley, H. P. 523
- In favor of the town of Robbinston, H. P. 879
- In favor of the town of Rockland, H. P. 614
- In favor of the town of Rome, H. P. 626
- In favor of the town of Roque Bluffs, H. P. 620
- In favor of the town of Roxbury, H. P. 707
- In favor of the city of Saco, H. P. 390

In favor of the town of Salem,
H. P. 227

In favor of Sandy River Plan-
tation, H. P. 19

In favor of the town of Sanger-
ville, H. P. 174

In favor of the town of Sears-
mont, H. P. 358

In favor of the town of Sears-
port, H. P. 34

In favor of the town of Sebago,
H. P. 720

In favor of the town of Sebec,
H. P. 224

In favor of the town of Shap-
leigh, H. P. 116

In favor of the road leading from
Sherman to Stacyville, H. P. 405

In favor of the town of Shirley,
H. P. 275

In favor of the town of Sidney,
H. P. 735

In favor of the town of Skowhe-
gan, H. P. 93

In favor of the town of Skowhe-
gan, H. P. 271

In favor of the town of Skowhe-
gan, S. P. 141

In favor of the town of Skowhe-
gan, S. P. 118

In favor of the town of Smith-
field, H. P. 315

In favor of the town of Smith-
field, H. P. 47

In favor of the town of Smyrna
Mills, H. P. 653

In favor of the town of Solon,
S. P. 159

In favor of the town of Solon,
S. P. 142

In favor of the town of Somer-
ville, H. P. 367

In favor of the town of Spring-
field, H. P. 397

In favor of the town of South
Berwick, H. P. 53

In favor of the town of South
Bristol, H. P. 394

In favor of the town of South-
port, H. P. 396

In favor of the town of South
Thomaston, H. P. 123

In favor of the town of South-
west Harbor, S. P. 102

In favor of the town of Standish,
H. P. 883

In favor of the town of Starks,
S. P. 203

In favor of the town of Stetson,
H. P. 555

In favor of the town of Steuben,
H. P. 636

In favor of the town of St.
Albans, H. P. 520

In favor of the town of St.
George, H. P. 648

In favor of the town of St.
John Plantation, H. P. 899

In favor of the town of Stock-
holm, H. P. 133

In favor of the town of Stockton
Springs, H. P. 35

In favor of the town of Strong,
H. P. 160

In favor of the town of Sullivan,
H. P. 403

In favor of the town of Sumner,
H. P. 631

In favor of the town of Surry,
H. P. 391

In favor of the town of Swans
Island, H. P. 159

In favor of the town of Swan-
ville, H. P. 285

In favor of the town of Temple,
H. P. 238

In favor of the town of Thorn-
dike, H. P. 539

In favor of the town of Tops-
field, H. P. 370

In favor of the town of Topsham,
H. P. 165

In favor of the town of Trenton,
H. P. 83

In favor of the town of Trescott,
H. P. 542

In favor of the town of Troy, H.
P. 540

In favor of the town of Turner,
H. P. 1369

In favor of the town of Union,
H. P. 257

In favor of the town of Unity,
H. P. 408

In favor of the town of Unity,
H. P. 628

In favor of the town of Van
Buren, H. P. 920

In favor of the town of Vassal-
boro, H. P. 719

In favor of the town of Vassal-
boro, H. P. 649

In favor of the town of Vienna,
H. P. 909

In favor of the town of Vinal-
haven, H. P. 647

In favor of the town of Waldo,
H. P. 409

In favor of the town of Waldo-
boro, H. P. 366

In favor of the town of Wales,
H. P. 513

In favor of Wallagrass Plantation,
H. P. 126

In favor of Wallagrass Plantation,
H. P. 125

In favor of the town of Warren,
H. P. 258

In favor of the town of Wash-
burn, H. P. 551

In favor of the town of Wash-
ington, H. P. 865

In favor of the town of Wayne,
H. P. 1194

In favor of the town of Webster,
H. P. 868

In favor of the town of Wellington, H. P. 897

In favor of the town of Wesley, H. P. 530

In favor of the town of West Bath, H. P. 167

In favor of the town of Westfield, H. P. 710

In favor of the town of West Gardiner, H. P. 114

In favor of the town of Weston, H. P. 268

In favor of the town of Westport, H. P. 1093

In favor of the town of Whitefield, H. P. 871

In favor of the town of Williamsburg, H. P. 348

In favor of the town of Willimantic, H. P. 274

In favor of the town of Wilton, H. P. 722

In favor of the town of Windham, H. P. 892

In favor of the town of Windsor, H. P. 886

In favor of the town of Winn, H. P. 398

In favor of the town of Winslow, H. P. 650

In favor of the town of Winterport, H. P. 28

In favor of the town of Winterville Plantation, H. P. 347

In favor of the town of Winthrop, H. P. 905

In favor of the town of Wiscasset, H. P. 355

In favor of the town of Woodland, H. P. 550

In favor of the town of Woodstock, H. P. 49

In favor of the town of Woolwich, H. P. 864

In favor of the town of York, H. P. 554

In favor of the city of Augusta, H. P. 350

In favor of the city of Belfast, H. P. 741

In favor of the city of Westbrook, H. P. 260

In favor of the town of Yarmouth, H. P. 354

In favor of the town of Scarborough, H. P. 135

In favor of the Townships of Township One, Range Nine; Township Two, Range Nine; Township Three, Range Nine; Township Two, Range Ten; and Township Three, Range Ten; Piscataquis County, H. P. 543

In favor of the town of Deer Isle, S. P. 105

In favor of townships No. 9 and No. 10, S. P. 313

In favor of the town of Pittsfield, H. P. 265

In favor of the Katahdin Iron Works, S. P. 103

In favor of a road in Lincoln Plantation, H. P. 727

In favor of the road from Wilson's Mills to Houghton, H. P. 893

In favor of Tatnic Road, S. P. 170

Authorizing the Highway Commission to purchase a certain lot of land, H. P. 17

In favor of the town of Hartland, H. P. 731

In favor of the towns of Leeds and Turner for the construction of a bridge, H. P. 867

In favor of the town of Wells, H. P. 259

In favor of the town of Milbridge, H. P. 638

Main River Bridge, Township 31, H. P. 528

reporting a consolidated resolve (H. P. 1878) under title of "Resolve for the construction, maintenance, and repair of roads and bridges" and that it ought to pass.

Report was read and accepted and the resolve given its two several readings under suspension of the rules, passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to be Enacted

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules.)

(S. P. 642) (L. D. 807) An act to provide for the appointment of a Commission on revision of the laws relating to the protection of ground fish.

(H. P. 433) (L. D. 116) An act relative to open season on moose.

