

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

SENATE

Tuesday, April 2, 1935.

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Tom Ackley of Gardiner.

Journal of yesterday, read and approved.

From the House:

Bill "An Act Relating to Local Option Provisions," (H. P. 1364) (L. D. 593)

In the Senate on March 21st, bill passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

In the House, bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, House Amendment "A" was read. Under suspension of the rules the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence; House Amendment "A" was adopted and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in concurrence.

From the House:

Bill "An Act to Provide for Licenses and Permits for Outdoor Advertising," (S. P. 625) (L. D. 752)

In the Senate, on March 26th, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendments "A" and "B" thereto.

In the House, Senate Amendments "A" and "B" to Senate Amendment "A" indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence; and the bill passed to be engrossed as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto, and further amended by House Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was read. House Amendment "A" was read. House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" was read. Under suspension of the rules the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendments

"A" and "B" to Senate Amendment "A".

Senate Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed in concurrence; Senate Amendment "B" to Senate Amendment "A" was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

House Amendment "A" to Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence; House Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence; House Amendment "A" to House Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence; and the bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto, and as further amended by House Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Mr. SCHNURLE of Cumberland: Mr. President, in view of the Chinese puzzle that I have just heard, I don't know how the other members of the Senate feel but I for one would like to see just how this thing looks after it has come out of the ether and if there is any way of doing it I would like to have it laid upon the table long enough for us to look it over.

Thereupon, the Senate voted to reconsider its action just taken whereby the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence; and the bill as amended was laid upon the table and five hundred copies ordered printed.

From the House:

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on "Resolve Regulating Fishing in Tributaries to Pleasant Pond in Kennebec and Sagadahoc Counties" (H. P. 1173) reported the same in a second new draft (H. P. 1828) (L. D. 882) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

In the House, Resolve passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B."

In the Senate, the report of the committee was accepted in concurrence and the resolve was given its first reading. House Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence; House Amendment "B" was read and adopted in concurrence; and under suspension of the rules the resolve was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" in concurrence.

From the House:

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Applications for Licenses" (H. P. 443) (L. D. 121) reported that the same ought not to pass.

In the House, bill substituted for the report and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A."

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Burkett of Cumberland the bill was substituted for the report in concurrence and given its first reading. House Amendment "A" was read; and on further motion by the same Senator the bill and amendment were laid upon the table pending adoption of House Amendment "A" in concurrence.

Papers from the House, disposed of in concurrence.

From the House:

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Game Preserves at Back Bay, Portland" (H. P. 1202) (L. D. 499) reported the same in a new deal (H. P. 1825) (L. D. 876) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

In the House, the report was read and accepted; and the bill was passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Pinansky of Cumberland, the bill and report were laid upon the table pending acceptance of the report, in concurrence.

House Bills in First Reading

(Under suspension of the rules the following bills were given their second reading and passed to be engrossed, in concurrence.)

"An Act Relating to Census of the Penobscot Indians" (H. P. 826) (L. D. 279)

"An Act Relating to Open Season on Fur Bearing Animals" (H. P. 1820) (L. D. 879)

"An Act Relating to the Bingham Water District" (H. P. 1827) (L. D. 878)

"An Act Relating to Construction of State Aid Roads in Indian Township" (H. P. 705) (L. D. 877)

From the House:

The Majority of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act to Provide for the Temporary Filling of Va-

cancies in the Office of Sheriff" (H. P. 333) (L. D. 103) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1823) (L. D. 875) under a new title, Bill "An Act Relating to Deputy Sheriffs," and that it ought to pass.

(Signed) Burkett of Cumberland
Burns of Aroostook
Hill of South Portland
Vaughan of South Berwick
Philbrick of Cape Elizabeth
Weatherbee of Lincoln
Gray of Presque Isle
Wiley of Falmouth
Jacobson of Portland

The minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought not to pass.

