

# 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

Seventy-Seventh Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1915

lays before the House Senate Document 160, bill "An Act relating to salaries of Clerk of Courts," tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connellan, pending its second reading.

On motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton, the bill received its second reading, and was assigned for its third reading tomorrow morning at nine o'clock.

Mr. PERKINS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that we take up out of order the report of the Committee on Labor, bill, "An Act relative to the employment of women and minors," House Document 328.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair now lays before the House, House Document 328, report of the Committee on Labor on bill, "An Act relative to the employment of women and minors," and recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill, I would like to say that all three parties in their platforms have agreed to a 54-hour bill. These amendments that have been attached to this bill are for a 56-hour bill. They are intended to defeat the 54-hour bill. They have come in here in the same way that they came in two years ago to defeat the 54-hour law. The telegraph and telephone companies have agreed to this bill. The mercantile establishments have agreed to satisfy in regard to keeping open Saturday nights and during the Christmas holidays. The only objection that we find anywhere is from the manufacturers. You will all admit that nine hours a day for minors, boys under sixteen years of age, and women, is long enough to work in the factories of this State where there is the rapidly revolving machinery, and where the sanitary conditions and other conditions are not too good at the best. If there is anything that we should do, it is to look after the health of our growing boys and the working women of this State. They have all agreed that this bill shall be passed, and now is the

time to pass it. I do hope that these amendments will be defeated and that the bill will receive a passage. Other states have adopted this bill like Colorado, nine hours for boys and eight hours for women; Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Rhode Island, Utah, New York and Texas. Let Maine pass this bill in its original form.

Mr. McCARTY of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire just what the question is before the House at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question is on the adoption or rejection of Amendment A to House Document 328.

Mr. McCARTY: Has there been any discussion of Amendments B and C?

The SPEAKER pro tem: None whatever.

Mr. FAY of Dexter; Mr. Speaker, I understand the question is now on the adoption of Amendment A?

The SPEAKER pro tem: Yes, to House Document 328.

Mr. FAY: I request unanimous consent to withdraw House Amendment A to House Document 328.

Unanimous consent was given.

Mr. FAY: Mr. Speaker, I have another amendment which I wish to offer and move the adoption of. I will say in explanation that there is certainly a difference of opinion on these bills. I realize the fact that all parties are pledged to the adoption of a 54-hour law. There have been differences, and I am going to offer this amendment to reconcile those differences, and I sincerely hope that it will meet with the approval of the members of the House, and that all can consistently vote for it. I now move that it be tabled for printing, and specially assigned for next Wednesday.

Mr. DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is fair to table that until next Wednesday. The time is getting short and we want to get out of here this month. Now this bill was put in and referred

to the committee early in the session, I believe the 15th of January. The committee advertised it thoroughly, and the hearing was put ahead a week so as to give all parties a hearing. We then went into executive session and went over the bill deliberately section by section and we reported a bill in new draft. We waited another week before putting in the report in the event something should turn up. Now an amendment is put in; and, if we keep on in this way, the session will be over and the bill will not reach the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Will the gentleman from Biddeford (Mr. Descoteaux) allow me to interrupt him? The Chair is in error. The question before the House should be, and is, on the acceptance of the report. The House Report is as follows: The committee on labor, to which was referred bill, "An Act relative to the hours of employment of women and minors," have had the same under consideration, and ask leave to report the same in a new draft under same title, and that it "ought to pass." The question, therefore, at this time is upon the acceptance of the report. The amendment may be considered after that.

On motion by Mr. McCarty of Lewiston, the report was accepted.

Mr. Thombs of Lincoln moved that the bill be given its first reading.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will say to the gentleman from Lincoln that the bill should lie on the table under the joint rules for printing.

Mr. THOMBS: I accept the suggestion.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the report that has just been accepted by the House is on House Document 323, which I judge is a new draft of the original bill, and which seems to me to be the bill now before the House. Should it not be given its first and second reading now? Possibly I am in error.

The Speaker pro tem: I will state to the gentleman from Lisbon that the bill has been printed. The motion now before the House is that the

bill be given its first and second reading.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill received its first and second reading, and was assigned for its third reading tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: I rise to a point of inquiry. As I understand it, the amendment could not properly be offered until the report had been accepted. Are these amendments properly offered, that is, the one offered by the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Fay? Was it not offered prematurely?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair would rule that all three amendments are offered out of order, and the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, is correct in his point of procedure. The Chair rules that there is nothing before the House in the shape of amendments at the present time.