(H. P. 1269) (L. D. 563) An act relative to the suspension of bounties on porcupines and hedgehogs.

(H. P. 1794) (L. D. 816) An act to provide for old age pensions.

(S. P. 666) (L. D. 850) An act to establish a boundary line for the town of Fayette.

(H. P. 1871) (L. D. 932) An act amending the charter of the city of Biddeford.

(H. P. 1825) (L. D. 876) An act relating to Game Preserves at Back Bay, Portland.

(H. P. 1869) (L. D. 936) Resolve in favor of the Charles H. Cutter Coal Company of Boston.

Reports of Committees

(Out of order, under suspension of the rules.)

Mr. ELLIS from the Committee on Ways and Bridges reported

ought not to pass on the following resolves:

In favor of the town of Alna, H. P. 503

In favor of the town of Alna, H. P. 502

In favor of the town of Anson, H. P. 348

In favor of the town of Athens, H. P. 59

In favor of the town of Baileyville, H. P. 371

In favor of the town of Bethel, H. P. 894

In favor of the city of Biddeford, H. P. 365

In favor of the town of Bowdoin, H. P. 387

In favor of the town of Brooks, H. P. 915

In favor of Townships C & D, H. P. 412

In favor of the town of Canaan, H. P. 730

In favor of the town of Caribou, H. P. 510

In favor of the town of Carroll, H. P. 127

In favor of the town of Castle Hill, H. P. 91

In favor of the town of Charleston, H. P. 932

In favor of the town of Cornish, H. P. 874

In favor of the town of Cushing, H. P. 120

In favor of the town of Deer Isle, H. P. 889

In favor of the town of Embden, H. P. 619

In favor of the town of Edgecomb, H. P. 177

In favor of the town of Fairfield, H. P. 46

In favor of the town of Farmingdale, H. P. 925

In favor of the town of Frankfort, H. P. 30

In favor of the town of Frankfort, H. P. 29

In favor of the town of Georgetown, H. P. 383

In favor of the town of Gouldsboro, H. P. 535

In favor of the town of Gouldsboro, H. P. 536

In favor of the town of Gray, H. P. 352

In favor of the town of Greenfield, H. P. 545

In favor of the town of Greenwood, H. P. 1084

In favor of the town of Greenville, H. P. 898

In favor of the town of Hancock, H. P. 388

In favor of the town of Hartland, H. P. 522

In favor of the town of Hermon, H. P. 526

In favor of the town of Houlton, H. P. 266

In favor of the town of Jackson, H. P. 411

In favor of the town of Jefferson, H. P. 369

In favor of Jerusalem Plantation, H. P. 1085

In favor of the town of Leeds, H. P. 869

In favor of the town of Limestone, H. P. 134

In favor of the town of Lisbon, H. P. 262

In favor of the town of Liberty, H. P. 249

In favor of the town of Maria-ville, H. P. 402

In favor of the town of Mechanic Falls, H. P. 399

In favor of the town of Montville, H. P. 416

In favor of the town of Monmouth, H. P. 901

In favor of the town of Monticello, H. P. 44

In favor of the town of Mount Vernon, H. P. 625

In favor of the town of Monroe, H. P. 629

In favor of the town of Naples, H. P. 633

In favor of the town of Northfield, H. P. 529

In favor of the town of Norridgewock, H. P. 279

In favor of the town of Norway, H. P. 516

In favor of the town of North Haven, H. P. 646

In favor of the town of North Haven, H. P. 645

In favor of the town of Otisfield, H. P. 726

In favor of the town of Parkman, H. P. 497

In favor of the town of Passadumkeag, H. P. 926

In favor of the town of Peru, H. P. 912

In favor of the town of Phippsburg, H. P. 252

In favor of the town of Phippsburg, H. P. 918

In favor of the town of Pittston, H. P. 888

In favor of the town of Pownal, H. P. 239

In favor of the town of Prentiss, H. P. 233

In favor of the town of Prentiss, H. P. 86

In favor of the town of Prentiss, H. P. 234

In favor of the town of Prospect,
H. P. 33

In favor of the town of Prospect,
H. P. 26

In favor of the town of Presque
Isle, H. P. 1290

In favor of the town of Rangeley,
H. P. 511

In favor of the town of Robbin-
ston, H. P. 714

In favor of the town of Rockport,
H. P. 255

In favor of the town of Rumford,
H. P. 866

In favor of the town of Sedgwick,
H. P. 381

In favor of the town of Somer-
ville, H. P. 505

In favor of the town of Starks,
H. P. 618

In favor of the town of Sumner,
H. P. 913

In favor of the town of Swan-
ville, H. P. 406

In favor of the town of Thomas-
ton, H. P. 119

In favor of the town of Trescott,
H. P. 1091

In favor of the town of Turner,
H. P. 87

In favor of the town of Verona,
H. P. 23

In favor of the town of Waldo-
boro, H. P. 506

In favor of the town of Waldo-
boro, H. P. 504

In favor of the town of Washing-
ton, H. P. 256

In favor of the town of Wayne,
H. P. 1090

In favor of the town of Wayne,
H. P. 1195

In favor of the town of West
Bath, H. P. 644

In favor of the road connecting
Morrill Village with Route No. 137
in Waldo, H. P. 630

In favor of repair of route No. 7
in Waldo County, H. P. 410

In favor of towns of Frankfort
and Winterport, H. P. 27

In favor of the town of Winter-
port, H. P. 891

In favor of the town of Winter
Harbor, H. P. 537

In favor of the town of Winter-
port, H. P. 346

In favor of the town of Woolwich,
H. P. 251

In favor of the town of Oquossoc,
H. P. 1516

In favor of the town of Chester-
ville, H. P. 401

In favor of St. Francis Plan-
tation, H. P. 84

In favor of Wallagrass Plantation,
H. P. 732

In favor of Ashland, H. P. 92

In favor of the town of Castle
Hill, H. P. 88

In favor of Wallagrass Plantation,
H. P. 280

In favor of the towns of Sheep-
scot Village to Newcastle-Damari-
scotta, H. P. 368

In favor of the town of Fairfield,
S. P. 78

In favor of the city of Belfast,
S. P. 85

In favor of the city of Saco, S.
P. 171

In favor of a bridge in Jonesport,
S. P. 261

In favor of a bridge in Addison,
S. P. 262

In favor of construction on route
No. 191, S. P. 309

In favor of the town of Jefferson,
S. P. 349

In favor of the town of Goulds-
boro, S. P. 350

In favor of Washington Planta-
tion, S. P. 370

Report read and accepted and
sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The
Chair recognizes the gentleman
from Belfast, Mr. Thompson.

On motion by Mr. Thompson, it
was voted to take from the table
bill an act to create and allocating a
general highway fund for State
road, State-aid and third-class
highway construction and to tem-
porarily suspend certain Statutes.
S. P. 702, L. D. 927.