(Signed) Fernald of Waldo

In the House, the majority report accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, the Majority Report of the Committee "Ought to Pass" was accepted in concurrence; and the bill was given its first reading. Under suspension of the rules the bill was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Ashby from the Committee on Insane Hospitals on Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Laws of 1933 Relating to the Return of Insane Persons to the State" (S. P. 237) (L. D. 211) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Burkett from the Committee on Pensions on "Resolve Providing for a State Pension for John W. Knight of Belfast" (S. P. 98) reported that the same ought not to pass, as legislation at this time is inexpedient.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of a Pension for Lucy Knowlton of Belfast" (S. P. 97) reported that the same ought not to pass, as legislation at this time is inexpedient.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Carrie Clark of Fort Fairfield" (S. P. 157) reported that the same ought not to pass, as legislation at this time is inexpedient.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Maggie Wallace of Beals" (S. P. 256)

reported that the same ought not to pass, as legislation at this time is inexpedient.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Ethel Smith Deblois" (S. P. 257) reported that the same ought not to pass, as legislation at this time is inexpedient.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Marion Cobb Fuller of Augusta," (S. P. 335) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a State Pension for Daniel F. Bartlett of Augusta," (S. P. 359) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a State Pension for Annie E. Wilton of Augusta," (S. P. 359) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a State Pension for Annie Kimball Turner of Augusta," (S. P. 360) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a State Pension for Elizabeth B. Reynolds of Augusta," (S. P. 361) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a State Pension for Leroy S. Kimball of Augusta," (S. P. 362) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Jackson from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Alice A. Mitchell of Belfast," (S. P. 122) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a State Pension for Bertha E. Prescott, of Augusta," (S. P. 227) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a Pension for Effie M. Higgins," (S. P. 303) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a State Pension for Alma Dora Gardiner of Augusta," (S. P. 363) reported that the same ought not to pass, as legislation thereon, at this time is inexpedient.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing a State Pension for Fred E. Merrill of Weeks' Mills," (S. P. 364) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Granting Teachers' Pension to Frederick E. Chapman of Bath," (S. P. 365) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of a Pension for Mary B. Smith, of Augusta," (S. P. 367) reported that the same ought not to pass, as legislation thereon, at this time, is inexpedient.

Mr. Harmon from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Reuel W. Robinson, of Sidney," (S. P. 337) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Bessie Carroll of Augusta," (S. P. 339) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing for a Pension for Leone E. Kelley of Wilton," (S. P. 340) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Louisa J. Levell of Damariscotta," (S. P. 341) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of James D. Shelters of North Bucksport," (S. P. 344) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Winslow B. Libby of Augusta," (S. P. 366) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Blanchard from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Relating to the Disposition of Certain State-collected Revenues," (S. P. 437) (L. D. 485) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Schnurle from the Committee on Maine Publicity on Bill "An Act Relating to State Publicity," (S. P. 424) (L. D. 516) reported that the same ought to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Schnurle of

Cumberland, the bill and report were laid upon the table pending acceptance of the report.)

Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate, Senate Report from the Committee on Agriculture "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill entitled "An Act Relative to Agricultural Marketing Agreements, (S. P. 401, L. D. 521) tabled on March 29th by Mr. Blaisdell of Hancock pending acceptance of the report, and today assigned; and on motion by Mr. Schnurle of Cumberland, the bill and report were retabled pending acceptance of the report.

On motion by Mr. Blanchard of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table, House Report from the Committee on Taxation "Ought Not to Pass" on bill "An Act Relating to Taxation of National Bank Deposits" (H. P. 863, L. D. 251), tabled on March 27th by that senator, pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. BLANCHARD of Franklin: Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the report of the committee, "ought not to pass", in concurrence.

Mr. FERNALD of Waldo: Mr. President, briefly I want to speak in opposition to the motion of the Senator from Franklin, Senator Blanchard. The bill proposes to increase the revenue of the State of Maine \$170,000 and to equalize the tax burden between savings banks, trust companies and national banks. I think my position in the matter has been clearly set forth in the House, in the Legislative Record of March 25, 1931. Since it is the consensus of opinion of this legislature that no tax measure should be passed at this time, I do not care to press the question further but assure you that it will be back with us at our next special session.

The motion to accept the "ought not to pass" report of the committee, in concurrence, prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Blanchard of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table Resolve proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Authorize the Use of Voting Machines in Elections, (S. P. 114, L. D. 25), tabled by that Senator on March 30th pending final passage.

