

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-Eighth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1937

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

HOUSE

Thursday, April 15, 1937.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Dr. McWhorter of Augusta.

Journal of the previous session read and approved.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Ellis from the Committee on Ways and Bridges on petitions in favor of a bridge at Poland, House Papers 1701, 1702, 1703, 1704 and 1705 reporting that same be placed on file.

Mr. Ellis from the Committee on Taxation reported ought not to pass on resolve in favor of a rebate of certain taxes for the town of Lincolnville (H. P. No. 208) (L. D. No. 76)

Reports read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Mr. Ellis from the Committee on Ways and Bridges reported ought not to pass on bill an act relating to apportionment of motor vehicle registration fees paid by inhabitants of North Haven and Vinalhaven (H. P. No. 711) (L. D. No. 232)

Mr. CROCKETT of North Haven: Mr. Speaker and Members of the 88th Legislature: I move to substitute the bill for the ought not to pass report.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the members of this Legislature the purpose and merit of this bill. Immediately, let me say, that we are not asking for an appropriation but simply asking what we believe to be a reasonable and equitable adjustment of motor vehicle registration fees of the inhabitants of the islands of North Haven and Vinalhaven, located in Penobscot Bay. North Haven and Vinalhaven are island towns situated in Penobscot Bay, fifteen miles from Rockland.

The whole proposition hinges on this island situation. I ask you to visualize these islands located fifteen miles out in the Atlantic ocean. This is the key to the whole situation and you can immediately see the basis of our request.

The cost of transporting a motor vehicle to the mainland is fifteen dollars besides your own fare, which is prohibitive to practically all automobile owners. The owners of these cars on the islands have

access to no other roads except those located on the islands, although we pay the same registration fees as those who have free access to all roads in the State. Because of the cost, it is impossible for these inhabitants to come to the main land and use the State and Federal highways.

Of course I can see what would be the first question to arise in the minds of the committee,—that is, precedent. I think I can sincerely say that the members of this committee, the majority, at least, saw the merit of this bill, and I can assure you that this bill would not establish a precedent which could be invoked because Swans island is the only other island to which it would apply. Matinicus has no registered automobiles, and the fees for Isle au Haut would be negligible. The islands in Casco Bay have reasonable ferry service to and from the mainland. Islesboro has a reasonable ferry service to the mainland.

In this connection it is fitting to note that Islesboro has been given special consideration by the State in this regard. The State has aided them in building their ferry terminal and their ferry boat.

I sincerely believe that this is the right and fair thing to do. I am glad for them to be given to this consideration. Owing to their improvements as a summer resort, I think they are entitled to it.

As you all realize, the Safety Department has a white truck, a safety car, so-called. The Lions Club of Vinalhaven, early this winter wrote to the Safety Department asking for this safety car to come to Vinalhaven. They received a reply that they would be glad to come, but some time later they received another letter from the Safety Department saying they would be unable to come. Why? Because of the expense. They could not afford to do it.

May I sum up our proposition like this: We are asking for seventy-five percent of the registration fees to be spent on the roads of these two islands under the supervision of the State Highway Commission, and we base our request on the following facts:

The islands of North Haven and Vinalhaven are located fifteen miles from the mainland. They pay the same registration fees as the inhabitants on the mainland. They

have access only to the roads located on these islands, as the cost prohibits the transportation of the car to the mainland. The island inhabitants do not use other Federal or State highways. Also they have no benefit of any bridge money.

It seems to me that every argument seems to favor this bill and I cannot see any argument against it.

You will note that we are asking for only seventy-five per cent to be spent on these islands because we realize the administrative expenses must be met. Also in a few isolated cases a few cars come from the mainland, but a very few.

It may also be noted that in the summer we have many summer visitors in North Haven and Vinalhaven and they bring their cars to the islands but they are always crying about the deplorable conditions of these roads and this has a tendency to deter them from coming.

I will say at this time that the registration fees sent to the State by the two towns amount to approximately \$4,500. This means that North Haven would get approximately \$1,300 and Vinalhaven approximately \$1,800, and this would be a great help to put onto our roads. It would be spent under the supervision of the State Highway Commission.

North Haven has 143 cars, Vinalhaven has 206. The mileage on Vinalhaven is 67 miles and on North Haven 37.

At this time Maine is doing all it can to increase the tourist business of the State and we feel that this extra money spent on these roads would be a great help.

I sincerely hope that this bill will not be tabled and that you will vote to substitute the bill for the ought not to pass report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Crockett, moves that the bill be substituted for the ought not to pass report of the committee. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rangeley, Mr. Ellis.

Mr. ELLIS: Mr. Speaker, if Vinalhaven and North Haven were the only islands on the Atlantic coast, I think that I and the rest of the committee would agree with the gentleman who has just spoken in favor of this bill; but as it happens there are a great many other

islands along the coast of Maine which next year and the year after would want to come in on this proposition. We will grant that these two islands, fifteen miles from the mainland, are further away than the other islands that I have referred to, some of which are only from half a mile to several miles out. However, this would be establishing a precedent, and for that reason, after considerable discussion, both in executive session and with Mr. Crockett, the committee unanimously reported ought not to pass; and I hope that the motion of the gentleman to substitute the bill for the report does not prevail.

Mr. SLEEPER of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, everything that the gentleman from North Haven (Mr. Crockett) has said is true in regard to the conditions out there. He is well warranted in asking for this money. It has been my privilege to visit these two islands and I was amazed at the courage those people have in attempting to construct roads as they have done. He has given you the number of cars on both these islands and he has given you the mileage.

They have less than three cars to each mile of road which they have constructed. I have watched the steamer that travels to these islands and I have seen many cars going out there but very few coming back. It would be safe to say that not over one car in twenty-five comes back to the mainland after it once reaches those islands. Certainly they are entitled to their registration fees, and I am surprised that he has not asked for the whole of them. You will notice that he is not asking for any undue proportion of the gas tax. Every gallon of gas bought on these islands pays four cents tax to the State. I think it is a very fair proposition and that it would not create a dangerous precedent but would encourage those people to keep their roads in better shape. Half the cars out there, perhaps, are these beach wagons and so forth, owned by the wealthy summer residents, and, if the roads on the islands are maintained in better shape, perhaps it would encourage more people to come there as summer visitors.

I sincerely hope that this Legislature will be big enough to recognize the condition of these people on these islands. I deem it to be

the fairest proposition that has been put up to this Legislature this winter, and I sincerely hope that the bill will be substituted for the report and given passage. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Crockett, that the bill be substituted for the report.

Mr. CROCKETT: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Crockett, asks for a division. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from North Haven, Mr. Crockett, that the bill be substituted for the report, will rise and remain standing until counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and six voting in the affirmative and 1 in the negative, the motion prevailed and the bill was substituted for the report.

Thereupon, the rules were suspended and the bill was given its two several readings and tomorrow assigned

Reports of Committees (Continued)

Mr. Maxell from the Committee on Indian Affairs on bill an act relating to the ferry between Indian Island and Old Town (H. P. No. 605) (L. D. No. 184) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1870) under same title and that it ought to pass

Mr. Jewett from the Committee on Pensions on bill an act to provide a pension for crippled persons (H. P. No. 847) (L. D. No. 278) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1871) under same title and that it ought to pass

Mr. Fellows from the Committee on Taxation on bill an act relating to exemptions from taxation (H. P. No. 1585) (L. D. No. 657) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1872) under same title and that it ought to pass

Same gentleman from same Committee on bill an act relating to exemptions of estates from taxation (H. P. No. 43) (L. D. No. 25) reported same in a new draft (H. P. No. 1873) under same title and that it ought to pass

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

Mr. Eddy from the Committee on Banks and Banking reporting ought

to pass on bill an act to permit Loan and Building Associations to consolidate or transfer assets (H. P. No. 1484) (L. D. No. 562)

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

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

(H. P. No. 1822) (L. D. No. 1039)
An act relating to support of dependents of soldiers, sailors and marines of the World War

(H. P. No. 1869) (L. D. No. 1034)
An act amending the law relating to unemployment compensation

(H. P. No. 653) (L. D. No. 1038)
Resolve to reimburse the town of Rome for burial expenses of Lester A. Brown, a veteran of the Spanish War

Passed to be Engrossed

(S. P. No. 208) (L. D. No. 294)
An act to ratify, confirm and make valid the acts and doings of the Guilford and Sangerville Water District

(S. P. No. 277) (L. D. No. 494)
An act relating to outdoor advertising

Mr. ELLIS of Rangeley: Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill. Day before yesterday we killed this bill deader than a door nail. Yesterday morning somebody got up and we overturned the action of the day before. The bill is dead anyway and I see no reason for cluttering the calendar with it for the next three or four days. I move its indefinite postponement.

Mr. STILPHEN of Dresden: Mr. Speaker, I hope that this motion will not prevail. I believe there is merit in this bill and that if we insist on our former action, it will go back to the Senate and result in a committee of conference which would be satisfactory to all.