Mr. THOMPSON: I move, Mr.
Speaker, that this bill be passed to
be enacted and I think it has an
emergency preamble.

Passed to be Enacted
(Emergency Measure)

S. P. 702, L. D. 927: An act to
create and allocate a general high-
way fund for State road, State-aid
and third-class highway construc-
tion and to temporarily suspend cer-
tain Statutes.

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

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty-six vot-
ing in the affirmative and none in
the negative, the bill was passed to
be enacted.

(Paper from the Senate, out of order and under suspension of the rules)

From the Senate: Bill an act to provide for the allotment of additional funds to the State School Fund and to provide for the equalization of the burden of supporting a Foundation Program of Education (H. P. 1846) (L. D. 909) which was passed to be engrossed in the House yesterday.

Comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Mr. COOK of Pittsfield: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the House for their support in the matter of this bill, and at this time I move that we adhere to our former action.

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur with the Senate, and that motion has preference.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to recede and concur prevailed, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Order

(Out of order.)

On motion by Mr. Tupper of Calais, it was

Ordered, that the Speaker be presented with the desk and chair used by him in his office during the present session.

Passed to be Enacted

(Out of order, under suspension of the rules.)

(S. P. 132) (L. D. 79) An act relative to resident fishing and hunting licenses.

(S. P. 252) (L. D. 201) An act to repeal Chapter 117 of Private and Special Laws of 1933 relating to the Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District.

Finally Passed

(S. P. 723) Resolve in favor of Harry E. Rowell of Saco.

The Chair lays before the House bill tabled this afternoon, being H. P. 1864, L. D. 918, an act to regulate the practices of professional engineering and land surveying, the pending motion being that of Mr. Martin of Oakland that we recede and concur with the Senate.

Mr. DEERING of Hollis: Mr. Speaker, I have examined that bill and I do not care to take any further action on it.

Thereupon the House voted to re-

consider its action whereby this bill was indefinitely postponed. It further voted to accept the report of the committee.

Mr. BURNHAM of Kittery: Mr. Speaker, my impression is that the House has not yet acted upon Senate Amendment A.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will inform the gentleman that we are just getting in position to act upon it.

Mr. BURNHAM: I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

Thereupon the bill had its two several readings, and on motion by Mr. Deering of Hollis, the rules were suspended and the bill was given its third reading at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it now the pleasure of the House to adopt Senate Amendment A in concurrence?

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had, Ninety-eight voting in the affirmative and four in the negative, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Orders

(Out of order)

On motion by Mr. Fogg of Rockland, it was

Ordered, that the Superintendent of Buildings be authorized and directed, with the approval of the Controller, to convert Room 66, the present third floor check room into a House Locker; and be it further ordered that Room 64 be made available by the Superintendent of Buildings for the use of the Clerk of the House at all future regular and special sessions until otherwise ordered by the House.

On motion by Mr. Tupper of Calais, it was

Ordered, that the Superintendent of Public Buildings be directed to deliver to the Clerk of the House at his home such equipment and supplies as the Clerk shall deem necessary for use in completing and indexing the Journal; and

Ordered, that the State Librarian mail to each member of the House of Representatives the part of the Legislative Record, beginning with March 25, 1935, page 582, after the close of the session.

On motion by Mr. Phair of Caswell, it was

Ordered, that the House Pages be

directed to take up a collection from the members of the House, to be taken forthwith, to be equally divided between the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, the two Pages, the telephone operator and the telephone messenger.

On motion by Mr. Fogg of Rockland, it was

Ordered, that the offices occupied by the Speaker of the House and the Clerk of the House, and the equipment therein, remain under their respective control until released by them.

Finally Passed

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules.)

H. P. 1877: Resolve in favor of the Chaplains of the House of the Eighty-seventh Legislature.

H. P. 1879: Resolve on the pay roll of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-seventh Legislature.

Recess

Papers from the Senate, out of order and under suspension of the rules.

From the Senate: Ordered, the House concurring, that the State Librarian mail to each member and officer of the House and Senate a copy of the Public Laws of this session when completed. (S. P. 724)

Comes from the Senate, read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Ordered, the House concurring, that resolve relating to the Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District, L. D. 935, be recalled from the Engrossing Department to the Senate.

Comes from the Senate, read and passed.

In the House, read and passed in concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: There are very important papers which will be returned to the House from the Senate shortly which will require probably the two-thirds vote of the House for their enactment. With this notice you may be at ease until the sound of the gong or gavel.

Recess

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

From the Senate: Resolve in favor of the town of Vassalboro. (S. P. 731)

Resolve in favor of the town of Oakland. (S. P. 732)

Come from the Senate received by unanimous consent under suspension of the rules, given their several readings and passed to be engrossed without reference to a Committee.

In the House:

Mr. ELLIS of Rangeley: Mr. Speaker, these two resolves are introduced merely to correct a clerical error in the blanket resolve that came in a while ago. In the Senate the error was discovered.

Thereupon the two resolves were received by unanimous consent, under suspension of the rules, given their several readings, and passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee, in concurrence.

The SPEAKER pro tem: I am requested to announce that the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, the pages, the telephone operator and her assistant wish to extend thanks to the members of the House for their generosity. (Applause)

Recess

The following paper from the Senate was taken up out of order under suspension of the rules:

From the Senate: Resolve proposing an Amendment to the Constitution providing funds necessary for maintenance, interest and retirement Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District bonds (S. P. 720) (L. D. 935) which was passed to be engrossed in the House yesterday and recalled to the Senate by Joint Order.

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

In the House:

(Senate Amendment A read by the Clerk.)

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of the bill and amendment. I do it for this reason, that that bill has got to be re-engrossed, and as there are other bills in the

Senate which have amendments, we cannot pass those bills unless we stay here until six o'clock this morning.

Now I do not belong to any church particularly, but I do have some respect for the Sabbath, and, in passing these matters over, as we are now, early in the Sabbath, we shall probably have to be here until six o'clock, and we must either postpone them or come over here next week and enact these laws with due consideration. Every bill that comes in with an amendment, I shall move its indefinite postponement, for those reasons.

Mr. HIGGINS of Ellsworth: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I too have the same respect for the Sabbath that the gentleman who last spoke has, but I do not think that a bill of this importance can be thrown out as idly as that.

This is a bill that means that probably 4,000 people the year round will be given the possibility of getting to the mainland easily and conveniently. It means that in the height of the summer season 10,000 people will be given that opportunity. It means even more than that: it means a hope that has been in the minds of my constituents for several decades will be passed up, and will be passed up at this time when our Federal Government is very generous. If you pass it up now, it means that bridge may never be built.