Mr. BLANCHARD of Franklin: Mr. President, I move that the resolve be given final passage.

On motion by Miss Martin of Penobscot, the resolve was laid upon the table pending final passage.

On motion by Mr. Worcester of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries "Ought to pass in new draft" (S. P. 708, L. D. 896) on Bill entitled An Act Relating to Purchase of Herring, (S. P. 430, L. D. 475) tabled by that Senator on March 30th pending acceptance of the report; and on motion by the same Senator the report of the committee was accepted and under suspension of the rules the bill was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Schnurle of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table, Senate Report from the Committee on Agriculture, "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill entitled, An Act Relative to Agricultural Marketing Agreements (S. P. 401, L. D. 521), tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending acceptance of the report; and that Senator yielded to Mr. Blaisdell of Hancock.

Thereupon on motion by Mr. Blaisdell of Hancock, the report of the committee "ought not to pass" was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Hathaway of Piscataquis, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Ways and Bridges, "Ought Not to Pass" on Bill, An Act Relating to the Hancock-Sullivan Bridge, (H. P. 1116, L. D. 307), tabled by that Senator on March 30th pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. HATHAWAY of Piscataquis: Mr. President, before I make any motion I would like to say a very few words. In fact, I am going to make the motion that we accept the report of the committee, and I wish to say a few words in defense of the committee on this bill. We had our hearing on this matter and the case was presented to us and we felt that the people in the bridge district were poor, but anyone on the Committee on Ways and Bridges has got to be fairly hard boiled. If we take over those bonds it is going to take just so much out of maintenance. The Highway Commission tell us now that we are not

going to have what we should have for maintenance money for the coming two years and it seemed to the committee that in addition to that, which was of paramount importance, that it would be dangerous legislation and would establish a precedent where in two years from now other bridge districts—in fact, in my own town we have a bridge that has been built under similar conditions with \$15,000 bonds outstanding and I feel very sure that if we do not accept the report of the committee that in two years from now we are letting down the bars and courting a lot of trouble for ourselves, and I make the motion that we accept the report of the committee “ought not to pass”.

Mr. BLAISDELL of Hancock: I frankly want to say, Mr. President, that it is just a bit embarrassing for me to resist the majority report of the committee because I naturally would like to say that I have always supported the idea that the majority reports of committees should in every instance, whenever possible, be accepted. However, in this matter, directly affecting, as it does, my own county and in which we are vitally interested down there, I feel forced to take this position.

The Hancock-Sullivan Bridge was built in 1921. It was built at a time when there was no such thing as a gas tax. It was built under that section of the statutes, I think it is Chapter 28 of the Revised Statutes, Section 63, which provides that the towns shall pay twenty percent and the counties thirty percent and the State fifty percent. This bridge, as I have said, was built two years prior to the passage of any gas tax or prior, even, to it being thought of, but as soon as the gas tax came in there was no question in anyone's mind but what the question of the cost of maintenance of roads was completely revolutionized. The state of Maine in 1931 recognized this and consequently it passed an act whereby it took over the construction of all bridges on Federal and State highways.

In 1921 when this bridge was constructed—a very necessary bridge—this was nothing but a country road. It is now an international federal highway leading from the St. Croix River to Miami, Florida, over which hundreds of thousands of people and cars are

constantly passing. This is not a local bridge. It is a tourist bridge and is absolutely necessary for the purpose of avoiding the necessity of ferries and so forth for the use of tourists and those who use this highway.

The five towns in the district involved have paid seventy-eight thousand dollars on this bridge but the economic conditions of these towns have all changed since 1921 when business was good and they were prosperous. There are five towns involved in this bridge district. Taking them as they are, the first one involved is the town of Hancock which has absolutely no industry of any kind or description. It depends for its existence and livelihood upon the few dollars that may be spent by the few tourists who may come in and go down to Hancock Point. The next town is the town of Sullivan with something like one hundred and seventy-three dependent paupers on its list right now. When this bridge was built this was a thriving granite community but the granite business is gone and they are in distress. The next town involved is the town of Sorrento which was made famous by Jones of Portsmouth,—I can best recall him to your minds, perhaps, by mentioning Jones' Ale. He built hotels and restaurants down there and the community prospered, but now practically the entire town of Sorrento could be sold for its taxes. The next town involved is the town of Gouldsboro, without one single industry of any kind or description in it. It is in distress. And the last town is the town of Winter Harbor—not one single industry in it but dependent entirely upon what few summer people go down to what we call Grindstone Neck. So much for the towns.