Mr. HIGGINS of Ellsworth: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion to indefinitely postpone will not prevail. I could not understand all of the remarks of the last speaker (Mr. Stilphen). I think, perhaps, he said that in the Senate —

The SPEAKER: The gentleman must not refer to the action of the Senate.

Mr. HIGGINS: Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, in the other body.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman must not refer to the action of the other body.

Mr. HIGGINS: If we pass this measure, Mr. Speaker, it will be amended at a certain point in its progress in such a way that it will be agreeable to all parties concerned.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Rangeley, Mr. Ellis, that the bill be indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of that motion will say aye; those opposed no.

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

Thereupon, the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Passed to be Engrossed (Continued)

(S. P. No. 491) (L. D. No. 1011)
An act to amend the charter of Lucerne-in-Maine Village Corporation

(S. P. No. 505) (L. D. No. 1025)
An act to extend suffrage to qualified voters in unorganized territory

(S. P. No. 509) (L. D. No. 1030)
An act to provide for aid to the blind

(S. P. No. 499) (L. D. No. 1010)
Resolve compensating a bidder on the General Howard Memorial

(S. P. No. 504) (L. D. No. 1024)
Resolve for repairs on the Kingman Bridge

(H. P. No. 1575) (L. D. No. 716)
An act relating to shipping clams beyond the borders of the State, as amended

Mr. LARRABEE of West Bath: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

This bill was very ably handled by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, and presented to the House as a conservation measure whereby we would conserve the clams for the State of Maine, a very big industry, through the spawning season. I was in favor of the bill, as I think the majority of the House were. Yesterday they presented an amendment which was adopted and which opens three counties out of eight. I say it is not a conservative measure when half the State is open and half closed. It will react on these three counties that are open, and they will come in and dig out the few clams that we have left in those three counties.

I understand this affects one large shipper who has quite a following here, and for that reason

this amendment was put on. There are other shippers in the eastern part of the State, and I claim that this measure is not fair if it is going to protect one shipper in the State and put other shippers out of business. Now these clam diggers do not require any equipment except a clam hoe, and they can get work in the summer months in the State of Maine on the roads and other projects and save these clams for the fall, winter and spring when they need them. Unless we close the entire State, I think we should not close any part of it.

Mr. TABBUT of Columbia Falls: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question through the Chair?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may ask the question, and the gentleman from West Bath may answer if he wishes.

Mr. TABBUT: As I understand, the gentleman moved to indefinitely postpone the bill, but it is my opinion—I may be wrong—that the gentleman wishes to indefinitely postpone the amendment adopted yesterday.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may answer if he wishes.

Mr. LARRABEE: I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I would move to reconsider our action on the amendment, but as I voted in opposition to the amendment, I did not feel that I had that privilege; so I moved the indefinite postponement of the entire bill.

Mr. SLEEPER of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to see the point of view of the gentleman from West Bath (Mr. Larrabee), but it seems to me a rather selfish way to do it. There has been a very vital demand for the bill in the counties that are now protected, and although the purport of the bill was to cover the entire State, and the entire State would have profited thereby, certain interests have apparently done quite a lot of organization work among the Representatives from those three counties, and we felt that if those three counties did not want to be protected, that was their hard luck. But we want to be protected, the other five counties in the State; and if Sagadahoc County wants to be protected, I find an amendment on my desk here that would allow it to be protected.

I sincerely hope that the motion for indefinite postponement of the

bill will not prevail. I think it would be an injustice to the hundreds of people who appeared here at the hearing on the bill. I will admit that there were canners here as well as clam diggers and I feel that the bill would be better if it did cover the whole State as the bill is just. We did consider the requests of a few people from York and Cumberland Counties. I will admit there were not many from Sagadahoc, and that was the reason I was glad to see the amendment on the desk here this morning. Out of a sense of fairness of the counties of Lincoln, Knox, Waldo, Hancock and Washington, please give us that much of the coast protected if you do not wish to protect the rest of it. I certainly hope that the gentleman's motion will not prevail.

Mr. COLE of Kittery: Mr. Speaker, I am definitely against this bill. However, I do not intend to vote for its indefinite postponement. We have had a good deal of difficulty with the bill in the last few weeks, we have canned it and shucked it, and done everything else with it. Those in the eastern part of the State made a sort of tentative agreement with some of us in the western part. Now, feeling that we have made that agreement, I am definitely against the motion of the gentleman from West Bath, Mr. Larrabee, to indefinitely postpone it.

Mr. HINCKLEY of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, when this amendment was offered yesterday, I was in doubt about it, and personally I was glad that the gentleman from West Bath, Mr. Larrabee, made his motion. But in view of the situation that has developed I am wondering if the gentleman would be willing to withdraw his motion for the indefinite postponement of the bill to permit us to consider a motion on the amendment.

The SPEAKER: Does the gentleman ask that as a question of the gentleman from West Bath, Mr. Larrabee?

Mr. HINCKLEY: I ask it through the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinckley, asks the gentleman from West Bath, Mr. Larrabee, whether he would be willing to withdraw his motion for indefinite postponement,

and the gentleman from West Bath may answer through the Chair if he wishes.

Mr. LARRABEE: I withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from West Bath, Mr. Larrabee, withdraws his motion for the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Hinckley of South Portland, a viva voce vote being taken, the House voted to reconsider its action of yesterday whereby House Amendment A was adopted; and on further motion by the same gentleman, a viva voce vote being taken, House Amendment A was indefinitely postponed.

Thereupon, the bill had its third reading, was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

Passed to be Engrossed (Continued)

(H. P. No. 1850) (L. D. No. 1012)
An act relating to elections in the city of Biddeford, as amended.

(S. P. No. 322) (L. D. No. 592)
An act relating to reckless driving, as amended by Senate Amendment A.

(S. P. No. 495) (L. D. No. 978)
An act relating to Indians, as amended by Senate Amendment A.

(S. P. No. 503) Resolve creating a Recess Committee on a State fund for workmen's compensation, as amended.

Passed to be Enacted

(S. P. No. 342) (L. D. No. 613)
An act relating to the support of paupers.

(S. P. No. 494) (L. D. No. 995)
An act relating to aid to libraries, expenses of State Historian, topographic mapping, and abolishment of grade crossings.

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, Item 2, being Senate Paper 494, L. D. 995, an act relating to aid to libraries, expenses of State Historian, topographic mapping and abolishment of grade crossings, I have particular interest in; but as I understand it, we have provided for a State Geologist under this bill at an expense of one thousand dollars, and there is nothing in the title of the bill to indicate anything about a State Geologist. I am wondering if we could not put in an amendment that would make this act more in line with what we have really done. As it is now, the title

is very misleading. I move that the bill be tabled until later in the day.

Thereupon, the bill was tabled pending its passage to be enacted and specially assigned for later in today's session.

Passed to be Enacted—Cont.

(H. P. No. 76) (L. D. No. 32) An act to validate the acts of the County Commissioners of the County of Oxford.

(H. P. No. 615) (L. D. No. 187) An act relating to maintenance of the Androscoggin Lake Dam.

(H. P. No. 1572) (L. D. No. 624) An act relating to lobster fishermen's licenses.

(H. P. No. 1695) (L. D. No. 824) An act to enlarge and define the powers of the Androscoggin and Kennebec Railway Company.

(H. P. No. 1787) (L. D. No. 914) An act relating to apothecaries and the sale of poisons.

(H. P. No. 1823) (L. D. No. 977) An act relating to weekly payment of wages.

(H. P. No. 1832) (L. D. No. 985) An act relating to consolidation of corporations.

(H. P. No. 1833) (L. D. No. 983) An act relating to the registration of stone-crushers, well-drillers, steam shovels, graders, rollers and wood-sawing outfits.

(H. P. No. 1834) (L. D. No. 984) An act relating to dealers in junk.

(H. P. No. 1835) (L. D. No. 987) An act to provide for licenses for outdoor advertising.

(H. P. No. 1845) (L. D. No. 996) An act relating to automobile junk yards

(H. P. No. 1849) (L. D. No. 1008) An act regulating sale of liquor near National Homes

(H. P. No. 1831) (L. D. No. 1007) An act relating to the extension of the jurisdiction of Municipal Courts in certain cases

Finally Passed

(S. P. No. 500) (L. D. No. 994) Resolve in favor of Stanley Gerow of Bangor

(S. P. No. 502) (L. D. No. 1028) Resolve creating a Recess Committee on labor relations

(H. P. No. 343) (L. D. No. 1006) Resolve in favor of L. D. Chandler of Boston, Massachusetts

(H. P. No. 802) (L. D. No. 1005) Resolve in favor of Harry C. Austin & Co., Ellsworth, for burial expenses of Mark Arsenault, having no known settlement in the State

(H. P. No. 1181) (L. D. No. 437) Resolve relating to taking of shellfish and worms within the limits of the towns of Yarmouth, North Yarmouth and Cumberland

(H. P. No. 1487) (L. D. No. 1003) Resolve, bonus granted to John Charles Maher of Old Town

Passed to be Enacted

(H. P. No. 1748) (L. D. No. 855) An act to provide for the surrender by town of Somerville of its organization

Finally Passed

(H. P. No. 1837) (L. D. No. 990)

Resolve relating to State pensions

(H. P. No. 1839) (L. D. No. 988)

Resolve providing pensions for certain soldiers and sailors and dependents

(H. P. No. 1841) (L. D. No. 1002) Resolve in favor of Henry E. Redmond of Solon

(H. P. No. 1842) (L. D. No. 1001) Resolve in favor of Guy M. Babcock of West Gardiner

(Tabled by Mr. Keller of Hallowell, pending final passage, and specially assigned for later in today's session.)