Mr. FAY of Dexter: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that that applies to the amendments all together, and that it is not necessary to withdraw them?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The ruling of the Chair is that the amendments having been offered before the bill was in the House, and before the report was accepted, there are now no amendments to the bill. If amendments are to be offered, they must be offered now or after the acceptance of the report.

Mr. FAY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take much time; but I do ask in fairness that that amendment be allowed; that the bill be allowed to be tabled and printed so that everybody can see what it is. There is no desire to conceal anything about it. This amendment is offered after consultation with parties on both sides, and I think many of the gentlemen of the House will agree with me that they have seen it. It has been discussed and changes have been made in order to get a bill that will meet the views of parties on both sides.

Mr. WESCOTT of Bluehill: Mr. Speaker, I want to be perfectly fair about this matter; but I must object to having that bill tabled for another

week. We are at the end of the session, and I can see no good that can possibly come from this delay either to the gentleman from Dexter (Mr. Fay) or anybody else. I ask that the matter be considered in a shorter and more reasonable length of time. Of course we are glad to consider any amendment that may be necessary. I ask that the matter be tabled for a reasonable period of time and not be put over until next week.

Mr. ST. CLAIR of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that section eight of this bill as printed is meaningless; it is a mere jumble of words that do not mean anything. You will find this by turning to your copies in your record. I move that before we proceed the matter be properly put before the House, so that we may know what that section is.

Mr. SANBORN of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I will say that the attention of the House was called to that by me two or three days ago, and the bill has been reprinted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: I will say to the gentleman from Calais, Mr. St. Clair, that the bill has been reprinted under the number of 495.

Mr. FAY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Bluehill, (Mr. Wescott), I will say that I have no desire, and I have so stated plainly, to postpone. I simply want everybody to have a chance to look over, talk over, and think over the amendment. If that amendment can be printed and brought in tomorrow morning, I have absolutely no objection to it. I thought that very likely there would be difficulty in getting it printed so early as that. If the gentleman wants to change the time to Tuesday next, I have no objection. I only ask for an assignment next Wednesday that there might be ample time to get it printed in a proper manner.

Mr. HOLT of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be put in the position of attempting to interfere in this matter; but yesterday morning the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Ferham, requested us to lay a bill on

the table until this morning, and the House did not see fit to extend him that courtesy. It seems to me that at that time we adopted that rule, and I can see no reason why the same rule should not apply in this case.

Mr. DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, is it not customary where an amendment is offered to have that amendment read?

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair will inform the gentleman from Biddeford that the motion of the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Fay, as the Chair understood it, was that the amendment lie on the table for printing. If action is to be had on the amendment this morning, the Chair will read it; but if it is to lie on the table for printing, it will be on the desks of the members in amended form, and then there would be no necessity for reading it. The Chair will, however, read it if the House desires.

Mr. McCARTY of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the custom of the House in its prior procedure on matters of this kind in relation to amendments, and I think in many cases it has been a wise procedure to adopt, inasmuch as the amendments offered to the various bills were more or less complex. Now I do not know the tenor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Fay. It may be so simple in its provisions that it would not require any delay at all in order to consider whether the amendment was a good one or otherwise; and I would suggest to the Speaker that the amendment be read. Then, if it appears to the House that it requires a four or five days' stay, of course the reasonable members of this House will readily consent to the request of the gentleman from Dexter that it be deferred until next Wednesday. On the other hand, if it is simple in its provisions, such delay will not be necessary. It seems to me that the action of the House on the question of delay should be entirely governed by the provisions of the amendment; and in order that the House may intelligently vote upon the matter, I would ask that the Speaker read the proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tem. The Chair will accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. McCarty, and read the amendment.

"Amendment A to House Document 328.

Strike out all of said bill after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

Section 2. Nothing herein provided of age, and no female, shall be employed in any factory, manufacturing or mechanical establishment more than nine hours in any one day, except when by reason of repairs necessary to prevent interruption of the ordinary running of the machinery, longer hours may be necessary to complete any work, material or product to be completed or delivered at a certain time under contract, or when a different apportionment of the hours of labor is made for the purpose of making a shorter day's work or a full holiday for one day in the week; and in no case shall the hours of labor of any minor or female exceed fifty-four hours in a week, except any female eighteen years of age or over may lawfully contract for such labor for any number of hours in excess of nine hours per day, but not in excess of four hours in any one day or forty-eight hours in any one year, and not otherwise, except the same shall be approved by the Labor Commissioner of the State of Maine.