I am glad to say this too, especially in view of the thought presented by the gentleman from Westbrook,—that the Governor of this State is keenly interested in this legislation, and I, as a Republican, am willing to go further and say that this bridge could never have been obtained had it not been for the interest of His Excellency, the Governor of the State of Maine, and I certainly dislike, in the closing hours of this session, to see this gentleman from Westbrook, (Mr. Scates) for whom I have a great deal of respect, standing in the way of the leader of his own party in the State of Maine.

I could go on further, perhaps, and explain the meaning of this bill, but I will say this: It probably will not entail a cent of expenditure on the part of the State of Maine.

Just to show the sentiment in my little district down there, they have said that if the bridge did not pay

for itself, they would help out under certain circumstances. Even now, basing it on the present revenue of the old antiquated apparatus down there, it is sufficient to take care of all expenses in the retirement of the bonds. I certainly hope, and I plead with you members of the House that we do not at this time indefinitely postpone, as the gentleman from Westbrook would have you. This is a vital piece of legislation, the most vital legislation that could possibly be enacted, at least for the individuals of one county of the State and of the whole eastern section. I would sum it up by saying: I plead with you that the motion for indefinite postponement will not prevail.

Mr. GRAY of Brookville: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I heartily concur with the gentleman from Ellsworth, Mr. Higgins. I could go on and explain a lot about the circumstances of this particular bill and of its importance to that community, but I will not impose upon you in this late hour to do anything of the sort. I certainly hope the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Scates) will not prevail.

Mr. DEVEREUX of Penobscot: Mr. Speaker, probably very few people here tonight realize how serious this question is. At the present time, after this is passed, the money can be obtained from the Federal Government to build this bridge. If this should go over two years more, we probably never would be able to obtain the money, and all we have to do now is to have the bill passed to be enacted. This emergency clause is all that needs to be passed at the present time for the towns in the district to go ahead and make the necessary arrangements with the Federal Government to obtain money to build this bridge.

Now a careful check on the income from the old ferry in the last two years shows that the income from the old ferry, as the gentleman from Ellsworth (Mr. Higgins) has stated, would be far in excess of the amount that is needed to run the bridge, and the entire cost. I certainly hope that the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook (Mr. Scates) does not prevail. It would be a very serious blow to the people.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I

heartily endorse all that has been said by the other members of the Hancock county delegation. We have voted for bills that have helped other parts of the State, and now the opportunity has come to help this part of the State. Let us not turn it down.

Mrs. LATNO of Old Town; Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The member from Old Town, Mrs. Latno, has moved the previous question. Before the Chair can entertain that motion the consent of one-third of the members of the House must be obtained. 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 pro tem: Obviously more than one-third of the members 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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Scates, that the resolve be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

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

Thereupon, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed. Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the resolve as amended by Senate Amendment A was passed to be engrossed.

Paper from the Senate, out of order and under suspension of the rules:

From the Senate: Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on resolve appropriating funds for the purchase of land from the city of Augusta to be added to the State Aviation Field at Augusta (S. P. No. 352) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 726) under title of resolve for the acquisition of additional land for the use of an airport and appropriating money therefor and that it ought to pass

Comes from the Senate report

read and accepted and the resolve passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A.

In the House:

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill for the reason that it has got to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Scates, that the bill be indefinitely postponed will rise and stand until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division was had.

Twenty having voted in the affirmative and 71 in the negative, the motion failed of passage.

Thereupon, the report of the committee was accepted and the resolve was given its first reading.

Senate Amendment A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Mr. Speaker, just a word of explanation of the amendment. The total price of this land is \$30,000, and as this Legislature only has authority to vote money for the next two years, the amendment was put on to show the total price.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Mr. CONNOLLY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendment be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connolly, moves that Senate Amendment A be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion will manifest it by saying aye; contrary minded no.

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

Thereupon, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence; and the resolve as amended by Senate Amendment A was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate:
SPECIAL COMMUNICATION
FROM THE GOVERNOR
STATE OF MAINE
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

Augusta, Maine

April 6, 1935

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

The Legislature has enacted and submitted to me for signature—H. P. 1794, L. D. 816—an act to provide for old age pensions.

I approve of the purpose and intent of the bill and favor the enactment of a workable old age pension law.

I do not desire the people of Maine, especially those entitled to old age relief to be misled by the fact that the bill has been enacted with no appropriation to carry into effect the provisions of the act.

I respectfully request the Legislature to point out to the Chief Executive and to the State Controller the fund from which money may be found to carry out the provisions of the act.

Section 16 of said act provides, "That the State Controller is hereby directed and empowered to set up from general funds of the State such an amount as may be required to carry out the provisions of this act, unless funds are otherwise provided."

The Legislature has failed to provide any fund to carry into effect the act, and the appropriation bill carries no appropriation for old age pensions.

The aged of the State are looking expectantly to the Legislature to provide some relief for them.

It is unjust to create any false hopes in the minds of the aged of the State.

Security of the elderly is too sacred an obligation with which to trifle.

The passage of this measure without provision for funds to make it effective, is an empty gesture.

I do not believe that either you or I wish to be put into the position of creating any false hopes and expectations in the minds of the aged.

I respectfully ask the Legislature to designate to the Controller and Chief Executive the source from which funds may be found to finance an old age pension law.

This is not a veto but a respectful request to the Legislature for information.

Respectfully submitted
(Signed) LOUIS J. BRANN,
Governor.

Comes from the Senate, read and placed on file.

In the House:

Mr. CONNOLLY of Portland: The members of the House seem to express the feeling that they want me to sit down; nevertheless, I am going to express the feelings I have on the matter, because if I do not

get it over tonight, I never will. I want to say this: We passed an old age pension law, and it looks to me as though we are passing the buck to the next Legislature.

Now we have revenue from the Liquor Commission, revenue from all the liquor and beer sold in the State of Maine. We have not done anything along that line, and I believe that the revenue derived from the liquor should go to the old age pension fund.

I submit, tonight, although I have not any bill or order to present, that the revenue derived from the liquor and beer commission should go to the old age pension fund.

Mr. THOMPSON of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully call to the attention of the gentleman from Portland, (Mr. Connolly) and to the members of the House, the fact that the proceeds from the liquor stores are already set up in the budget to pay for bills that have already been passed by this Legislature, and I do not see where you can get any money from the liquor profits to pay for an old age pension fund.

On motion by Mr. Tupper of Calais, it was voted to recess for five minutes.

Recess

Mr. HILL of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move that the communication from His Excellency, the Governor, be received and placed on file.

The motion prevailed.

Papers from the Senate out of order and under suspension of the rules.

From the Senate: Ordered, that the House concurring, that the Governor be requested to return to the Senate, bill an act to provide for old age pensions, House Paper 1794, Legislative Document 816, for further consideration.