I want to take this occasion to answer directly the one important assertion which has been made by the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Hathaway, as to the dangers and evils of a serious precedent being established. There are two precedents for what we are now doing. True, they are not directly applicable but they have a very strong bearing. Strange as it may seem the first which I will cite is in that splendid town from which a member of the Ways and Bridges Committee comes.

In the Laws of 1927 on page 651:

"Skowhegan, Town of, Construction of a Bridge. Resolved: That there be, and hereby is, appropriated the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars to aid the town of Skowhegan in the construction of a bridge across the Kennebec River, at some point below the existing railroad bridge. This bridge shall be constructed under the provisions of the Bridge Act, so-called, and construction work shall be started in the year 1927." That is the Bridge Act referred to here as the twenty percent for the town, thirty percent for the county and fifty percent for the State, and the Legislature of the state of Maine saw fit, even while they were building the bridge, to award the twenty percent to the town of Skowhegan. True, it can be answered—and I will answer it for them—that for some unknown reason, I don't know what it was, they failed to construct the bridge. Whether it was because of dissension in the town or in the county, or what, I don't know, but the money was appropriated in a lump sum to the town of Skowhegan for the purpose of taking care of their twenty percent for a bridge to be built under identically the same situation. So much for that proposition.

In 1931 — I have debated with much amusement and interest with some of my friends and colleagues as to the applicability of this particular section—it seems that the town of Woolwich, perhaps through the request of the Highway Commission or some one else, decided that it was necessary to have an overpass over the railroad tracks at Woolwich. That job was to cost one hundred and eighty thousand dollars and under the Bridge Act, again, ten percent of the cost of that job was to be borne by the town of Woolwich, sixty-five percent was to be borne by the State of Maine and twenty-five percent was to be borne by the railroad corporation over whose tracks they were building it. Here we have the same set-up only with a different set of figures. In 1931 the town of Woolwich came in and received eighteen thousand dollars in one lump sum as her percentage for the building of an overpass down there. You may say that an overpass is not a bridge but I simply say that it has abutments and piers and girders

and it goes over something, whether it is a railroad track or a river.

The expression used is interesting in that it said that this sum of money should be paid to the town of Woolwich and "hereby is assumed by the State, said expense to be paid for from the State Highway Department Funds." There are two instances directly applicable to our own situation. On Federal Highway Number One between Calais and where the road leaves the state of Maine there are three bridges that have similar characteristics to the one we are talking about. I believe this bill should be decided on its merits. I have shown that there are precedents for the things we are asking for. We are not asking for a great deal. For instance, four thousand dollars will take care of this whole situation, with the interest, and that being paid at this time for this year it will be still less next year and will continue to diminish year by year until it absolutely passes out.

Now let us see what has happened all of a sudden. There are thirty-five hundred people in this bridge district I am talking about and where we have about four million dollars coming in from the gas tax; whether you realize it or not that is practically six dollars per capita for every man, woman and child in the state of Maine and consequently if there are thirty-five hundred people in this bridge district they are paying in to the state of Maine approximately twenty thousand dollars in gas money. But let us go a step further. Four dollars per capita is the amount of the automobile license fees in the state of Maine and if you take the gas tax and the licenses, one of which is six dollars and the other four, and put them together it makes a total of ten dollars and for thirty-five hundred people that is thirty-five thousand dollars a year which this district is paying in to the state of Maine. I grant you that some of this money comes back in the form of maintenance, assistance, and so forth, but these people are contributing heavily to the maintenance of their roads and bridges and they cannot tax gas and automobiles. They have to make their taxes apply strictly to real estate.