(H. P. No. 1843) (L. D. No. 1000) Resolve to reimburse the town of Benton for burial expenses of J. Wilkes Hall, a veteran of the Civil War

(H. P. No. 1844) (L. D. No. 999) Resolve reimbursing the town of Stonington, for support of Harry Taylor

Orders of The Day

The Chair lays before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter, Senate report of the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game, reporting ought not to pass on bill an act relating to bounty on porcupines and hedgehogs, S. P. 172, L. D. 260, which came from the Senate with the bill substituted for the report and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A; tabled on April 13th by Mr. Flanders of Auburn pending acceptance of report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. FLANDERS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this report be accepted in non-concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Flanders, moves that the ought not to pass report of the committee be accepted in non-concurrence.

Mr. HASKELL of Lee: Mr.

Speaker and Members of the House: I have stated two or three times that I would like to make a few remarks regarding the porcupine bill.

The hedgehog is to the forests and the nearby farms what the house rat is to our homes and store-houses; they are nothing but vermin, and nothing good about them can be said that I know of. They destroy grain fields, sweet corn, apple trees, blueberries, camps and canoes; but the greatest damage is to our forests. Most of their food is the bark of the trees, the trees being girdled.

We spend thousands of dollars for forest fire protection, to protect our forests from fire, and it is only a small amount we have ever expended for the destruction of the hedgehog. We pay twenty-five cents for each one, and every time we have a dead hedgehog we have made a good investment for the State. Last year, in the last six months of the year we paid over seven thousand dollars for damage done by bear, yet we let the bear go on and call him an asset. Why we should not have some provision made for destroying these hedgehogs is more than I can see.

I went to the Fish and Game Department for figures for the amount paid out for several years we have had bounties on hedgehogs, and they are more or less misleading, I will admit that. June 30, 1930, I believe the amount was a little over \$5000; June 30, 1931, between \$11,000 and \$12,000; June 30, 1932, nearly \$10,000; June 30, 1933, \$3728; 1934, \$11,260; 1935, \$15,247.

This has been given me by some people showing that it is increasing, and by and by we would be paying a very large amount. But I will ask you to take into consideration that sum paid in 1935, \$15,247, is two years after our bounty had been stopped, and it was to clean up for the years 1932 and 1933. When I asked the Department for the number of hedgehogs killed in those different years and the claims made, so that I could present it to the House, to show you how it compared in the different years, they said they could not give it to me because they did not have it filed in that way; but they gave it to me by years, as I have stated.

I feel sure that the members of the House will see the hedgehog

question as I do, and that you will vote to have the bounty on them. The law as passed was for a bounty of 25 cents, but that was suspended for two years and then suspended for another two years until June, 1930. The committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reported un-animously that this bill should stand, that we shall have a bounty of 25 cents on hedgehogs. The amendment which we have before us is to suspend it for another two years. I sincerely hope that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Flanders) will not prevail.

Mr. CARLETON of Alma: Mr. Speaker, I have asked a number of the members of this House if they had any trouble with hedgehogs in their districts. Some have told me that they had not. I will say they are very fortunate, for I have had them in my town on my own land.

Now two years ago this spring we had a C. C. C. camp in my county, and they sent an army of men into my town and my village, and they were there for weeks, going over our woodlots looking for pine blister rust, pulling up what we call wild currants, skunk cabbage and gooseberries, for the prevention of pine blister rust.

Now I have a piece of land on my farm in the neighborhood of 124 acres, and they went on there for four weeks and tramped all over it, looking for this pine blister rust. Now the porcupines have done more damage to my trees than the pine blister rust ever did. The government sent those fellows there, and they tramped all over my property. I told them to get out. I told them: "I have got a deed to this property as high as heaven and as deep as hell, and I want you to keep out of this." (Laughter)

Now if any of you members have a dog who has ever got afool of a porcupine, you would have some sympathy for these dumb animals. I come from a town where a poor man keeps one dog and a very poor man keeps two and sometimes three, and I happen to be one of the poor men who keeps one dog. Many times when I have been out in the woods with my dog he has got afool of these quills; they are driven into the roof of his mouth, into his tongue, and the only way you can get them out is to have help, and you have probably got to

etherize the dog. I had a big dog that got these quills, and we had to etherize him, and three of us got etherized before the dog did. (Laughter) I know a man who paid five dollars to get these quills taken out of his dog. If the quills get into the dog's tongue, it gets sore, and the dog gets ugly; they are poison, and you have to be careful. There is a man in my county who says: "I have two dogs, and I value them at one hundred dollars apiece. I hope you will have that bounty put on porcupines."

Now as I say, they are no known good, these animals, and they do great damage to apple trees, sweet corn and crops and timber. This amount that we are asking is only a twenty-five cent bounty on each one, and it is paid by your town treasury and reimbursed by the State. The Fish and Game Department has asked for \$125,000 appropriation this year, or the next two years, and also they have an increase in the hunting and fishing licenses. I think that this bounty should be paid and help stamp out this menace—and these animals certainly are a menace. I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Flanders, does not prevail.

Mr. PHILBRICK of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, I think there is some confusion as to what this bill and report do. The law now on our Revised Statutes sets up a twenty-five cent bounty. This bill that is now before us would repeal the bounty, therefore the ought not to pass report of the committee would leave the bounty law in existence.

Mr. FLANDERS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I did not make my motion clear. My intention was that we concur with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Flanders, withdraws his motion to accept the ought not to pass report. The same gentleman now moves that the bill be substituted for the report.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. Speaker, this bill came before the committee on Inland Fisheries and Game, and, as I took an active part in the work of that committee, I feel in some measure qualified to speak.

The committee reported the bill ought not to pass. Now the bill would repeal the law now on the

statute books. The law which is now on the statute books will automatically go into effect on July 1st., and a bounty of 25 cents each will be paid on porcupines. That is, if there is no action taken by this Legislature, a bounty on porcupines will automatically be in force on July 1st; therefore the committee reported the bill ought not to pass, which in effect amounts to this: If the bill which we have had under consideration does not pass, you will have a bounty on porcupines on July 1st.

Now perhaps I should defend the position of the committee. Since they listened to me more or less in the arguments, I feel that the committee itself deserves some consideration. Not all of the members of the committee were in favor of this porcupine law, but they were willing to go along with the majority who wanted a bounty on porcupines.

Now it would look to me that we have here an economy measure something like that of the Mayor of one of our New England towns, where the story is told of how the people rose up in a body against the extravagance of his administration, and he said to his constituents: "I think we have got to make some economy move." So they went downstairs and they fired one scrubwoman.

Now this porcupine bounty costs the State eight or nine thousand dollars a year. That is probably true, but the damages the State pays for porcupines exceeds the amount that we would pay in bounties. Furthermore, we have this to consider: The people in our rural sections are not wealthy, and there are a few people at least who object to the increase in the fishing and hunting license. If these people are allowed to go out and kill porcupines and get 25 cents for them, all they have got to do is do that four times and they have got enough to buy a hunting license, and do the same thing again and they have got enough to get a fishing license. I think for that reason, the bill should be indefinitely postponed, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Auburn (Mr. Flanders) does not prevail.

Mr. FLANDERS: The amendment was to suspend the law for two years more, and I move that the amendment be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's

motion to adopt the amendment is not in order at this time. It will be in order at a later stage if the gentleman's motion to substitute the bill for the report prevails.

Mr. FLANDERS: I will explain what it will mean if the amendment should be adopted. I want the Legislature to understand that it will cost the State more than six to seven thousand dollars. When this was discussed in the Finance committee it was brought out that from July 1, 1929 to June 30, 1930 it cost \$5268; from July 30, 1930 to June 30, 1931 it cost \$11,693; from July 1, 1931 to June 30, 1932 it cost \$9784; from July 1, 1932 to June 30, 1933 it cost \$3728; from July 1, 1933 to June 30, 1934, \$11,260, and from July 1, 1934 to June 30, 1935 it cost \$15,447.

Now this law has been suspended for two years, and if the law is not suspended for the next two years I think it will cost the State something like \$30,000. That was the estimate.

I know that this is a proposition that the people in the smaller communities are interested in. I just wanted to give the picture as it was.

Mr. HOWES of Charleston: Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but what the hedgehogs in the State of Maine cost us one hundred thousand dollars a year. A man in our town last fall had a five-acre field of sweet corn, and he got a bunch of boys to go in and drive them and they killed seventeen hedgehogs out of that one piece of corn. There were no coons there, but the corn was literally torn to pieces. Furthermore, they are spoiling lots and lots of apple trees. I had a man come to me who wanted me to put in a bill. I did not do it. I am sorry I did not.