Comes from the Senate read and passed.

In the House:

The SPEAKER pro tem: Is it the pleasure of the House that this order receive passage in concurrence?

Mr. COOK of Pittsfield: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER pro tem: All those in favor of the passage of this order will rise and stand until

counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

Mr. SCATES of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, will you please state the question again?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question is on the passage of this order in concurrence. All those in favor of the passage of the order will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division was had.

One hundred and two having voted in the affirmative and 6 in the negative, the order received passage in concurrence.

Paper from the Senate, out of order and under suspension of the rules.

From the Senate: Bill an act relating to State publicity (S. P. No. 424) (L. D. No. 516) which was passed to be engrossed in the House earlier in the day as amended by House Amendments A and B in non-concurrence.

Comes from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A and House Amendment B as amended by Senate Amendment A thereto, and Senate Amendment A to the bill.

In the House:

Senate Amendment A to House Amendment B read.

Mr. FINDLEN of Fort Fairfield: Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendment be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman wish to reconsider our former action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed?

Mr. FINDLEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Thereupon, by a viva voce vote, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed. The House voted to reconsider the adoption of House Amendment B. Thereupon the House voted to adopt Senate Amendment A to House Amendment B. Thereupon the House voted to adopt Senate Amendment A to the bill, and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in concurrence.

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

Thereupon the House voted to adopt House Amendment B as amended by Senate Amendment A, and the bill was passed to be en-

grossed, as amended, in concurrence.

Report of Committee

(Out of order, and under suspension of the rules)

The following report was taken up out of order under suspension of the rules:

Mr. Ellis from the Committee on Rules and Business of the House on House Order, relative to appointing House Select Committee to investigate the advisability of establishing County Farms, reported that the same be referred to the 88th Legislature.

Report was read and accepted.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to introduce tax bills for the two current years. These are in the regular course of business.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Calais, Mr. Tupper, introduces out of order and under suspension of the rules, two tax bills. The Clerk will read the titles.

Bill an act for assessment of State tax for the year 1935,

Bill an act for assessment of State tax for the year 1936.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Calais, Mr. Tupper, asks the unanimous consent of the House to introduce these two bills at this time, and that under suspension of the rules the bills be given their three several readings.

Mr. DONAHUE of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, I think we should know the contents of those bills before we pass them. I think it only fair that they be read.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Mr. Speaker, these are the regular tax bills for the State revenue that called for seven and one quarter mills on State property.

Thereupon bill an act for assessment of State tax for the year 1935 had its three several readings under suspension of the rules and was passed to be engrossed.

Bill an act for assessment of State tax for the year 1936 had its three several readings under suspension of the rules and was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Bramson of Portland presented the following order, out of order, and moved its passage:

Ordered, the Senate concurring,

that bill an act creating a State Lottery Commission, H. P. 147, L. D. 149, be returned to the House from the Legislative files.

Mr. BRAMSON: Mr. Speaker, I would say that this House has failed to provide any funds for the old age pension, and I think the lottery scheme is a thing that should be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the passage of the order.

Mr. TUPPER of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of the order.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Calais, Mr. Tupper, that this order be indefinitely postponed. All in favor of that motion will manifest it by saying aye, contrary-minded, no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had, Seventy-eight voting in the affirmative and 46 in the negative, the order was indefinitely postponed.

Passed to be Enacted

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

(H. P. No. 840) (L. D. No. 287)

An act relating to caucus law of Biddeford.

Finally Passed

(H. P. No. 207) (L. D. No. 67) Resolve creating a Recess Committee on compulsory liability insurance for motor vehicles.

(H. P. No. 1875) Resolve for screening certain lakes and ponds in the State.

(H. P. No. 1876) Resolve for screening certain lakes and ponds in the State.

(H. P. No. 1878) Resolve for the construction, maintenance and repair of roads and bridges.

H. P. 1324, L. D. 577: An act relative to the exemption of personal property from attachment.

Passed to be Enacted

(Emergency Measure)

H. P. 1873: An act for the relief, rehabilitation, protection and enhancement of agriculture and dairying in the State of Maine.

The SPEAKER pro tem: This being an emergency measure, it is necessary that it have the affirmative vote of two-thirds the entire membership of this body. All those

in favor of the passage of this bill to be enacted will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division being had,

The SPEAKER pro tem: One hundred voting in the affirmative—

Mr. FINDLEN of Fort Fairfield: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Fort Fairfield, Mr. Findlen, asks for a roll call. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Scates.

Mr. SCATES: The result has already been declared, has it not? It was reported one hundred.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The motion for a roll call is in order.

Mr. SCATES: After a vote has been declared, there cannot be a roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman raise a point of order?

Mr. SCATES: I surely do.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair rules that the request for a roll call was seasonably made.

Mr. SCATES: I am not going to take exception to the ruling of the Chair, but I distinctly understood that the vote was declared.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The roll call has been asked. Before it is ordered it is necessary that one-fifth of the members indicate their desire.

Mr. SCATES: Simply for a matter of record, that it may be placed upon the Record—

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman is out of order at the present time. The roll call has been ordered. All those in favor of the roll call at this time will manifest it by rising, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had,

The SPEAKER pro tem: Obviously more than one-fifth of the members having arisen the roll call is ordered. This is an important measure and we must have your attention. The question before the House is the enactment of an act for the relief, rehabilitation, protection and enhancement of agriculture and dairying in the State of Maine. Those in favor of the enactment of the bill will answer yes; those opposed will answer no. The pages will direct the members in the corridors to resume their seats. Is the House ready for the question? The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOYLE of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be quite a misunderstanding among the members as to just what they are voting on, and for the benefit of a few of us I would like to have it explained. Personally I know what it is.