In 1921 when we started building this bridge the total amount of the income from automobiles in the state of Maine was one million five

hundred thousand dollars and now it is over eight million. True, we have built new bridges and longer roads and have better maintenance of them and all that but it is true that we have been here in this Legislature and we have passed out of our committee and through this Legislature the disorganization of different towns who have found themselves suffering and in distress and why let the burden rest on these people when you are doing these things to relieve the others and they have no way of taxing themselves excepting by real estate.

It is only a fair proposition. When the state of Maine took over this bridge from these people they should have taken over with it the mortgage but what they have done is to take our bridge and leave us the mortgage. I am perfectly willing the thing should be decided on its merits. I am not going out of this Senate in tears either way. I just want to help to lift the burden of those people who had the nerve and courage at one time to build a bridge across there which the State is now using.

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. President, I did not think I would speak a second time on this question. I am not a man who takes up the time of the Senate in debating but I fail to see where a bridge built under the Bridge Act in Skowhegan in 1929, or an overpass in Woolwich in 1931 under the Bridge Act, I fail to see where it has any bearing on taking over bonded indebtedness for bridges, and let me add that in 1929 and in 1931 was when the state had money. It was when the Ways and Bridges Committee had money. In addition to our gas and registration fees we had a million dollars from direct taxation that we do not have now. As I said earlier this morning, we of the committee realize the financial condition of those people. Why don't they have the bridge—I do not know how they could go about it but there is a way—to go before a committee and have it changed to a toll bridge and charge toll, and it seems they could get out of the situation that way.

Mr. BURNS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I regret that I am obliged to disagree with the able and distinguished Senator from Hancock, Senator Blaisdell, in regard to this matter, but I, for one, cannot quite follow the logic of his argument. As the Chairman of the committee

(Senator Hathaway) has said, the two precedents that he has given which he says are similar to the case in hand, fall short of that. I do not know of a case that is similar to this where the State is called upon to assume the defaulted bond of a town, because that is what this amounts to so far as it relates to a bridge. Back in 1921 these five towns, Hancock, Sullivan, Sorrento, Gouldsboro and Winter Harbor formed a bridge district and this bridge was built. This bridge district issued bonds, the county issued bonds, and the State agreed to assume some of the financial burden resulting from the construction of the bridge. As the years have gone on the state has paid its obligations and the towns heretofore have paid their obligations and the county has paid its obligation as the bonds fell due, and it has been said that these towns have paid \$78,000 thus far. They now ask themselves to be relieved of the amount yet due on these bonds which amount, as I understand it, is somewhere around \$32,000. That is the minimum they place the figure at. To it should be added interest and altogether it will amount to a financial burden to be assumed by the State of from forty to fifty thousand dollars. To take the curse off, it has been stated that the interest on four or five thousand dollars a year will be less as the years go on. However, the glaring fact remains that we, the people of the State of Maine, are asked to assume the bonds of this bridge district. At first they asked the State of Maine to assume the bonds of the county but the bill was amended and that feature of the bill was struck out. Altogether it would have amounted to \$104,000, but now it will amount to \$40,000 or \$50,000 which the people of Maine will be obliged to bear in this instance. It will come from maintenance fund of the State Highway Department. Every town is interested in the maintenance fund of the Highway Department. It is in that fund that our local roads and the roads we are directly interested in are concerned. If we allocate in any one county, whether it be Hancock or some other county \$40,000 or \$50,000 more than they should have under equitable distribution of the maintenance fund, it means funds which we in Aroostook County

and the people in the rest of the State, will be deprived of. I can appreciate the zeal with which the Senator from Hancock, Senator Blaisdell, has presented his argument because he is more concerned, and should be, with the direct interests of the people of Hancock County. But we, as Senators here, represent not only our own county but represent the State at large, and when it is pointed out to us that the State will suffer as the result of any proposed legislation in any one section of the State or any one county is given some special fund at the expense of the rest of the state, it is time for us to prevent that if we possibly can and I think that is what this bill proposed to do.