I think the State in the past has made a terrible mistake when they stopped the bounty on hedgehogs. During the time of the depression I know of two men in my town who made a living out of this. If they had not got it they would be living on the town. They rigged themselves up to get hedgehogs, and they got part of them and got a living out of it, enough to support their families. The State suspended the hedgehog bounty. At the time they took it off they were pretty well exterminated; there were not hedgehogs enough to bother. It was the greatest mistake the State ever made when they took it off, because

it only gave them a chance to breed up, and the State will have to pay a lot more. If we extend it for two years more, we will just have to pay more in the end. I have hunted them myself, and I have killed probably twenty hedgehogs this winter. I have killed every one I have seen and I always will, although I do not make a business of it. If you go to work and take the bounty off of hedgehogs for two years, you are certainly going to give them an opportunity to breed up, and you will pay an enormous price for it. The bounty should be put on hedgehogs and kept there.

Now the Fish and Game Department asked for \$125,000, and under this new set-up they are going to get \$75,000 more a year than they have had. I assure you that it costs the farmers of Maine more than \$75,000 right straight along. I would like to see the bounty put on and kept on. After we got them thinned down, everybody realizes it was a terrible mistake when they took the bounty off. If we had kept the bounty on, we would be paying hardly anything a year now. Now they have had a chance to breed up, and it seems to me they are thicker than they ever were. (Applause)

Mr. LEONARD of Hampden: Mr. Speaker, I think this is one of the greatest conservation measures that has come before the House. One of these hedgehogs in one night will kill a spruce tree that has taken fifty to sixty years to grow. You can see in the light snow where they come and climb the tree and in one night destroy that tree. Last spring, on the Union River I stopped and counted the number of trees that were killed. There was a lot of nice pulpwood right in that spot.

I do not want to take up the time of the House here, but I have had a lot of experience in the woods as a timberland owner. Possibly there are very few men in the House who have roamed the woods more than I have. I think I know what I am talking about, and I think this bounty should be kept on porcupine.

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am in error or not, but it is my understanding that there is no opposition at this time to a bounty on hedgehogs, and the acceptance of the report, ought not to pass, allows the bill to remain in force. Am I right about that?

The SPEAKER: The pending

question is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Flanders, to substitute the bill for the report.

Mr. NOYES: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion as to just how anyone should vote providing they want a bounty on porcupines. I will try in one sentence to straighten this matter out. If you want a bounty on porcupines, vote against the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Flanders, to substitute the bill for the report.

Mr. SLEEPER: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: To authorize the Chair to entertain the motion requires the assent of one-third of the members present. As many as are in favor of entertaining the motion will rise and remain standing until counted, and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division of the House was had.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than one-third having arisen, the motion for the previous question is entertained. The question is, shall the main question be put now? As many as are in favor of putting the main question now will say aye; those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Flanders, that the bill be substituted for the report. As many as are in favor of that motion will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to substitute the bill for the report did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Lee, the ought not to pass report of the committee was accepted in non-concurrence, and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair lays before the House the second today assigned matter, majority report of the committee on Judiciary reporting ought not to pass on bill an act requiring owners of certain motor vehicles and trailers to furnish security for their civil liability on account of personal injuries caused by their motor vehicles and trailers, S. P. 302, L. D. 496, and minority report of same committee reporting same in a new draft, S. P. 498, L. D. 1013, under

title of 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, and that it ought to pass. This came from the Senate with the majority report read and accepted and was tabled on April 14th in the House by Mr. Thorne of Madison, pending acceptance of either report; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. THORNE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the 88th Legislature: It had been my intention to discuss and debate this matter before this body this morning, but in view of the position of this bill and its progress in the Legislature, and realizing that it could not now be enacted into law at this session, I have adopted a different course. However, I consider this to be one of the most important questions facing the people of the State of Maine today, and, if the people of my district see fit to return me to this body, I purpose to introduce here this measure, or a like measure, and urge its passage; but for the time being I feel that the matter could not have a passage at this session. Therefore I now withdraw my troops from the field of battle and have the honor, Sir, to move the acceptance of the majority report ought not to pass in concurrence.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed, and the majority report, ought not to pass, was accepted in concurrence.

Mr. SLEEPER of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, out of order and under suspension of the rules, I would like to ask the House to reconsider its action on the indefinite postponement of House Amendment A to H. P. 1575, L. D. 716, an act relating to shipment of clams beyond the borders of the State. (Laughter)

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's motion is in order, and that gentleman moves that the House reconsider its former action taken earlier in today's session whereby House Paper 1575, L. D. 716, an act relating to shipping clams beyond the borders of the State, was passed to be engrossed. As many as are in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

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

Fifty-eight voting in the affirmative and 45 in the negative, the motion to reconsider prevailed.

Mr. SLEEPER: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House reconsider its former action taken in today's session whereby House Amendment A was indefinitely postponed.

I can well imagine that the House can well imagine that the House may be getting tired of clamming; but I can well understand why some members of this House did not want the question reconsidered; they wanted to save time. That is what I am trying to do because, if the bill passes in its present condition, it will be amended, and further amended, come back to us, and keep swinging back and forth, until eventually it will either die or enter its final stage in such a condition that there will be nothing left but the title. The committee was divided on the question and the member from Cumberland County, a member from the Senate from Sagadahoc County and a member of the Senate from York County were all opposed to the bill.

I realize that it is not ethical to roll logs or trade horses but the bill came out of the committee ought to pass, six to three, with the agreement that the three counties in which the minority members signed would not be included in the final passage of the bill. Of course we find that there are some members from those three counties who would like to be included in the bill, but evidently that cannot be; so if those members from those three counties want to join in the benefits of this prohibition of shipping clams beyond the State, I would suggest that at the next session of the Legislature, or at the next special session, there will undoubtedly be one who will bring in an amendment to that effect. I assure you members of the Legislature that the only way that this bill can come up will be to adopt the amendment excluding the counties of Sagadahoc, Cumberland and York from the provisions contained in it. Therefore I again move that the House reconsider its action whereby the amendment was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. LARRABEE of West Bath: Mr. Speaker, I have not the ability to talk like some of the gentlemen on the other side of this question. I will put it before the House in this manner: I ask for a fair deal,

This bill is a fair and square bill for the protection of the State of Maine; but a bill that only protects half of the State is no protection at all. I, for one, want to stand for the protection of the entire State or throw the bill out entirely. We do not want our three counties all dug up and the rest of the State protected. It is just one thing or the other,—protect the whole State or protect none of it; and I ask you to stand with me in this matter.

Mr. HINCKLEY of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, as I stated a while ago, I was not particularly interested in this bill when it was first presented in this House and I did not know very much about the amendment when it was adopted. It was sprung quickly on me and I had not read it, but I began to have my doubts after I did read it, and after it passed here yesterday, and I made some inquiries this morning. I have listened very attentively to the remarks made by the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, and I believe fully in the remarks that he made here on this floor, that this is a conservation measure for the whole State of Maine. If we are going to legislate for a part of the counties on the coast, I think we should legislate for all of them.

Now there are no clams in South Portland that one can dig. You are not allowed to dig them anyway; but there are clams in Cumberland County, and I am interested sometimes in getting a shore dinner, and when I go to some of these shore dinners and see there clams that look like periwinkles, it gives me ground to object to this amendment. I believe that Cumberland, York and Sagadahoc Counties should be protected as well as the rest of the State; but as I understand it, we are legislating here for a few canners who want to ship clams to New Hampshire and Massachusetts and get a profit out of them. This does not seem to be for the benefit of the State of Maine, but for the benefit of a very few shippers of clams. I believe we ought to protect these counties as well as the others, and therefore I hope the motion will not prevail.

Mr. PHILBRICK of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that I would not have to say anything on th's bill. I heartily concur in the statements of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, as be-

ing entirely fair and going through with what I understand to be the agreement in the Sea and Shore Fisheries Committee.

There are two sides to this proposition and I want to state very briefly my position. The Selectman of the town of Scarborough, in my district, has requested me to do everything I can to defeat this bill because it would put one hundred men in that town out of business in the summer months. The amendment is entirely fair and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, will prevail.

Mr. LEONARD of Hampden: Mr. Speaker, are the members of this House bound to recognize special agreements made in committee?

Mr. HINCKLEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the remarks of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, (Mr. Hinckley) that this is entirely satisfactory to his town and to the members from Cumberland County. If that is the remark that he made, then I disagree with it because I have heard several members from Cumberland County say that they were not in accord with this amendment.

Mr. CUSHING from Freeport: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any part in this discussion. The town of Freeport probably has more flats than any other town or city along our county coast, and another reason is that we have no clams left to talk about. We have been cleaned out for years and we are cleaned out now and it does not make any difference which way this is acted upon. All the clams that we have there that are sizable will be dug every year and we do not have any too many of them. The reason why I rise is because the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Philbrick, said that Cumberland County was in favor of this bill, and I will say that Cumberland County, at least my part of it, is not in favor of it.