The SPEAKER pro tem: As the Chair has stated the question before, the matter before the House is on the enactment of an act for the relief, rehabilitation, protection and enhancement of agriculture and dairying in the State of Maine. Those in favor of the enactment will vote yes and those opposed will vote no. Is the House ready for the question? The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Alden, Austin, Parkman; Ayer, Bragdon, Brown, Bubar, Burgess, Burnham, Burrill, Cambridge, Campbell, Carleton, Carswell, Chase, Baring, Chase, Limington; Churchill, Clark, Plymouth; Cole, Connolly, Cook, Coolidge, Cote, Crosby, Cummings, Currier, Davis, Fairfield; Davis, Newfield; Deering, Demers, Dennett, Devereux, Donahue, Dorr, Dow, Doyle, Caribou; Doyle, Skowhegan; Drisko, Eddy, Elliot, Ellis, Castle Hill; Ellis, Rangeley; Finden, Flanders, Fogg, Rockland, Fortin, Fowles, Graves, Gray, Brooksville; Gray, Presque Isle; Hall, Hammond, Harriman, Gardiner; Harriman, Prospect; Haskell, Hastings, Hathorn, Hesselcock, Higgins, Hill, Jandreau, Jillson, Kendrick, King, Labbee, Lancaster, Latno, Lausier, Lebel, Lindsey, MacKenzie, Mallett, Martin, Dexter; Martin, Oakland; Mason, McKay, Mosher, Newton, Noyes, Oliver, Palmer, Patterson, Payson, Phair, Pike, Poulin, Proctor, Roach, Rush, Russ, Sawyer, Seabury, Sennett, Sewall, Shaw, Sleeper, Smith, Bangor; Smith, Van Buren; Sprague, Stickney, Stilphen, Stoddard, Story, Thompson, Belfast; Thompson, Chelsea; Thurston, Tompkins, Tupper, Vaughan, Wallace, Weatherbee, Weber, Wentworth, Wheeler, Willey, Wright, Young.

NAY—Allan, Austin, Exeter; Belaire, Bramson, Bushey, Crowell, Desmond, Eveleth, Forbes, Gibbons, Goss, Hagan, Heald, Kilroy, Leclair, Leonard, Mace, Maheu, Parsons, Ryder, Woodbury, Worthen.

ABSENT—Boucher, Chase, Sebec; Clarke, Cooper; Donovan, Forgue, Lewiston; Gleason, Hearn, Hobbs, Jacobson, Lewis, Philbrick, Richardson, Scates.

116—Yes.

22—No.

13—Absent.

One hundred and sixteen voting in the affirmative and 22 in the negative, the bill was passed to be enacted.

During the roll call the following colloquy took place:

Mr. FORTIN of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tem: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FORTIN: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, or I rise to a point of personal privilege, if that is the parliamentary law. I have not voted on this yet.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's name will be called.

Clerk called the gentleman's name.

Mr. FORTIN: Mr. Speaker, I prefer not to vote unless the House allows me to state my reason for not voting.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman cannot interrupt the roll call for that purpose. The roll call is not completed.

Mr. FORTIN: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to vote unless I have the consent of the House to state my reasons.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman refuse to answer to his name?

Mr. FORTIN: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that no discussion is to take place on this, that it is not debatable?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman will answer the question of the Chair.

Mr. FORTIN: I am trying to answer the question indirectly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman will kindly answer the question yes or no. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman refuses to vote?

Mr. FORTIN: I do, Mr. Speaker, because we have voted on this once.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. FORTIN: I knew it.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman still refuse to vote? The Clerk will call the gentleman's name. It is the rule of the House that the gentleman must vote. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name again.

Mr. FORTIN: I vote yes.

Passed to be Enacted

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules.)

(S. P. 692) (L. D. 858) An act relating to settlement of children.

(H. P. 1874) An act relating to bounty on bobcats.

Finally Passed

(S. P. 725) Resolve in favor of the Chaplains of the Senate of the Eighty-seventh Legislature.

(S. P. 728) Resolve on the payroll of the Senate of the Eighty-seventh Legislature.

(S. P. 729) Resolve in favor of clerks, stenographers, and messengers of the several committees of the 87th Legislature.

(S. P. 731) Resolve in favor of the town of Vassalboro.

(S. P. 732) Resolve in favor of the town of Oakland.

(H. P. 1864) (L. D. 918) An act to regulate the practice of professional engineering; creating a State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers.

Paper from the Senate out of order and under suspension of the rules disposed of in concurrence.

The following papers from the Senate, out of order and under suspension of the rules.

From the Senate: Final report of the committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs

Comes from the Senate, read and accepted.

In the House read and accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Bill an act supplemental appropriation act to further provide for the necessary expenditures of State government for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936 and June 30, 1937. (S. P. 736)

Comes from the Senate received by unanimous consent, under suspension of the rules, given its several readings and passed to be engrossed without reference to a committee.

In the House, received out of order by unanimous consent, under suspension of the rules, given its three several readings without reference to a committee and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the Senate, An act to provide for old age pensions (H. P. 1794) (L. D. 816) which was passed to be enacted in the House earlier in the day and passed to be engrossed and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in non-concurrence earlier in the day, and which was recalled to the

Senate from the office of the Governor by Joint Order.

Comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. PATTERSON of Freeport: Mr. Speaker, this is Sunday, and I hate to do what I am about to do because I am in favor of an old age pension law. We met with the Governor yesterday and we thought we had everything all prepared to take care of the old age pension, which we had figured was going to be set up by the Federal Government, but those things that we brought into the House this morning were indefinitely postponed. We thought we did have the wherewithal to take care of the old age pension when the Federal Government had decided to put it in effect. All of us were sure that we were going to have a Federal Government pension.

Now, as we have not one thing to take care of that old age pension, I shall have to move, although I hate to do it, but because I don't see any other way,—and I believe all of you in this House can see no other way. Until some method is provided to take care of the old age pension fund there is no use to pass something at the present time. Therefore I move that we recede and concur with the Senate.

Mr. DOYLE of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I compliment the gentleman from Freeport (Mr. Patterson), on his moral courage.

Mr. YOUNG of York: Mr. Speaker, for about fourteen weeks we have been down here, and we have had tax bill upon tax bill presented to us, and they have all been turned down. The most of them have been turned down within the last ten days, and I think, if I remember correctly, about ten days ago the press came out with a statement that there was an ample fund in the treasury to take care of the old age pension for all those over seventy years of age. We passed that old age pension bill. And on whose recommendation? You all know as well as I do.

Now when we get out of here we are going home and we are going to be condemned for not providing for an old age pension, but we were told by the press there was ample funds to take care of the old age pension, and I think I can read correctly.

Now this bill comes in here to-night, passed to be engrossed, and ready to be enacted, and we are told there is not sufficient funds. Now, one question I want to ask: Who is to blame for it? Both parties—I do not care who they are—voted against every tax measure that came before this Legislature, and I stand on my feet to say that neither party can be blamed, and I do not care who the man is or who the member of this Legislature is who says so.

I realize now, and we all realize that there are not sufficient funds, and I realize, and I think most every one here realizes, that there never has been sufficient funds to carry this old age pension without additional revenue.

I would like to go on record that I am in favor of the old age pension; I always have been in favor of an old age pension; and I have voted for every tax measure that has come in here to provide for an old age pension; but since there is not any money, I will not go on record as voting to put a bill on the statute books when we have no money to provide for it.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Patterson, that the House recede and concur with the Senate.