"Section 2. Nothing herein provided shall apply to any factory or manufacturing or mechanical establishment or business, the materials or products of which are perishable or require immediate or continuous labor thereon to prevent decay thereof or damage thereto.

Section 3. Section 48 of Chapter 40 of them Revised Statutes is hereby repealed.

Section 4. This act shall take effect January first, 1916."

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is upon the motion of the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Fay, that amendment A to House Document 328 lie upon the table for printing.

Mr. PERKINS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I would amend that motion by stating that it lie on the table until tomorrow morning.

Mr. FAY: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if we can get it printed by that

time? I want to get it before the members in printed form, so that they may intelligently consider it and understand what they are acting upon. We are not very far apart at the present time; but if the gentlemen desire to vote on it now without allowing us the privilege of having that amendment in print and studying it over—it is for them to say.

Mr. McCARTY of Lewiston, Mr. Speaker, I did not quite catch the remark of the gentleman from Dexter, (Mr. Fay) and I would ask the Chair the tenor of his proposition.

Mr. FAY: Mr. Speaker, The idea I intended to convey was that I believe in fairness we should be allowed to see this amendment in printed form. The amendment was drawn up this morning. I have read it but two or three times, and do not feel that I have had sufficient time to digest it. We are not very far apart on these matters now; I did say that, if it is the desire of this House to vote on it without giving us this privilege, well and good. I think it only courteous and fair that the members should have the privilege of knowing what they are acting on. I cannot believe the House is not willing to give time to have this amendment printed so that we can all have a copy of it and see what it is.

Mr. McCARTY: I would like to inquire of the Chair if it would be satisfactory to the gentleman from Dexter that the amendment lie on the table until tomorrow morning pending printing?

Mr. FAY: Mr. Speaker, I would be entirely willing provided we can have the printed bill at that time. I have assumed that it would be next to impossible to get it so early as that. It has been suggested to me, and I would be perfectly willing, to make it Tuesday next.

Mr. McCARTY: I would move to amend the motion by substituting the words "Friday next" for the word "Wednesday."

Mr. THOMBS: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: It seems to me—this is the first time I have heard the amendment read—that this is a very important matter, and I do not

see how the members can become fairly conversant with it in that limited time. It seems to me that Tuesday, perhaps, might give us ample time to familiarize ourselves with it, and I would offer the further amendment, and substitute the word "Tuesday" for the word "Friday."

Mr. PERKINS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, as I understand that amendment, women over eighteen years of age have a right to work over time. That is the only difference. This matter has been before the House a long time, and I think we are as conversant with it as we are with any bills that come before us. If it is possible to have this amendment printed, and have the matter come before the House tomorrow morning, I do not see why it should not be done. We can then either pass this or not as we see fit, and thus get through with the 54-hour bill. I will second the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. McCarty.

Mr. McCARTY: Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent from the oral reading of the amendment that some of us do not even understand it now. I listened to the Speaker read this amendment, and I understood that there were other changes than that providing for the labor of females over the age of eighteen years. One change that is very important is the reduction of the hours from 56 to 54. I want to be absolutely fair in this matter. I do not want to crowd the House nor the gentleman who is proposing this amendment (Mr. Fay) in any way, shape or manner; and, if there is any question about the printing of this bill and its being before the House tomorrow morning, then in my spirit of fairness I am willing to adopt the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Lincoln, and agree with him that we take this matter up for discussion and action next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The motion of the gentleman from Lewiston is that the bill lie on the table for printing, and be assigned for consideration for Tuesday of next week.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the gentleman from Lewiston (Mr. McCarty) withdraws this amendment applying to tomorrow

morning? If so, I will offer that amendment. And it seems to me, as stated by the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Descoteaux, that this matter has been before us a reasonable length of time, and that those who desire to make changes in the bill have had a reasonable length of time to prepare those amendments.

I submit further, Mr. Speaker, that even in the absence of a printed copy of the amendment that if the amendment is any way simple that it could be explained to the members of this House by some proponent so that we can understand it and vote upon it intelligently; but the session is nearing its close, and it is even hoped by some of us, even if not expected, that perhaps two weeks from this week will wind up the business of this session, and this bill still has to go to the Senate, and it may be that these amendments will be offered to it, and that when these amendments have been printed and the matter has come up again that still other amendments will be offered. It may be that after that a conference committee on the part of each branch of the legislature will be necessary to be appointed in order that they may meet and talk the matter over. In the closing hours of the session we are apt to be tolerably busy, and for these reasons I trust that the bill will be kept upon its third reading tomorrow morning; and it seems to me that the clerk of the House possibly by taking extraordinary diligence in the matter might be able to get this amendment here in season so that it may be discussed. It is more important to save time upon this one matter than perhaps on any of the ordinary bills that go through here and to which no objection will be raised. I trust that the amendment making the date Friday of this week instead of Tuesday of next week will be adopted.