Mr. SLEEPER: Mr. Speaker, the bill seems to have aroused quite a bit of controversy, and I will admit at this time that at the hearing the majority of the diggers, shippers and clambers and so forth who came from the counties of York, Cumberland and Sagadahoc were opposed to the bill and that is the reason why we felt that the amendment was justified. But the other five counties are for the bill to a man, and as I mentioned be-

fore, if the members from those three counties last mentioned, Cumberland, York and Sagadahoc, felt that they would like to enjoy the benefits of this bill, they should have worked on their members in the committee prior to the reporting out of the bill. In the future I would say that, at the next session of the Legislature, or the next special session, they join in with us and enjoy the true conservation measure that this bill provides. I do hope and I do feel that half a loaf is better than none, and if we can conserve the clams in five counties to the east, we will have that much done, and if the other three counties find that they have followed the wrong course, undoubtedly they will join us later in this conservation measure. So I do hope that we do not indefinitely postpone this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Sleeper, that the House reconsider its former action of today whereby House Amendment A was indefinitely postponed. As many as are in favor of the motion to reconsider will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted, a division of the House was had. Forty-five voting in the affirmative and 53 in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the bill was passed to be engrossed and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair lays before the House the third today assigned matter, bill an act relating to the sale of alcohol, H. P. 1836, L. D. 993, tabled on April 14th by Mr. Sleeper of Rockland, pending third reading; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. SLEEPER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologize for rising so often but I hope the House will not believe the old proverb that a hollow drum makes a lot of noise. An amendment is in the process of being reproduced, and I hope to be able to offer it on the next legislative day, so I would like to retable this matter until the next legislative day.

The bill was then retabled pending third reading and specially assigned for tomorrow.

The Chair lays before the House the fourth tabled and today assigned

matter, majority report, ought to pass, and minority report, ought not to pass, of the committee on Judiciary on bill an act relating to Emergency Municipal Finance Board, S. P. 179, L. D. 254, tabled on April 14th by Mr. Varney of Berwick, pending motion of Mr. Philbrick of Cape Elizabeth, that the majority report be accepted. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney.

Mr. VARNEY: Mr. Speaker, having conferred with the gentleman from Madison (Mr. Thorne) I now trust that the motion for the acceptance of the majority report will prevail.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the legislative members of the Judiciary Committee are about the finest bunch of fighting wildcats that I have ever worked with. I find that on this matter now under discussion six of them voted ought to pass and I alone signed the report ought not to pass. I very much dislike to have to oppose all those fine gentleman, and I am particularly sorry to have to oppose my seatmate in the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Thorne, who has worked so well with me in most matters.

Mr. Speaker, I request the privilege of facing the House.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may do so.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN (Continuing): Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, and for these reasons: First, because it takes away democratic government in the towns affected and places it in the hands of bureaucracy at Augusta; second, because it affects the morale of the towns that are covered by this measure; third, because it will take away the credit of every poor town in this State the moment this bill is passed; and, fourth, because if honest officials in the towns affected, with all the taxation machinery that they have, cannot collect these taxes and pay their bills, then some stranger from Augusta cannot do it either, unless he imposes some hardship upon someone. If it is true that there are some dishonest men in these towns, then I say send them to jail.

I want to discuss briefly the four points that I have just mentioned. The United States government has gradually been encroaching upon the rights of the states until at the

present time the matter has become so serious as to alarm many of us. Already Italy has its Mussolini, Germany has its Hitler, Russia has its Stalin, and we are steadily tending towards centralization in this country.

In this State, we have a central government at Augusta; we have sixteen counties and several hundred towns. We have had towns handling their own affairs since the adoption of the Constitution in 1820, and the towns for the most part have done a pretty good job. Eight years ago we had an unprecedented depression. That depression affected many towns, and they were unable to collect their taxes and to pay their bills. So it is now proposed that we take away that self-government from those towns for a time at the pleasure of the Commission and substitute, as I have stated, a bureaucracy in Augusta.

My second point, that it would affect the morale of the towns themselves: When you go into a town that happens to be back for a year on their taxes, and say to the selectmen and the officers of that town: "You are no good; you cannot do this job; we will turn you out, and we will put in some other men who can do the job,"—you are discouraging those men, and you are taking away the backbone that they need to do the town work. It is not any way to make a man do his best work by telling him that he is no good. You are affecting his morale. What we want in these towns is men like some of you in this Legislature who have served your towns. You have a pride in your towns, but you are temporarily hampered because of depression and cannot get the money. Do you want the State to come in and say you cannot do that job yourselves, that you are no good? I say that it is far better to keep the morale of the people than it is to relieve one or two towns or a dozen towns in the way that is asked in this bill.

This bill enables that Commission to go to any town when it is in arrears on their taxes and just take over that town's affairs for whatever period of time the Commission sees fit. I say further that it will affect the credit of every poor town in this State if it goes forth that there is a law whereby this Commission can take over the affairs of a city or town when it is a year in arrears on taxes or in-

terest on bonds or payment of school teachers. Where is the man or where is the bank that will give that town credit, when the provision is made that while they are in the hands of that Commission no suits can be brought against the Commission or against the town?

I have said further that if the honest men in a town collect these taxes and pay their bills, then a State official cannot do it without imposing a hardship upon somebody. How can they collect the taxes when the townspeople cannot? I will tell you how. They will have a lien on all the property in that town. They will care nothing for the lien upon the property of the poor man who cannot pay, but there will be some men in the town perhaps a little better off than this fellow. They can put a lien on that property and compel that man to pay.

Now I happened to hear part of the argument in the Senate on this measure. One argument that was put up was this: that in a certain town somebody destroyed the records. That town, according to the argument, ought to be taken over by the State. Listen! Is that not a whole of an argument for taking away the rights of a town, because some crook in that town destroyed the books? I say if you have got crooks in your town, send them to jail and keep them there, but do not take away the right of self-government from the people.

Those opposed to me will argue that this will do no such thing. What I am trying to point out to the members of this Legislature is that you are taking what I consider a dangerous step; you are taking one step towards a precipice and the bank is not far away.

I once stood on top of the Jungfrau, in Switzerland, and on top of the mountain the guides had put a flag that indicated how far it was safe to go and that it was not safe to go beyond that point, and if you went about fifty feet beyond that flag you would drop a mile. Now would anybody consider it wise to go beyond that danger mark?

This measure is a measure towards centralization of government. We have already got too much centralization in this country. Are we going to adopt similar methods in this State?

Members, I am simply putting this matter before you as I see it.

I respect the judgment of my colleagues. If, after what I have pointed out to you, you feel that their judgment is better than mine, vote with them. I shall not be elated by victory in this matter, neither shall I be depressed by its defeat. I simply want to point out to you the dangers as I see them, and I consider them great. Now it is up to you to vote as you please. (Applause)

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with either the majority or the minority report on this matter, but the facts are these: The State of Maine has spent \$800,000, and it is guessed that the State of Maine should rightfully raise about \$300,000 to do that work under proper conditions.

If we were conducting a business and it was scattered and the time arrived when some of our scattered interests were going very much astray and entirely out of our control, and out of our control to such an extent that there was no book-keeping, there were no records, things were being done in the most haphazard way imaginable, would not we in our central office attempt to reach out to that particular branch and make a correction?

This bill does not propose to affect the State of Maine as a whole. The right may be given, but it is not intended that it shall be used. It is rather an emergency means of grabbing hold of the very loose condition that we have in certain parts of the State, in an effort to save the State half a million dollars in the coming year.

Mr. THORNE of Madison: Mr. Speaker, as one of the fighting wildcats on the Judiciary Committee, I rise to defend the action of the Judiciary Committee—one of nine old men.

In the beginning, I want to thank the member from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, in refraining from mentioning his friend Nero and the place of his last known residence. For my part, I am willing to let Nero fiddle and Rome burn. Let Nero sleep with his fathers, and leave Rome to Mussolini.

I want to call your attention to this matter particularly from the viewpoint of the committee on Judiciary. The matter received an exhaustive hearing. The report of that committee—perhaps it is of no particular consequence, but if I have

made an error in saying that eight signed the majority report and two signed the minority report,—if I am in error somebody will correct me. During that hearing there were many appalling things and conditions described in many sections of our State.

Now nobody wants to take away from any town its right of self-government; nobody intends to. Just because a town is hard up or suffering temporary trouble is no reason for stepping in and taking over its financial affairs—nor is it the intention of this bill to bring that about. But when a private corporation cannot function it goes into the hands of a receiver, to be reorganized and put back on the right trail. This situation, as one of my colleagues said to me privately this morning, is like an automobile which goes over a bank. You do not intend to go over the bank but when you do, somebody has to pull you out.

When a town is in such condition, due to depression, mismanagement or other situation, that it can no longer function, something must be done not to that town but for it. When a town cannot pay its teachers and support its paupers and take care of itself, something must be done for the town, and that is the purpose of this bill.

