

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-Ninth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1939

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

SENATE

Wednesday, March 15, 1939.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Louis Staples of Gardiner.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

From the House:

Majority Report "Ought to Pass," Minority Report "Ought Not to Pass" from the Committee on Judiciary on bill "An Act to Make the Process of Forcible Entry and Detainer Available in Case of Trespass on Public Lands." (S. P. 213) (L. D. 285)

(In the Senate, majority report "Ought to Pass" accepted, and on March 10, passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A").

Comes from the House, minority report "Ought not to Pass" read and accepted in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Miss Laughlin of Cumberland, that body voted to adhere.

Papers from the House referred in concurrence.

House Committee Reports

The Committee on Banks and Banking on bill "An Act Making Securities Issued or Insured by the Federal Housing Administrator and Obligations of National Mortgage Associations Eligible for Deposit and Investment Purposes." (H. P. 1344) (L. D. 862) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

The same Committee on bill "An Act to Authorize the Incorporation of Credit Unions," (H. P. 1310) (L. D. 549) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. DORR of Oxford: Mr. President, I move that Legislative Document 549 be laid upon the table pending the acceptance of the committee report and in explanation I will say that Representative Poulin who introduced the bill is now in the hospital and that is the reason I am asking to have it tabled.

The motion prevailed and the bill was laid upon the table pending acceptance of the committee report "Ought Not to Pass."

The Committee on Claims on "Resolve in Favor of Mary A. Dodge of Wayne," (H. P. 27) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Oscar O. E. Young of Fayette," (H. P. 62) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Cecil Carter of Surry," (H. P. 535) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Harrison Whitney of Windham," (H. P. 1518) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of Jason R. Bennett of Locke's Mills," reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of the Town of Passadumkeag," (H. P. 1519) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve in Favor of the Rising Sun Lodge, No. 71, F. & A. M. of Orland," (H. P. 824) reported that the same ought not to pass as taken care of otherwise.

The Committee on Education on bill "An Act to Provide Honorary Scholarships," (H. P. 1766) (L. D. 935) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

The Committee on Judiciary on bill "An Act Providing that an Injured Employee may Select his own Physician or Surgeon," (H. P. 1324) (L. D. 537) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. HILL of Cumberland: Mr. President, this bill is somewhat similar and yet in some rather important respects very different from a measure that was presented by me as a member of the House in the Eighty-seventh Legislature in 1935. For that reason I should like at this time just briefly to express my position on this matter, having acquiesced in the "Ought Not to Pass" report from the Committee on Judiciary on this particular bill. This bill is broader in scope than was the previous measure and it contains, it appears to me, certain discriminatory provisions that are highly objectionable.

In the previous case to which I have alluded, the minority of the Judiciary Committee reported favorably on the new draft of the bill

that would permit injured employees to select their own surgeons in cases of major surgical operations to be performed in hospitals. That minority report was taken to the floor of the House and the bill was passed by a vote 106 to 12 but was subsequently defeated in the Senate.

If this were the same measure I should be entirely unable to concur in the report of the committee. If it seemed possible to pass in this legislature a bill such as the one which was proposed in 1935 I would be very happy to speak, if necessary, in support of that measure, because it seems to me only humane and only fair and just that an employee who is subjected to a serious and vital surgical operation should clearly, without any doubt, have the legal authority to select his own surgeon without any danger of forfeiting his rights to compensation or his rights to reimbursement for his medical or surgical expenses.

This measure, however, being different in certain respects, I am opposed to this particular bill and in view of the fact that the sentiment of apparently a substantial majority of the Judiciary Committee would oppose a new draft similar to the measure presented four years ago it seems useless to do anything other than to concur in the general report "Ought Not to Pass."