Mr. CLIFFORD of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I will say that as I have listened to the reading of that amendment it seems to me that it has embodied in its contents about everything that another bill contained that was brought before the committee on labor. The contents of that bill have been discussed about the State House and among the members of this legislature, and it seems to me that putting this amend-

ment over until next Tuesday for discussion is simply doing something that will cause an endless amount of delay; and I would urge the members of this House to support the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, because as he stated, when it comes up to the Senate undoubtedly there will be amendments offered there, and then it may go to a conference committee and back here with more amendments; and I believe that we can discuss the contents of this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Fay; and for that reason I second the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer.

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham: Mr. Speaker, I believe that no question of so vast importance has come before this legislature, and it is not a question of whether we are to pass or to kill a 54-hour law; it is the duty, as I understand it of every member of this legislature regardless of party affiliations to pass a 54-hour bill, and the only thing that is of importance and the only question that there is for us to discuss or to consider, is what is the best 54-hour law for all parties concerned to be passed here today; and as this amendment which has been offered is a new proposition and something which should be taken into consideration, I believe that it should be printed and that every member of this House should have ample time in which to familiarize himself with this new amendment. It perhaps may be virtually a new bill, and in order that the members may have an opportunity to compare the new bill and to decide honestly, fairly and justly which is the best bill for them to support, I think it should be printed as has been suggested.

Mr. PERKINS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the amendment which has been offered here is a bill in itself and not an amendment. Now, we have agreed to support a 54-hour bill, and this is the same sort of a bill as Massachusetts has adopted, the same as Rhode Island has adopted and a great many other states of the union have adopted. This bill has been talked about here in the State House for the last month, and there is no reason why this matter can not be acted upon to-

tomorrow. It is not a long bill, and it has been talked over and over; everybody understands the bill; and now we will keep on adding amendments, and it is time we got down to solid work, either to pass a 54-hour bill or to defeat it. I would like to ask for a ruling of the Chair as to whether the amendment is an amendment, or whether it is an original bill. It occurs to me from the fact that it strikes out everything after the enacting clause, that it is a new clause.

Mr. DUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Perkins, misunderstands the situation. It is not the desire of anybody to kill the 54-hour law, but it is the desire to get at the best law that is for the interests of both laborers and employers; and we wish simply to have this printed in order that it may be intelligently considered. There is no member of this House who wants to see the 54-hour law killed. Any man who would stand up here and vote against the 54-hour law has got to be a traitor to himself and to his party and to his constituents, and it is a matter of great importance that we should decide what is the best law; and if we are going to take it into the very last days of this legislature to consider this matter I consider that out time will be well spent; and if we can not do our duty to ourselves and to our constituents any better than to spend it in considering what is the best 54-hour law to be passed,—and it is not asking for anything unreasonable that this amendment lay upon the table for printing and have its further consideration on Tuesday next, it is not a matter of any unreasonable delay—I do not believe in passing a 54-hour law in the House and sending it to the Senate to have it tinkered over there; it is just as well for us to consider here in this body what is the best bill, and then pass it honestly and fairly and consistently.

The SPEAKER pro tem: In reply to the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Perkins, the Chair will rule that the proposed amendment is an amendment.

Mr. CLIFFORD: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Perkins, has well stated that this bill offered by the gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Fay, is practically the same bill that was presented before the labor committee at



the time we had the hearing in the Senate Chamber. What is the object of putting in this amendment? It is simply to kill the measure. It is putting before this House that bill which the committee heard, and they are putting it in here in the form of an amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the only and the sole object of that amendment is to kill this 54-hour bill and to put in if it is possible, a 56-hour bill or to put in such a bill that they can kill the 54-hour bill. I object to it and I believe the members of this House have listened and have talked over the contents of that amendment. I believe that we should take it up tomorrow. I do not dispute the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton, when he says that no man will stand up here and oppose a 54-hour bill, because, as we all know, that was in the platform of each party. But there are different ways of killing and opposing it. You can apparently be with it and at the same time by putting in such a bill, that in effect the 54-hour law would not be passed. I am against it, gentlemen. I was on that committee and we heard the able attorneys on both sides present their case, and after hearing all the evidence this committee brings in an unanimous report, and with the amendments that have been offered by the different mechanical establishments. Now they come in here with practically the same bill that was presented there before us at that time, and I hope the members of this House will not allow this thing to be done, and will not allow them to talk about putting it over until next Tuesday.