After an exhaustive hearing the Judiciary Committee decided to report that the bill ought to pass. Had I been here in the House yesterday tending to my legislative duties, as I should have been, I should have moved the passage of this bill. I now want to say that I am heartily in favor of the acceptance of the majority report of the committee, and I hope that the motion of the member from Berwick, Mr. Varney, will prevail.

Mr. FINDLEN of Fort Fairfield: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we ought to take away from the towns their right to run themselves, realizing as I do that a great many towns in my county in the last few years have found themselves in the category of not being able to pay their State tax within the required time. If you will look back over the history of Aroostook County, you will find that this is the first time in its history it has not been able to pay its bills. Now there is a reason behind that. The reason is that

we have run into an emergency; we have run into not crop failure but price failure over a period of years, resulting in tremendous loss to the people up there who produce the greatest crop there is grown in the State of Maine. It will penalize our towns tremendously. I seriously object to this type of bill being passed by this Legislature. We never know when a city or a town may fall into an emergency. Our towns have. I want to say to you that we are gradually crawling out of that emergency, and if you leave us alone long enough we will pay the State every dollar we owe.

A similar condition was wished upon the banks of the State of Maine, and because of that a tremendous amount of banks were closed, especially in Aroostook County, that never should have been closed at all. They placed on those banks receivers, like you will on these towns. You will throw these towns into a State receivership; you will appoint a receiver under this law. These towns will work out of their own difficulties if we just give them a little bit of time. I move that the minority report be accepted. (Applause)

Mr. RUSS of Caribou: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I very much dislike to disagree with my colleague from Fort Fairfield, (Mr. Findlen) but I feel, as it has already been pointed out to us here, that this bill is not aimed at towns that are ordinarily in proper condition. I feel that there is an emergency in certain sections of this State and that this bill is very much needed. I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. VARNEY of Berwick: Mr. Speaker, I feel that on behalf of the Judiciary Committee I should say a few words justifying my reasons for signing the report of ought to pass.

First, I want to point out to this House that this is not a new act. This is simply an amendment to an act which was passed in 1933, I believe. When the officials attempted to assist these towns under the act as it was in 1933 they found one or two difficulties, and this present bill which we are considering is only an amendment to the act which we already have, in order to overcome some of those difficulties. I believe that they found in some of the towns which were in dire need there were no officials in the towns who

would attempt to help the towns out of their difficulties. It therefore became necessary to amend this act in order that some one not a resident of the town might be appointed. That is one amendment. Another difficulty that they faced was when they came into a town that was unable to pay its bills and attempted to help that town out of difficulty, the creditors of the town could come in and select the best piece of property in the town and levy their claims on that property and take it away from the owner.

Now imagine yourself in the position of owning the best or one of the best pieces of property in one of these towns which has got into financial difficulties and being confronted with either having to pay some one claim against the town or lose your property. Therefore an amendment was suggested to this act—and it is in here—whereby in these towns if they do take over the town they can not do as we did with our banks—put the bank into receivership and simply divide up what there was among those who had deposits in the bank what they had left—but merely defer payment of the claims which were then existing against the town until such time as the town could be back on a firm financial basis. At the end of that time, all creditors of that town will be paid not only in part but in full. This differs quite materially from the receivership of our banks in that particular, and I want the members to understand that. We are not putting a town into receivership and simply giving the creditors of that town a percentage of what is left. We are only asking the creditors to all wait until the town can be put back on a firm financial basis, when the citizens of that town will again take over the management and pay the claims in full. I think those are the two material changes in the act as it now exists.

Mr. PHAIR of Caswell Plantation: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In a small way I have been interested in a town that this bill is meant to help. Now I want to explain my position. Perhaps someone will say: "He is talking because he wants a job." But I already have a job, and I do not know what I will do with it. Under the present set-up there is not any-

thing I can do to help these people unless there is more authority given.

The gentleman from Fort Fairfield (Mr. Findlen) says that this trouble is all due to the depression. It is not. Some of these towns were in this condition before the depression ever set in, and will always be that way, due, mostly, in these particular towns, to mismanagement.

Now I cannot see how this is centralization of government. This bill has been amended so that it applies only to towns that are receiving State aid for their poor. If a town is all right, the State does not bother it. The gentleman from Fort Fairfield (Mr. Findlen) said that this Commission could levy upon these farms and take them away. Now that is just the condition which we hope to avoid by this bill. There are towns where that very thing is being done and will be done again.

I wish you would consider the farmer in one of these towns that took his farm when it was covered with trees; he cut them down and dug out the stumps and picked out the rocks, and as his farm was cleared and his family increased he built himself a home. He has always paid his taxes to this town, he does not owe them a dollar, and he owns his home which he hopes to keep to take care of him in his old age. He has passed the age when he can go out and earn his living. A creditor of this town can come in and take this farm away from him. Now what does he become? He becomes a liability to either the State or the town.

I think that this will enable these towns to get in such a position that they will be no longer a liability to the State but an asset. It is a fact there are some towns where there are citizens capable of doing this job, and there are some that you cannot get into public office because it is such a difficult job and necessarily they must pay small wages to do this work, and these citizens do not have time to do it; they are busy earning their living.

Now if there is any other way that these towns can be saved, I would be glad to have it done. I believe in keeping our old method of town government as long as we can, as long as it is a town government; but there are cases when it is not a town government. A bunch

will get in power and use it for the benefit of themselves. I hope that the majority report will be accepted.

Mr. PHILBRICK of Cape Elizabeth: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the Clerk read the first paragraph of Senate Amendment A and the whole of Senate Amendment C to the bill?

The SPEAKER: If there is no objection, the Clerk will read the first paragraph of Senate Amendment A and all of Senate Amendment C.

(The first paragraph of Senate Amendment A, and Senate Amendment C read by the Clerk)

Mr. PHILBRICK: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, was not here yesterday afternoon when I spoke on this bill. I dislike to make any repetition, but it does seem to me that the remarks of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. McGlauffin) are directed almost entirely to the law as it now exists and as it was enacted in 1933.

Under the 1933 law it provided that the Board could step into a town's affairs if taxes were six months overdue or if the town was behind on its debt payments or if it was not paying its school teachers. Under Senate Amendment A, the right of the State to step in would be distinctly limited to cases where towns applied to the State for emergency relief. Under Senate Amendment C, the right to step in would be further limited to cases where the arrears were one year instead of six months and cases where ten per cent of the real estate taxpayers in the town asked the State to take that step. It is the 1933 law that is an infringement of the right of home rule. It is this bill as amended by Senate Amendment A and C that very carefully guards infringement of the right of home rule. It seems to me that the voters of every town in this State who are interested in home rule ought to favor this bill as amended.

Mr. PACKARD of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Packard, moves the previous question. To authorize the Chair to entertain the motion requires the assent of one-third of the members present. As many as are in favor of entertaining the motion for the previous question will rise and remain standing until

counted and the monitors will make and return the count.

A division was had.

The SPEAKER: Obviously more than a sufficient number having arisen, the motion is entertained. The question is, shall the main question be put now? As many as are in favor of putting the main question now will say aye; those opposed no.

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

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Cape Elizabeth, Mr. Philbrick, that the majority report ought to pass be accepted. As many as are in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the majority report ought to pass was accepted.

Thereupon, the bill was given its two several readings.

The SPEAKER: The question now is on the adoption of Senate Amendment A. The Clerk will read Senate Amendment A.

On motion by Mr. Snow of Dover-Foxcroft, the reading of Senate Amendment A was dispensed with.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the adoption of Senate Amendment A in concurrence.

A viva voce vote being taken, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and tomorrow was assigned for the third reading of the bill as amended.

On motion by Mr. Ellis of Rangeley, recessed until 4 P. M.

After Recess—4:10 P. M.

The Speaker in the Chair.

Papers From the Senate

(Out of order and under suspension of the rules)

On motion by Mr. Ellis of Rangeley, it was voted to take up, out of order, the tenth item on the afternoon calendar, bill an act to provide for old age assistance, H. P. 1863, L. D. 1029, which was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendments A and B in the House yesterday.

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

Mr. JEWETT of Ripley: Mr.

Speaker and members of the House: As a freshman in this Legislature I hesitate to rise and speak, but I feel it my duty as a member of the committee on pensions to do so.

We have heard a lot about the figure \$2,800,000 as being the amount recommended by the committee on pensions for old age assistance for the biennium. It is only fair that the members of this House should know that we as a committee in executive session never recommended this amount. The only executive session we have had where the appropriation clause has been discussed was Saturday, April 10th. It was the unanimous opinion at that meeting that a sum sufficient to carry out the intentions of the bill should be recommended; therefore the sum of \$2,000,000 per year was unanimously approved. We based our recommendations on figures furnished by the Department of Health and Welfare.

There is a strong lobby at work to reduce this recommendation. I ask you why? I am sure that it is to defeat any large tax measure, such as the sales and income tax. If they are successful in cutting down this recommendation to \$1,400,000 per year, we will be told that a sales tax is unnecessary.