Miss LAUGHLIN of Cumberland: Mr. President, I would like to go on record that in general my position is the same as that of my colleague from Cumberland, Senator Hill. But I would perhaps go a little further than he does. My position would be that an employee should have the right to select his own physician, not merely in surgical cases but in everything else, provided that a check on his choice was given the employer. It should not be a complete privilege without such a check because I have known of cases where it has happened that the employee received very poor service in selecting his own physician or surgeon, but I believe that he should have the right with proper provision made for a check on the part of the employer. However, this bill as drawn of course is most objectionable because it does not provide that an employee may select his own physician or surgeon. If you will look at Document 537 you will see that the title of the bill is misleading because the bill pro-

vides that the employee may select, provided he selects a physician or surgeon or doctor of medicine, which clearly cuts out his right of choice if he wishes to have an osteopath. I am not speaking for the osteopath and I probably would not select one for myself if I should ever need a physician, which I haven't for many years, but I am speaking on the basis that under this bill, he is not free to choose his own surgeon.

In common with my colleague from Cumberland County (Senator Hill) I would have liked to have seen a new draft of the bill with a proper provision for the employer and employee together to select the physician or surgeon but it seems impossible to present such a new draft with any hope of its acceptance and I will simply say that, in common with Senator Hill, my colleague from Cumberland County, I am not opposed to, but rather am in favor of, an employee having the right to select his own physician with proper safeguard for the employer, and my chief opposition to this bill is that the text of the bill is a denial of its title.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the acceptance of the "Ought Not to Pass" report of the Committee on Judiciary. Is it the pleasure of the Senate that the report be accepted in concurrence?

Thereupon, the report of the committee "Ought Not to Pass" was accepted in concurrence.

The same Committee on bill "An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law Relating to the Employment Service," (H. P. 1320) (L. D. 536) reported that leave be granted to withdraw.

The same Committee on bill "An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law Relating to Waiting Periods," (H. P. 1422) (L. D. 607) reported that leave be granted to withdraw.

The same Committee on bill "An Act Relating to Business Records as Evidence," (H. P. 1631) (L. D. 721) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on bill "An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law Relative to Liability of Employers," (H. P. 906) (L. D. 298) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on bill "An Act Relating to Number of Employees under Unemployment Compensation Law," (H. P. 1884) (L. D. 750) reported that the same ought not to pass, as the subject matter is covered by another bill.

The Committee on Motor Vehicles on bill "An Act Authorizing the Secretary of State to Arrange for Expiration of Motor Vehicle Registrations at Stated Periods," (H. P. 1331) (L. D. 539) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Sanborn of Cumberland, tabled pending acceptance of the report in concurrence.)

The same Committee on bill "An Act to Extend the Time for the Display and Use of Motor Vehicle Registration Plates," (H. P. 934) (L. D. 324) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on bill "An Act Relating to Closing Clam, Quahaug and Mussel Flats to Digging," (H. P. 1719) (L. D. 894) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Relating to Digging for Clams in Biddeford," (H. P. 1798) (L. D. 963) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence.

The Committee on Claims on "Resolve in Favor of William A. Moran of Bangor," (H. P. 704) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1875) (L. D. 1019) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve for the Transfer of Certain Money in the Hands of the Bangor State Hospital," (H. P. 852) (L. D. 334) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1874) (L. D. 1018) under a new title, "Resolve for the Transfer of Certain Monies in the Hands of the Bangor State Hospital and the Augusta State Hospital," and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Claims on "Resolve in Favor of Alvah E. Spear of Warren," (H. P. 1273) (L. D. 1017) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Towns on bill "An Act to Provide for the Surrender by Concord Plantation of its

Organization," (H. P. 261) (L. D. 73) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1876) (L. D. 1020) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on bill "An Act Relating to Attesting of Records," (H. P. 1667) (L. D. 888) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Judiciary on bill "An Act Relating to the Probation Officer for the County of Cumberland," (H. P. 1154) (L. D. 383) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on bill "An Act to Confirm, Ratify and Validate the Incorporation of the First Baptist Church of Yarmouth, Maine, and to Increase its Power," (H. P. 919) (L. D. 359) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence, the bills and resolves read once, and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on bill "An Act Relating to the First Congregational Church of Kittery," (H. P. 126) (L. D. 48) reported that the same ought to pass if amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted herewith.