Mr. CHURCHILL of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, I move that we have a yea and nay vote.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Before that motion can be entertained one-fifth of the members present must so indicate it by rising. All those in favor of a roll call will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had, Twenty-six voting in the affirmative, and there being 128 members present the roll call is ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Freeport, Mr. Patterson, that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the bill. All those in favor of the motion will answer yes when their names are called, those opposed no. Are you ready for the roll call? The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Alden, Allan, Austin, Exeter; Aver, Bragdon, Brown, Bubar, Burnham, Bushev, Cambridge, Campbell, Carleton, Chase, Baring; Chase, Limington; Cole, Cook, Coolidge, Crowell,

Currier, Davis, Fairfield; Davis, Newfield; Deering, Dennett, Devereux, Dow, Doyle, Skowhegan; Eddy, Ellis, Castle Hill; Ellis, Rangeley; Findlen, Flanders, Fogg, Rockland; Fowles, Goss, Graves, Gray, Brooksville; Gray, Presque Isle; Hagan, Hall, Hammond, Harriman, Prospect; Haskell, Heald, Hescoc, Higgins, Hill, Lancaster, Leonard, Lindsey, MacKenzie, Martin, Oakland; Mason, Newton, Noyes, Palmer, Parsons, Patterson, Pike, Russ, Sennett, Sewall, Sprague, Stickney, Stilphen, Story, Thompson, Belfast; Tompkins, Tupper, Vaughan, Weatherbee, Webber, Wentworth, Worthen, Young.

NAY—Austin, Parkman; Belaire, Bramson, Burgess, Burrill, Churchill, Clark, Plymouth; Connolly, Cote, Crosby, Cummings, Demers, Desmond, Donahue, Dorr, Doyle, Caribou; Drisko, Elliot, Eveleth, Forbes, Fortin, Gibbons, Harriman, Gardiner; Hastings, Hathorn, Hearn, Jacobson, Jandreau, Jillson, Kendrick, Kilroy, King, Labbee, Latno, Lausier, Leclair, Mace, Mahou, Mallett, Martin, Dexter; McKay, Mosher, Oliver, Payson, Poulin, Proctor, Roach, Rush, Ryder, Sawyer, Scabury, Shaw, Sleeper, Smith, Bangor; Smith, Van Buren; Stoddard, Thompson, Chelsea; Thurston, Wallace, Wheeler, Woodbury.

ABSENT—Boucher, Chase, Sebec; Clarke, Cooper; Donovan, Forge, Lewiston; Gleason, Hobbs, Lebel, Lewis, Phair, Philbrick, Richardson, Scates, Willey, Wright.

73 Yea, 62 No, 15 Absent.

Seventy-three voting in the affirmative and 62 in the negative, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Smith of Bangor presented the following order, out of order and moved its passage:

Be it resolved that it is the consensus of opinion of the majority of the Eighty-seventh Legislature of the State of Maine that immediately at the close of this session of the Legislature that the Governor enact steps to reduce expenses of every department of the State of Maine, in order that savings may be made, and that many worthwhile projects may be begun.

Thereupon, the order received a passage.

Mr. FORTIN of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tem: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. FORTIN: I did not have time, Mr. Speaker, to prepare an amendment to that order.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does

the gentleman wish to reconsider the passage of the order?

Mr. FORTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add an amendment, but I have not had time to prepare it. I did not know what the order was. I would say the Governor and Council—

The SPEAKER pro tem: Does the gentleman move to reconsider the passage of the order?

Mr. FORTIN: With the permission of the House, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Fortin, moves that the House reconsider its action just taken whereby it voted to pass this order. All those in favor will say aye; those opposed no.

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

Mr. FORTIN: Mr. Speaker, I doubt the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Fortin, doubts the decision of the Chair and asks for a division. The question before the House is on the reconsideration of the action of the House where it voted to give this order a passage. All those in favor of reconsideration will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors will return count.

A division was had.

Four having voted in the affirmative and 62 in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Conference Report

Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on bill an act relating to State Planning and Development (H. P. 1852) (L. D. 916) reporting that the bill ought to pass provided Senate Amendment B to House Amendment A be indefinitely postponed.

(Signed)

Messrs. Davis of Fairfield
Hill of So. Portland
Tupper of Calais
Committee on part of House.
Blaisdell of Hancock
Burkett of Knox
MacDonald of Washington
Committee on part of Senate.

The report was accepted.

Thereupon Senate Amendment B to House Amendment A was indefinitely postponed.

From the Senate: Report of the Committee of Conference on the

disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on bill an act relative to vagrant cats (S. P. 696) (L. D. 863) reporting that the Committee is unable to agree.

(Signed)

Messrs. Schnurle of Cumberland
Ashby of Aroostook
Fernald of Waldo
Committee on part of Senate
Mace of Augusta
Mosher of Farmington

Mrs. Kilroy of Portland
Committee on part of House.
Comes from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

Finally Passed

(Constitutional Amendment)

S. P. 720, L. D. 935: Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a bond issue, the proceeds of which to be disbursed for the furnishing and paying of additional funds, necessary maintenance, interest and retirement of bonds Deer Isle-Sedgwick Bridge District.

The SPEAKER pro tem: This being a Constitutional Amendment, it is necessary under the Constitution that it have the affirmative vote of two-thirds the entire membership of this body. All those in favor of the final passage of this resolve will rise and stand in their places until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division being had,

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

Passed to be Enacted

(Emergency Measure)

H. P. 1880: An act for the assessment of a State tax for the year 1935.

The SPEAKER pro tem: This being an emergency measure, it is necessary that it have the affirmative vote of two-thirds the entire membership of this body. All those in favor of the passage of this bill to be enacted will rise and stand in their places 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 bill was passed to be enacted.

Passed to be Enacted

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules.)

(S. P. 736) An act supplemental appropriation act to further provide for the necessary expenditures of State Government for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936 and June 30, 1937.

(H. P. 1881) An act for the assessment of a State tax for the year 1936.

Finally Passed

(H. P. 1860) (L. D. 925) Resolve in favor of John H. Simmonds of Portland.

From the Senate: Joint Resolution requesting the Governor to reduce expenses in Departments (H. P. 1882) which was adopted in the House earlier in the day.

Comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the House:

Mr. SMITH of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, the last thing in the world that I planned to do was to refer this to any other body except our own. I desire to be among friends. I appreciated the pretty nearly unanimous vote of this House. I did not plan, when I introduced the order, to have it go out of the House of Representatives. This is where I feel very much at home, and I think that my associates feel at home with me, but, inasmuch as it did go out of this House by mistake of myself, I have no remarks to make on it. I did mention the Eighty-seventh Legislature. I simply meant the House of the Eighty-seventh Legislature, and I did not realize we were referring it to any other body connected with the Eighty-seventh Legislature.