If this amendment is adopted in concurrence without changing the limitations of the bill, about one-half the people eligible to receive old age assistance must go without.

The people back home expect us to pass an old age assistance measure, believing, of course, that we will appropriate a sufficient amount of funds to carry out the intentions of the bill. They do not expect us to go half way and grant about half of those eligibles a pension and let the other half go in want.

I, for one, believe that if we cannot afford to go the whole distance, we should not attempt it at all. My interest in this matter is with the old people in need, regardless of what certain lobbyists here to defeat certain taxation measures think.

Mr. Speaker, I move you, sir, that we insist and ask for a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ripley, Mr. Jewett, moves that the House insist and ask for a committee of conference.

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, I think that every member of this House knows that I am one

of that number who have consistently been in favor of the sales tax, therefore it would not appear that, as far as I am concerned, I was interested in that group who were trying to defeat anything of that sort.

It is my understanding that the Senate members of the committee on Pensions are in sympathy with a lesser amount than are the House members, for the reason, I assume, that it is going to be very hard for the House to get the Senate to go along with them unless they go part way.

I have talked with Mr. Leadbetter since dinner time, and he tells me that a million and a half of dollars, or \$1,400,000 the first year—that figure of \$1,400,000 or half a million is more or less immaterial in the proposition that we are considering, and I doubt very much, from a psychological standpoint, whether we will want to bother to shift that figure to the extent of one hundred thousand dollars; but I do feel that in order to do our part in cooperation with the other branch of the Legislature, that I would like to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman's motion to amend would not be in order while the motion to insist is pending. If the motion to insist does not prevail, the motion to amend can be made at a later stage.

Mr. McGLAUFLIN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I have maintained since I first came to this Legislature that we were sent up here to do a big job, and that if we did it at all we should do it well. If it is necessary—and I believe it is—to have this sum of two million dollars instead of a less sum, I for one am going to insist upon having that amount if this Legislature gets to the point of raising any money at all.

I talked with Mr. Leadbetter in regard to this matter, and he said that if we did not get money enough to take care of the needy we had better not appropriate anything at all, because it was not any use to just half do this job. I for one am with the gentleman who asked for the two million dollars. (Applause)

Mr. RYDER of Orrington: Mr. Speaker, a reduction in the proposed appropriation would of course mean a similar reduction in the Federal contribution. If we reduce our figures from \$2,000,000 to \$1,400,000, this means that we will lose

\$600,000 of Federal money plus the 5% additional which the Federal Government contributes toward administration expenses.

We should not overlook the fact that there are hundreds of State paupers and city and town paupers over 65 years of age who would qualify for Old Age Assistance. In fact, practically all of them over this age would qualify for Old Age Assistance. If they could be transferred from the pauper lists to the Old Age Assistance lists, the cities and towns would be relieved to a very great extent and the Federal Government would contribute one-half of the cost.

Of course there are many towns that cannot carry their pauper burden and other towns are having a hard time to do it. The transfer of their aged paupers to the Old Age Assistance lists would be of great benefit to the poorer towns.

Even if we have to make some compromise on the first year, we should have the full two millions for the second year. Otherwise, we will have to pass by many persons who are as deserving as those who receive the assistance, or we will have to reduce the allowances to a point which will not admit of a decent scale of living.

Mr. BATES of Patten: Mr. Speaker, I think we are all in accord with the gentleman who has spoken previously, that we really need two million dollars for the fiscal year, June 30, 1938 to June 30, 1939 is due to the fact this Old Age Pension law will not go into effect until August 1st. I question whether or not the department can spend two million dollars in a proper manner between August 1st and June 30, 1938. It would almost seem to me as though a million and a half dollars would be ample to take care of the Old Age Pension from August 1st to June 30th, 1938.

Mr. PAYSON of Brooks: Mr. Speaker, we all realize that this Old Age Assistance is a big business for the State of Maine. We all promised it when we were elected to come here, both parties.

Now as a member of the Pension committee myself, I will say that we have studied this very carefully and we have figured it as close as we possibly could, and in order to do our duty and do what we promised when we came here we have got to have two million dollars each year for the next two years.

Mr. FINDLEN of Fort Fairfield: Mr. Speaker, I wish to agree with the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Hinman, in his statement that I believe \$1,500,000 is a very sizable figure for the first year, and \$2,000,000 for the second. Since this will not go into effect until August, I like the gentleman from Patten, Mr. Bates, believe it will be a very generous figure. I do not believe they can spend more than a million and a half, so I favor that million and a half as a compromise.

Mr. HINMAN of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I neglected to say, I think, either yesterday or today, and that is this: We all know that after we have been in this program for a year we are going to have to go in further. Now if we go in as far as we are going in a two-year period the first year, we are going to be in a most embarrassing condition with the citizens of the State of Maine to not be able to take on new cases; and my thought has been all the time that regardless of how much you decide to raise you must have more money the second year than you had the first. Now it would seem as though if we compromised and put back \$600,000 or one-half of what the Senate has cut, it would be about all we could—

The SPEAKER: The gentleman must not refer to the action of the Senate.

Mr. HINMAN: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OWEN of Bath: Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize for speaking again on this subject. As a matter of fact, it might well be that in the second year less money would be needed than in the first year, and, on the basis of the remarks of the gentleman who has just spoken, the next fiscal year, as far as this bill is concerned, will only be one-twelfth shorter than the fiscal year following. We must necessarily rely on the only possible source of exact information, and that is the Department of Health and Welfare.

The investigation of these cases has been going on continuously, as I understand it, although there has been no additional Old Age Assistance granted since last September, when the money gave out. Nevertheless, as a result of these investigations, there are already approved applications nearly sufficient to take care of the \$1,500,000 which it is

proposed to offer as a compromise with the Senate. Now that figure of \$1,500,000 is simply a guess that somebody is making that that will be all that we require, whereas we have, through the Welfare Department the information that two million dollars will be required for the first year as well as the second. Once these people, the estimated 20,000, are receiving Old Age Assistance, so long as the act remains the same as it is, there will be no future tendency to increase. The people will die at about the same rate as they become eligible. There is also the fact that within a few years, I believe it is, the Social Security benefits will become effective, and people who are employed now will not be eligible for this Old Age Assistance because they are provided for by the old age benefits under the Social Security Act, and they are contributing for that purpose.

It seems to me that it is extremely unfair and extremely unwise, as I said yesterday, if we are going to do this thing at all, to not provide enough money to do it completely.

Mr. CARLETON of Alna: Mr. Speaker, we have been informed that there are 27,000 applications waiting, and eighty per cent of these will pass. Now if we cut this down to \$1,500,000, which is to be matched by Federal money, we are losing out from the Federal government. If we make it \$2,000,000, they match it with \$2,000,000, and five per cent of that can be used for investigation of these cases, which will help carry on this work. I fail to see why this is not going to be a great help to every town, city and plantation in the State of Maine. It is going to take people off of relief; it is going to lighten our appropriation for relief. This money will be expended locally in each and every town.

If you have read the provisions of the bill and understand it, it says that a person cannot be supported in an almshouse or a pauper asylum, but they can be supported outside of that if they are entirely supported by your town or plantation today. Why is not that a benefit to your town in getting one-half from the Federal government. If you have read your bill carefully, it says you have got to appropriate enough for a decent and respectable living. It has been suggested here this afternoon that they were going to give them \$10 a month. Who can live on \$10 a month. You could

not do it yourselves, and you should not expect others to do it. I am not here to play politics with old age or cripples or poverty. I want to go home and face these people as a man. I do not want to have it laid at my door that I am a scab legislator, a scab politician, and that I am trying to deprive some aged people of a decent, respectable living. When the Federal government will match it, I say it is our duty as citizens to do this now. (Applause)

Mr. SEABURY of Yarmouth: Mr. Speaker, I have observed one outstanding point here and that is they say we do not get any relief till August 1st. If that is contingent on our voting, I say let us vote. If we have got to wait three months for it, let us vote.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ripley, Mr. Jewett, that the House insist and ask for a committee of Conference. Is the House ready for the question? As many as are in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion prevailed, and the Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. Jewett of Ripley, Payson of Brooks and Owen of Bath.

On motion by Mr. Ellis of Rangeley, it was voted that the bill be sent to the Senate forthwith.

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 terms and salaries of City of Lewiston officials (S. P. No. 457) (L. D. No. 850) reporting that both branches recede from their former action and pass the bill to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B" submitted herewith.

(Signed)

Messrs. Dutil of Lewiston
Dow of Norway
Boucher of Lewiston
—Committee on part of House.
Maliar of Androscoggin
Fortin of Androscoggin
Spear of Cumberland
—Committee on part of Senate.

Report was read and accepted. Thereupon, the rules were suspended, and the House voted to reconsider its action of April 8th whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The rules were further suspended and the House voted to reconsider its action whereby House Amendment A was adopted and that amendment was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the adoption of House Amendment B, as follows:

House Amendment "B" to S. P. No. 457, L. D. No. 850, bill an act relating to terms and salaries of City of Lewiston officials.