In the House, the report was read and accepted and bill as amended by Committee Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, the report was read and accepted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading. Committee Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment A was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The same Committee on bill "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Ogunquit Village Corporation," (H. P. 1174) (L. D. 491) reported that the same ought to pass if amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted herewith.

In the House, the report was read and accepted and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment "A" was passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, the report was read and accepted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading. Committee Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill as amended by Committee

Amendment A was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The same Committee on bill "An Act Relating to Marriage Licenses," (H. P. 1650) (L. D. 921) reported that the same ought to pass if amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted herewith.

In the House, report read and accepted and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment "A" passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, the report was read and accepted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading. Committee Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment A was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Mercantile Affairs and Insurance on bill "An Act Making Certain Changes in the Insurance Law," (H. P. 1436) (L. D. 616) reported the same under a new draft (H. P. 1863) (L. D. 1015) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

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

In the Senate, the report was read and accepted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading. House Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended by House Amendment A was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The majority of the Committee on Judiciary on bill "An Act Providing that Employers of One or More Persons Shall be Subject to the Unemployment Compensation Law," (H. P. 1628) (L. D. 867) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(Signed) Senator Burns of Aroostook, Representatives Thorne of Madison, McGlauffin of Portland, Weatherbee of Lincoln, Bird of Rockland, Varney of Berwick.

The minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1926) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(Signed) Senators Laughlin of Cumberland, Hill of Cumberland, Representatives Hinckley of South Portland, Fellows of Augusta.

In the House, the majority report "Ought Not to Pass" read and accepted.

In the Senate:

Mr. BURNS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I move that the Senate, in concurrence with the action of the House, accept the majority report "Ought Not to Pass" on this bill, An Act Providing that Employers of One or More Persons Shall be Subject to the Unemployment Compensation Law. In support of this motion, Mr. President, I wish, first of all, to call to the attention of the Senate that this measure deals with the Unemployment Compensation Insurance law. It does not deal with the state Workmen's Compensation Act, to which mention has been made in previous debate earlier in the session.

This bill was referred to the Committee on Judiciary and at that time proponents of this measure appeared there, largely representatives of labor, if not entirely so, advocating the passage of this bill. They brought out as their chief reason for enactment of this measure that there was a discrimination between the employees where there were less than eight in the employ of an employer and in cases where there were eight or more employees employed by a certain employer. They said that this brought about a discrimination, and at first glance there cannot be much question about that particular stand taken.

It would be desirable for every employee to receive the same advantage as his fellow employee receives in some other industry or business. It is a desirable goal and I hope that some day the sought for amendment will result in passage by some future legislature. There are many things in this life that we desire. Some things we hope to attain and some things we feel are gone forever. I think that in time a measure of this nature can be obtained.

In dealing with matters that affect industry here in the state of Maine many considerations must be given to particular problems which arise in respect to these industries. In some sections of the state, I think in small numbers, we have large industries. This state essentially is a rural, farming state in its larger geographical areas, and measures that affect business generally affect the smaller employer

more than they do the larger employers, or employers of a larger number of employees.

Under the present law, employers engaging the services of eight or more employees must come within the provisions of the act. These larger industries have so regulated their business that they can absorb this additional social security charge of unemployment compensation insurance. The smaller industries are not so situated. They have not brought their affairs in order so that at the present time they can absorb this additional charge of unemployment insurance. The reason is probably due to the present economic chaotic condition of this state and of the country. The time is not ripe for the adoption of this measure.

The position I take, first of all, is that the efforts of employees in organized labor to bring this measure about, while of altruistic motives and very desirable, at the present time if they should press this matter and succeed in the final enactment of this measure it would frustrate their very purpose. The position I take is this, that the smaller employer, that is, one who employs less than eight men or women, realizing he would be unable to carry this additional burden, would be obliged to reduce the number of employees in his employ, thereby instead of bringing about better conditions among the laboring class, I say that the inability of employers to absorb this expense would result in the defeat of their purpose because the employers of less than eight employees would be obliged, by force of circumstances, to discharge some of their employees, unwilling though they might be to bring that about.