I felt that perhaps the time was coming, not far distant, when it might be possible that the State of Maine might vote to reduce departmental expenses. It seems that the time is not ripe. It was through my error, and I have no more remarks to make, and I do not care whether we concur or do not concur with the opinion of the other end of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state to the gentleman from Bangor (Mr. Smith) that on the reading of this document there was no course the Clerk could take but send it to the Senate, as it

reads, "Members of the Eighty-seventh Legislature." Of course that includes both bodies.

Mr. PAYSON of Brooks: Mr. Speaker, I move we adhere to our former action.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Brooks, Mr. Payson, moves that the House adhere to its former action. All those in favor of that motion will say aye; contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

House at Ease

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH: I may be vague in parliamentary usage, and I think I probably am. The time is getting late. I thought, when I was elected to the Legislature, I was not told when to get through. I do not wish to hold up at all any further discussion of this bill or this resolve. If it could be amended so that it would simply refer to the House of Representatives, with no other reference, I would prefer to do it. Whether that can be done or not, I do not know. I do not wish any committee of Conference on it, although I appreciate the action of my friend from Brooks in attempting to save the resolve. If it could be referred simply to this House of Representatives as a resolution to our Governor, I would like to have it done that way. I do not know how to do it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will state that the matter is not now before the House for action.

Mr. THOMPSON of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, would it be possible for us to reconsider our vote taken a few moments ago? I will make that motion, that we reconsider our vote taken on this matter to adhere to our former action.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Thompson, moves that the House reconsider its action taken a few minutes ago, whereby it voted to adhere to its former action. All those in favor of the motion will manifest it by saying aye; contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed.

Mr. THOMPSON: Now, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if it is permissible at this time to offer a ver-

bal amendment or a written amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman makes a parliamentary inquiry that the Chair cannot answer because there would be no appeal from his decision.

Mr. THOMPSON: May I ask that this matter be laid on the table, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman may so move, if he wishes.

Mr. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I move we recede and concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Belfast, Mr. Thompson, moves that the House recede and concur with the Senate. All those in favor of that motion will manifest it by saying aye; contrary minded no.

A viva voce vote being doubted, A division was had.

Forty-five having voted in the affirmative and 58 in the negative, the motion failed of passage.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the friendship and the spirit that is being shown here. I think it is the opinion, by the vote of this House, that this resolve should be presented. I know not parliamentary rules, but is there not some way that this can be taken care of so it will not be referred elsewhere, on account of my error?

Mr. CROWELL of Weston: Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong in my contention, I will stand to be corrected, but I move you that this order be returned to Mr. Smith, that he may be given a chance to write a new one in proper form.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The motion is out of order.

Mr. COOK of Pittsfield: Mr. Speaker, I move that the order lie on the table for five minutes.

The motion prevailed.

House at Ease

Finally Passed

(Out of order, under suspension of the rules.)

S. P. 726: Resolve for the acquisition of additional land for the use of an airport and appropriating money therefor.

Recess

The SPEAKER pro tem: We have on the table a Joint Resolution asking the government to reduce the expenses of every department.

On motion by Mr. Cook of Pittsfield, the resolution was taken from the table, and on further motion by the same gentleman the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the resolution.

Papers from the Senate, out of order and under suspension of the rules, disposed of in concurrence.

Passed to be Enacted

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules.)

S. P. 424, L. D. 516: An act relating to State Publicity.

H. P. 1852, L. D. 916: An act relating to State Planning and Development.

Mr. HILL of South Portland presented, out of order, the following resolution, and moved its adoption:

Resolution in favor of the equalization of educational opportunities in the State of Maine.

Whereas, the House of Representatives of the Eighty-seventh Legislature of the State of Maine recognizes the fact that the equalization of educational opportunities should be established as a principle, but it is not believed that legislation should be passed on this subject without providing adequate revenue for carrying out the provisions thereof:

Now therefore be it resolved, by the House of Representatives in the Eighty-seventh Legislature assembled that the principle of the equalization of educational opportunities set forth in House Paper 1846, L. D. 909, is hereby endorsed.

The resolution was adopted.

From the Senate: Final Report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges.

Comes from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, read and accepted in concurrence.

A message was received from the Senate, through Senator Burkett of Cumberland, informing the House that the Senate had transacted all the business before it and was ready to adjourn without day.

On motion by Mr. Hill of South Portland, that gentleman was charged with and conveyed a message to the Senate informing that body that the House had transacted all business before it and is now ready to adjourn without day. That

gentleman subsequently reported that he had conveyed the message to the Senate.

From the Senate: The following order, out of order and under suspension of the rules:

Ordered, the House concurring, that a committee of three on the part of the Senate, with such as the House may join, be appointed to wait upon the Governor and inform him that both branches of the Legislature have acted on all matters before them, and are now ready to receive any communication which he may be pleased to make.

Comes from the Senate, read and passed, with the following members appointed on its part:

Senators Pinansky of Cumberland

Friend of Somerset

Bodge of Kennebec

In the House, read and passed in concurrence, with the following members appointed on the part of the House:

Messrs. Oliver of Bath

Flanders of Auburn

Dennett of Sebago

Miss Stickney of Brownfield

Messrs. Scates of Westbrook

Allan of Topsham

Mrs. Kilroy of Portland

Subsequently, Mr. Oliver for the committee reported that they had attended to their duties and begged leave to report that the Governor had gone.

(At this point Mr. Carswell of Gorham resumed his seat on the floor of the House, amid applause of the House, and Speaker Tompkins resumed the Chair.)

Mrs. LATNO of Old Town: Mr. Speaker, I move that we extend a rising vote of recognition to the gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Carswell, for the fine way in which he has presided during the present physical disability of our esteemed Speaker, Honorable Nathaniel Tompkins.

The motion prevailed, amid the applause of the House, the members rising.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Scates.

Mr. SCATES: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted, and I apprehend that you are, in the motion that I am about to make,—

Communication from the Governor
STATE OF MAINE
Office of the Governor

Augusta, April 6, 1935.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House:

I herewith transmit a list of the acts and resolves passed by the present Legislature.

I have approved a total of 281 acts and 134 resolves.

I presented one veto.

I have nothing further to engage your attention.

May my best and sincerest wishes attend your journeys home.

Sincerely submitted,

(Signed) LOUIS J. BRANN,
Governor.

Comes from the Senate, read and ordered placed on file.

In the House, placed on file in concurrence.

Mr. SCATES: Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to be the oldest member of the House in service but not in years. Many of you are older than I am, and I will repeat what I started to say before that the motion which I shall now offer will be pleasing to you as well as to myself, and it is this: That the House of Representatives of the Eighty-seventh Legislature adjourn without day.

The SPEAKER: The motion made by the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Scates, prevails, and the Chair at 11.50 P. M. declares the House of the Eighty-seventh Legislature adjourned sine die.