Amend said bill by striking out all of Section 5 and inserting in lieu thereof the following section:

'Sec. 5. Date when effective. So much of this act as authorizes the submission of its acceptance to the voters of the city of Lewiston shall take effect as provided in the constitution of the state, but it shall not take further effect unless accepted by the legal voters of the city of Lewiston, as provided in section 4, and if so accepted shall become effective on the first day of March 1939 and the officers elected on that date shall hold office for 2 years, as provided in section 1.'

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

Senate Resolves in First Reading

S. P. 512, L. D. 1036: Resolve providing for the payment of certain pauper claims.

S. P. 300, L. D. 498: Resolve relating to a State Highway Planning Survey and Planning Survey Committee.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Report of the committee on Library on bill an act relating to vital statistics. S. P. 189, L. D. 288, which was recommitted, reporting ought to pass as amended by Senate Amendment A. Prior to recommitment the bill had been given its three readings in the House and its two readings in the Senate and had been amended by Senate Amendment A.

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

In the House, the report of the committee was read and accepted in concurrence.

Senate Amendment A read by the Clerk.

A viva voce vote being taken, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended by Senate Amendment A was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

From the Senate: Majority Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting ought not to pass on bill an act to provide for the nomination of candidates for elective office (S. P. No. 394) (L. D. No. 733)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Fernald of Waldo
Wiley of Cumberland
Miss Laughlin of Cumberland
—of the Senate.
Messrs. Hinckley of So. Portland
Weatherbee of Lincoln
Thorne of Madison
McGlauffin of Portland

—of the House.
Minority Report of same Committee on same bill reporting same in a new draft (S. P. No. 497) (L. D. No. 986) under title of an act to provide for the nomination of candidates for county offices and that it ought to pass.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. Philbrick of Cape Elizabeth
Varney of Berwick
Bird of Rockland

—of the House.
Comes from the Senate with the majority report read and accepted.

In the House, on motion by Mr. Hinckley of South Portland, the majority report ought not to pass was accepted in concurrence.

From the Senate: Resolve Creating a Recess Committee on Compensation for Occupational Diseases (H. P. No. 1852) (L. D. No. 1004) which was passed to be engrossed in the House on April 10th.

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

In the House, on motion by Mr. Philbrick of Cape Elizabeth, that body voted to reconsider its action of April 10th whereby this resolve was passed to be engrossed.

Senate Amendment A read by the Clerk.

On motion by Mr. Ellis of Rangeley, the bill and amendment were tabled pending the adoption of Senate Amendment A in concurrence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Proceeding under Orders of the Day the Chair lays before the House the fifth tabled and today assigned matter, Senate report ought to pass in new draft of the committee on Legal Affairs on bill an act to provide for annual audits in cities, towns, plantations and village corporations. S. P. 89, L. D. 87, new draft S. P. 408, L. D. 796, tabled on April 14th by Mr. Varney of Berwick, pending acceptance in concurrence; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Varney, the report of the committee, ought to pass in new draft, was accepted in concurrence.

Thereupon, the bill had its two several readings and tomorrow assigned.

The Chair lays before the House the first matter tabled earlier in today's session by the gentleman from Hallowell, Mr. Keller and specially assigned for this afternoon being H. P. 1842, L. D. 1001, resolve in favor of Guy M. Babcock of West Gardiner, tabled pending its final passage and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

On motion by Mr. Keller, the rules were suspended to permit a motion to reconsider the former action of the House whereby this resolve was passed to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same gentleman the House voted to reconsider its former action whereby this resolve was passed to be engrossed.

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

House Amendment A to H. P. No. 1842, L. D. No. 1001, resolve, in favor of Guy M. Babcock, of West Gardiner.

Amend said resolve by striking out all after the amount "\$250" and inserting in place thereof the following: 'to be paid to Guy M. Babcock, of West Gardiner, as a full and final settlement against the state for all claims on account of injuries received by him while employed by the state highway department.'

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

The Chair lays before the House

the second matter tabled earlier in today's session by the gentleman from Skowhegan, Mr. Hinman, pending enactment and specially assigned for this afternoon, being Senate Paper 494, L. D. 995, an act relating to aid to libraries, expenses of State Historian, topographic mapping, and abolishment of grade crossings; and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. HINMAN: Mr. Speaker, while this bill originally included the State Geologist, I believe that during the session that has been taken out. I beg the pardon of the House for the interruption, and move that it be enacted.

Thereupon, the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Varney of Berwick, it was voted to take from the table the ninth unassigned matter, bill an act as to the importation of intoxicating liquors other than those consigned to wholesale malt liquor licensees; emergency, H. P. 1847, L. D. 998, tabled by that gentleman on April 14th pending third reading.

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

House Amendment A to H. P. No. 1847, L. D. No. 998, bill an act as to the importation of intoxicating liquors other than those consigned to wholesale malt liquor licensees; emergency.

Amend said bill by striking out in the 7th line of Section 1 thereof the words "a person" and inserting in place thereof the words "an individual";

Further amend said bill by striking out in the 8th line of Section 1 thereof the word "import" and inserting in place thereof the word "transport", and by striking out in the same line thereof the words "in his own private vehicle,";

Further amend said bill by striking out in the 9th line of Section 1 of the bill the word "intoxicating" and inserting in place thereof the words 'spirituous or vinous';

And further amend said bill by inserting after the word "liquors" in the 5th line of Section 3 thereof the following: ', except liquors purchased from a state store or the state liquor commission'.

Thereupon, House Amendment A was adopted by a viva voce vote, the bill had its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as

amended by House Amendment A and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. McGlauffin of Portland, it was voted to take from the table the fifth unassigned matter, bill an act relating to hunting while intoxicated or under the influence of drugs, H. P. 1707, L. D. 382, which was passed to be enacted in the House on March 30 and which came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A in non-concurrence, and which was tabled April 13th by Mr. McGlauffin, pending the adoption of Senate Amendment A.

Mr. MCGLAUFFIN: Mr. Speaker, I moved to table this bill so that I could see the effect of the amendment upon the bill. The bill provides that if a man is found guilty of being intoxicated or under the influence of drugs while hunting, he shall lose his license for one year. The amendment offered provides that if a man is found guilty of intoxication or the use of drugs, if he appeals, his license is still in effect until the matter is settled on appeal.

I am not particularly interested in this bill one way or the other. but I do want to point out that that amendment kills the effect of the bill. For example, let us suppose that a hunter comes in here from Boston or New York and is found guilty of intoxication. He is fined five dollars for being intoxicated and he appeals. He then goes right on with his hunting license and continues to stay until the season is over, and what does he care about the license being taken away for a year? It clearly spoils the effect of the bill. I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, that we insist and ask for a committee of Conference.

The SPEAKER: For the information as to the position of this bill and the previous action of the House, the Clerk will read, if there is no objection the endorsements on the bill, omitting the signatures.

(The Clerk reads the endorsements on the bill.)

The SPEAKER: Two branches of the Legislature not being in disagreement at the present moment on this measure, the Chair rules that the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. McGlauffin, to insist and ask for a committee of Conference is not in order. The

question is on the adoption of Senate Amendment A in concurrence.

Mr. VARNEY of Berwick: Mr. Speaker, I move that Senate Amendment A be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney, that Senate Amendment A be indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being taken, Senate Amendment A was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence, and the bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Stilphen of Dresden, it was voted to take from the table the third unassigned matter, bill an act relating to the transportation of intoxicating liquor, H. P. 1846, L. D. 997, tabled by that gentleman on April 12th pending third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berwick, Mr. Varney.

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

House Amendment A to H. P. No. 1846, L. D. No. 997, bill, an act relating to the transportation of intoxicating liquor.

Amend said bill by striking out in the 14th line of the bill the word "intoxicating" and inserting in place thereof the words "spirituous or vinous".

Further amend said bill by inserting after the word "quarts" at the end of the 15th line of the bill the following: ", unless said liquor was purchased from a state store or the state liquor commission";

Further amend said bill by striking out in the 18th and 19th lines thereof the words "for a specific journey" and by striking out in the 19th line of said bill the words "at a state store";

Further amend said bill by striking out in the 20th line of said bill the following: ", in a quantity not to exceed 3 gallons," and inserting in place thereof the following: ". It shall be lawful for common carriers and contract carriers duly authorized as such by the public utilities commission to transport liquor to state stores, to state ware-

houses, to licensees of the state liquor commission, to purchasers of liquor at state stores and from manufacturers to state warehouses, state stores and to the state line for transportation outside the state; for licensees of the state liquor commission to transport liquor from state stores to their place of business; and for manufacturers to transport within the state to state warehouses and state stores and to the state line for transportation outside the state. :

And further amend said bill by striking out from the last sentence

thereof the words "transports any intoxicating liquors in violation" and inserting in place thereof the words 'violates any of the provisions'.

Thereupon, by a viva voce vote House Amendment A was adopted, the bill had its third reading, was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A and sent up for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Ford of Saco, Adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.