I say that the employer who has under eight in his employ now, instead of absorbing the expense and reducing his profit, would reduce the number of employees in his employ, and as a consequence, labor would not benefit at this time with the enactment of this measure. I go further and say that if the bill becomes a law, in some cases it would drive the smaller employer out of business. It would not only adversely affect the employee but it would adversely affect the employer and would drive him out of business. It would also have a tendency to bring about the consolida-

tion of small business concerns and result in the establishment of large business enterprises. That would defeat our American system of life.

This bill would put a very heavy burden upon our summer tourist business, and resort business. The hotel and resort business is practically unanimous in opposition to this measure. One of the peculiar features of the measure as it is worded, is that if a seasonal employer, that is, one who owns a hotel or resort business and employs one of his various employees under eight, over a period beyond 20 weeks, then the others who might not be employed for a period of 20 weeks but might be employed only several months, would come within the purview of the act and the employer must pay unemployment compensation on all the employees. That seems to be undesirable at the present time because of the burden it would place upon seasonal employers, and many say they would be obliged to shut down their summer business.

Another objectionable feature to this bill, as I see it, is that the administrative charges and the cost of enforcing the unemployment compensation insurance law would greatly increase. In dealing with large business concerns who have well organized and well operated clerical forces, the Unemployment Compensation Commission is able to make a check on their records very satisfactorily and very easily. If you set up this particular law, the number of employees in our state unit under the Unemployment Compensation Commission would be greatly increased. Their duties would be almost two-fold, I would venture to say, and they would be obliged to employ additional clerks, supervisors and field workers to go about the state and enforce this law. They would run into difficulties which they would not run into with the employer who has a well established and organized business with an adequate clerical force. Some of the smaller businesses do not keep a set of books. In those cases the field workers would be obliged to set up bookkeeping systems and record systems so that they could see that the law was enforced. That would all entail considerable expense, and you will get diminishing returns finally when you reduce the figure from eight to one.

This is an important bill because it affects a great many people in the state of Maine. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have to do with or that has come before the Senate up to the present time. So, Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate accept the majority report of the committee, "Ought Not to Pass," on this bill.

Miss LAUGHLIN of Cumberland: Mr. President, this new draft has not been printed, I understand, probably the fault of the minority of the committee in not making that recommendation when they made the new draft. That is correct, is it not?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that the Senator is correct. The new draft has not been printed.

Miss LAUGHLIN: Mr. President, I move that 500 copies of the new draft be printed and pending the printing of the new draft that the matter be laid on the table.

Mr. BURNS: Mr. President, may I inquire if the new draft provides only for the change of the number from eight to four, on line four of the bill?

I see from the copy of the bill that has just been handed me, that it does. I therefore have no objection to the bill being tabled.

Thereupon, the bill was laid upon the table pending acceptance of the majority report of the committee, "Ought Not to Pass" in concurrence, and 500 copies of the new draft ordered printed.

Referred to Committee

The following remonstrances were received and on recommendation by the Committee on Reference of Bills were referred to the following committees:

Taxation

Mr. Sanborn of Cumberland presented "Remonstrance of Francis Sullivan and 1630 others of Portland and vicinity against any Tax on Tobacco or Cigarettes." (S. P. 489)

The same Senator presented "Remonstrance of Elmer Verrill and 109 others of Scarborough against any Tax on Tobacco or Cigarettes." (S. P. 490)

The same Senator presented "Remonstrance of Warren L. Thorpe and 81 others of Falmouth

against any Tax on Tobacco or Cigarettes." (S. P. 491)

Mr. Marden of Kennebec presented "Remonstrance of Frank B. Hubbard and 261 others of Waterville against any Tax on Cigarettes or Tobacco." (S. P. 492)

Mr. Friend of Somerset presented "Remonstrance of Lloyd Stitham and 140 others of Pittsfield against any Tax on Cigarettes or Tobacco." (S. P. 493)

Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin presented "Remonstrance of G. R. Jordan and 32 others of Mechanic Falls against any Tax on Tobacco or Cigarettes." (S. P. 494)

Mr. Elliot of Knox presented "Remonstrance of Fred H. Smalley and 28 others of St. George against any Tax on Tobacco or Cigarettes." (S. P. 495)

Sent down for concurrence.