If a town can default on its bonds in regard to a bridge, it can also, default on bonds in regard to schools or any other purpose for which a town has given bonds, such as construction of water works or anything like that. We are opening up a wide avenue which will give people in the various towns and counties a precedent to come here and ask the state to assume the bonded obligations which they, themselves, made. They went into this with their eyes wide open and they are directly benefited by the Hancock-Sullivan bridge. It has been a means of bringing summer people to that section, and we know that is a large industry. They pay large sums in taxes. They have had the benefit of that and there is no reason why they should not pay the expense of the bridge as they agreed to do in 1921. I do not think this Senate should go on record as approving any moratoriums declared by any towns in the state. It is said that these towns here are in financial distress and if that situation was unique of that section of the state of Maine, perhaps I would be disposed to lend a helping hand, but I venture to say the financial conditions in the rest of the state are just as acute as in the county of Hancock, and I, for one, think they are worse in some sections of the state at the present time than they are in Hancock County.

I therefore second the motion of the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Bridges, to accept the report "ought not to pass" of the committee.

Mr. BLAISDELL: Mr. President,

only one moment of your time. I appreciate very keenly the things my brother, Senator Burns, has said. We are Senators here and we represent the whole state and I have only tried to point out where there is some distress. There was pointed out by the Governor recently the difficulties in Aroostook County and I gladly stood up and supported a \$50,000 appropriation of the money of this state to help Aroostook County.

The people in these five towns did go into the building of the bridge with their eyes open, but two years later there was a complete revolution in the manner of handling the highway funds, as applied to the gas tax. I think that the monies of the State of Maine should be allocated so as to lift burdens wherever they find them, whether it is in the form of pauper supplies or whether it is to lift an obligation, such as is carried by some of these towns and communities who cannot carry their obligations without assistance. I am ready to stand up and help to introduce legislation by unanimous consent for any distressed section of this state, whether it is my own section or some other. I am very pleased that my brother brought out the fact that the bill was amended and Hancock County is not now affected. It is just a group of towns in distress.

Mr. HATHAWAY: Mr. President, when the vote is taken, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Hathaway, that the "ought not to pass" report of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on bill, an act relating to the Hancock-Sullivan Bridge, be accepted in non-concurrence, and that Senator asks for a division.

A division of the Senate was had. Twenty having voted in the affirmative and seven opposed, the report of the Committee, "Ought not to Pass" was accepted in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Burkett of Cumberland the Senate voted to take from the table, bill, An Act Relating to Application for Licenses, (H. P. 443) (L. D. 121), tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending adoption of House Amendment A in concurrence; and

on further motion by the same Senator House Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence.

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules the bill was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Burkett of Cumberland the Senate voted to take from the table, House Report from the Committee on State Prison "Ought to Pass in New Draft, Under New Title" on bill, an Act Providing for the Manufacture of Motor Vehicle Registration Plates for the Use of the State Prison, (H. P. 1819) (L. D. 869), tabled by that Senator on April 1st, pending acceptance of the report in concurrence; and on further motion by the same Senator the report was accepted in concurrence.

Thereupon, under suspension of the rules the bill was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Burns of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table, bill, An Act relating to minimum wages for laborers (H. P. 1797) (L. D. 840), tabled by that Senator on March 29th pending assignment for second reading.

Mr. BURNS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill. The bill was amended in the House striking out what really constituted the teeth of the proposed legislation, and that is the next to the last sentence which reads as follows: "The wages for a day's work paid to laborers employed in the con-

struction of highways and public works as aforesaid shall not be less than those payable under the provisions of the Code for the construction of industry." That sentence has been stricken out and with that out there isn't much left. I do not see why we should clutter up our statutes with legislation which means nothing, especially where that legislation is already on our statute books and I therefore move for the indefinite postponement of the bill.

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

Sent down for concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would like to state that adjournment is drawing near and would appreciate it very much if tomorrow as many as possible of the matters now on the table are taken care of.

The President laid before the Senate, bill, An Act relating to Hawkers and Peddlers (S. P. 221) (L. D. 194), recalled by joint order from the Engrossing Department.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Blaisdell of Hancock the rules were suspended and the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Harmon of Hancock the bill was then laid upon the table pending passage to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Potter of Penobscot,

Adjourned, until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.