Legal Affairs

Mr. Sewall of Sagadahoc presented "Remonstrance of Mabel H. Paquet and fifteen others of Bath against State Lottery, Legalized Gambling and Beano." (S. P. 496)

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. MARDEN of Kennebec: Mr. President, I would appreciate at this time the unanimous consent of the Senate to introduce a measure. The measure seeks permission from this Body for the construction and maintenance of a bridge in Square Pond in the Town of Shapleigh, County of York. Up to within the last ten days the property involved has been involved in a trust situation and only within the last 10 days has that situation changed whereby this proposal could be considered.

I might say that the Senator from York, Senator Boothby, is aware of this measure and it is being introduced by me solely because persons interested come from my district.

We are suggesting reference to the Committee on Legal Affairs if the measure is allowed introduction solely because we do not wish at this late date to impose the additional work on some other committee which may have its work all planned, although we have no objection to any committee to which the Committee on Reference of Bills may suggest.

The PRESIDENT: Is it the pleasure of the Senate that unanimous consent to receive the bill be granted?

Thereupon, the bill, An Act to Authorize the Construction of a Bridge on Square Pond in Shapleigh (S. P. 498), was received by unanimous consent.

On motion by Mr. Friend of Somerset the bill was then laid upon the table pending reference.

First Reading of Printed Bills

Bill "An Act Defining the Term 'Dealer' and 'Securities.'" (S. P. 486) (L. D. 1023)

"Resolve in Favor of Harry F. Ward of Baldwin." (S. P. 487) (L. D. 1024)

Bill "An Act Relating to Registration of Motor Vehicles." (S. P. 488) (L. D. 1025)

Which bills and resolve were severally read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Senate Committee Reports

Mr. Boothby from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on bill "An Act Relative to Closing Areas Stocked with Rabbits," (S. P. 358) (L. D. 768) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on bill "An Act Classifying Certain Fur-Bearing Animals as Domestic Animals and Protecting Property Rights Therein," (S. P. 361) (L. D. 767) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Chamberlain of Penobscot, tabled pending acceptance of the report.)

Mr. Elliot from the same Committee on bill "An Act Relative to Open Season Fur-Bearing Animals," (S. P. 318) (L. D. 598) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on bill "An Act Relating to Closed Time on Wild Hares and Rabbits," (S. P. 118) (L. D. 80) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on bill "An Act Relating to Trapping Muskrats," (S. P. 252) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on bill "An Act Relative to Trapping," (S. P. 317) (L. D. 594) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

The majority of the committee on Temperance on bill "An Act Relating to Local Option Provisions," (S. P. 146) (L. D. 132) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 497) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(Signed) Senator Boucher of Androscoggin, Representatives Merrifield of Lebanon, Dorrance of Richmond, Mills of Farmington, Meserve of Casco, Dow of Kennebunkport.

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

(Signed) Senators Littlefield of York, Marden of Kennebec, Representatives Good of Monticello, Bubar of Weston.

Mr. OSGOOD of Oxford: Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the majority report of the committee "Ought to Pass in New Draft" and that 500 copies of the new draft be printed.

Thereupon, on motion by Miss Laughlin of Cumberland the bill and reports were laid upon the table pending motion to accept the majority report, and 500 copies were ordered printed.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Regulating the Closed Time on Scallops." (H. P. 1718) (L. D. 673)

Bill "An Act to Conserve the Supply of Herring on the Coast of Maine." (H. P. 1862) (L. D. 1014)

Bill "An Act Providing for the Payment of a Filing Fee for Statements of Foreign Insurance Companies." (H. P. 1864) (L. D. 1011)

Bill "An Act Relating to Insurance Policy Forms and Endorsements." (H. P. 1865) (L. D. 1012)

"Resolve in Favor of Mrs. Alfred Lausier of Frenchville." (H. P. 1866) (L. D. 1013)

"Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Bethel for the Fighting of Fire in Unorganized Township of Albany." (H. P. 1867) (L. D. 1010)

Which bills and resolves were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Unemployment Compensation." (S. P. 141) (L. D. 122)

Bill "An Act Relating to Bonds on Mesne Process and Disclosures after Judgment." (S. P. 368) (L. D. 800)

Bill "An Act Relating to Penalties for Removing Identification Marks from Motor Vehicles." (S. P. 384) (L. D. 787)

Bill "An Act Enlarging the Discretionary Powers of the Liquor Commission." (S. P. 429) (L. D. 974)

Which bills were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Passed to be Enacted

An Act Relating to Bang's Disease. (S. P. 293) (L. D. 513)

An Act Relating to Knox County Game Preserve. (S. P. 296) (L. D. 906)

An Act Establishing a Game Preserve in Piscataquis County. (H. P. 540) (L. D. 214)

An Act Relating to Hunting in the Town of Castine. (H. P. 541) (L. D. 215)

An Act to Amend the Charter of the Camden and Rockland Water Company. (H. P. 710) (L. D. 263)

An Act Amending the Farm Lands Loan Act. (H. P. 713) (L. D. 265)

An Act Relative to Trapping on Game Preserve. (H. P. 1129) (L. D. 407)

An Act Relative to Trapping in the Winthrop and Wayne, Standish and Rangeley Game Preserves. (H. P. 1130) (L. D. 408)

An Act Relating to the Standish Game Preserve. (H. P. 1131) (L. D. 409)

An Act to Extend the Rights, Powers and Privileges of the Sabat-us Water and Sewer District. (H. P. 1171) (L. D. 477)

An Act to Provide for Alternate Jurors. (H. P. 1592) (L. D. 691)

An Act Relating to Judicial Notice of Foreign Law. (H. P. 1618) (L. D. 706)

An Act Relative to Game Preserve in York County. (H. P. 1834) (L. D. 1000)

Finally Passed

Resolve, to Reimburse Certain Exhibitors at the Penobscot and Piscataquis Fair. (H. P. 1833) (L. D. 999)

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Friend of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table, An Act to Authorize the

Construction of a Bridge on Square Pond in Shapleigh (S. P. 498), tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending reference; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. BURNS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I would like to inquire through the Chair whether the Secretary has in his possession the proposed Senate Amendment A to Legislative Document 287, An Act Relative to Court Proceedings in Relation to the Enforcement of the Inland Fish and Game Laws.

The PRESIDENT: The Secretary informs the Chair that the bill is not in the Senate Chamber but that it is in the possession of the Secretary of the Senate and he will send for it.

(Presently the Secretary produced the bill.)

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Burns of Aroostook, under suspension of the rules, the Senate voted to reconsider its action taken on March 10th whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Burns presented Senate Amendment A.

"Senate Amendment A to Legislative Document 287. Amend said bill by striking out the words, 'the nearest trial justice or the nearest municipal court in the county where the offense was committed' appearing in lines 6 and 7 of Section 100 of said bill and inserting in place thereof the following, 'any municipal court having jurisdiction thereof or before the nearest trial justice court in the county where the offense was committed.'"

Mr. BURNS: Mr. President, in explanation of this proposed amendment I will say that this amendment has been passed upon by the Committee on Judiciary and while it did not receive the unanimous approval of the committee at the time it was discussed it did receive the support of eight of the ten members of the committee.

I think the amendment is proper and I move its adoption at this time.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment A was adopted and the bill as amend-

ed by Senate Amendment A was passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table, An Act relating to Insurance Agents and Brokers (S. P. 473) (L. D. 1007), tabled by that Senator on March 10th pending second reading; and on further motion by the same Senator,

the bill was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: Is there further business to come before the Senate?

On motion by Mr. Worthen of Penobscot

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.