Mr. DUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Clifford, implying that I am in favor of a movement to kill the 54-hour law and substitute in its place a 56-hour law. I do not believe there are in both branches of this legislature over a dozen men but what will vote for a 54-hour law. I, myself, will positively object, and I will positively not vote for anything but a 54-hour law; I am pledged to vote for the best 54-hour law that can be devised or placed before this body. I do not want to see a 56-hour law; I do want to see the best 54-hour law, and I am in favor of it, and I shall work in every way for its passage, and it is not my

intention and it is not the intention of the proponents of this amendment that anything but a 54-hour law shall be passed at this session of the legislature; and I object most strenuously, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Clifford, implying that this is a movement upon my part or upon the part of any member of this House to kill the 54-hour law.

Mr. WESCOTT of Bluehill: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I heartily acquiesce in the position taken by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Clifford, because I believe he is right. I believe this matter has been talked over thoroughly and that everybody knows about the proposed 54-hour law. Amendments have been offered from time to time and have been thoroughly considered, and I hope that the matter will not be put over until it is finally postponed and killed.

Mr. WARD of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. McCarty, I move that it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. McCarty, that this bill lay upon the table for printing and be specially assigned for consideration next Tuesday. An amendment has been made to that motion by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, that the word "Friday" be substituted for "Tuesday." The question then is first upon the amendment, shall this bill lay upon the table and be specially assigned for next Friday? Upon this motion the yeas and nays have been called.

A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tem: If the members of the House wish to assign this bill for debate tomorrow you will vote yes; if you do not, you will vote no. The clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Ames, Averill, Ballard, Benn, Bernier, Blake of New Gloucester, Bourque, Brown, Brown of Auburn, Brown of New Sharon, Campbell, Chadbourne, Clifford, Colcord, Connellan, Colliss, Currier, Davis, Descoteaux, Dilling, Douglass, Drapeau, Durgain, Edwards, Evans, Fossett, Gallagher, Gerrish, Goldthwait, Gooding, Goodwin, Gould, Greeley, Greenlaw, Greenleaf, Haskell,

Hill, Hodgkins, Holt of Skowhegan, Jordan, Lawrence, Leader, Lewis, Libby, Lord, Mansir, McCarty, McCarrison, McCurdy, McIntire, Michaud, Millett, Morse, Mulligan, Mullin, Neilon, Newell, Noyes, O'Connell, Peabbles, Perham, Perkins, Picher, Pierce of Farmington, Pierce of Houlton, Plummer, Pollard, Robinson, Russell of Lewiston, Ryder, St. Clair of Calais, St. Clair of Rockland, Sanborn, Small, Smith, Tabbutt, Tate, Thibodeau of Fort Kent, Traffon, Turner, Ward, Waggatt, Watts, Webb, Welch, Wescott, Wilkins, Wilson, Woodman, Wyman—90.

NAY—Albert, Beal, Bessé, Blake of Oakland, Bonney, Bradbury, Bragdon, Brann, Bussey, Carson, Chamberlin, Clement, Cobb, Coffin, Daigle, Danforth, Drummond, Dutton, Ellis, Erskine, Fay, Ford, Gilmour, Grant, Greaton, Hanson of Saco, Hanson of Sanford, Harper, Hart, Higgins, Hobbs, Holt of Gouldsboro, Jameson, Lombard, McKinley, Meader, Mitchell, Morrison, Nicholas, Peterson, Ranney, Ricker, Roberts, Russell of Alfred, Snow, Thombs, Tobey, Towle, Tuttle, Washburn, Wise—51.

ABSENT—Allen, Chaplin, Connors, Haraden, Littlefield, Maxwell, McNally, Varney, Waterhouse, Wheeler—10.

The SPEAKER pro tem: Ninety having voted in the affirmative and 51 in the negative, the amendment has been carried. The question before the House now is upon the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, that House Doc. No. 328, be laid upon the table tomorrow morning.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, if it be in order, I move that the clerk be instructed to send a copy of this amendment directly to the printer as soon as this session is closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair now lays before the House Senate Doc. No. 148, bill, An Act relating to the salaries of sheriffs, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connellan, and assigned for consideration today.

The pending question being on the adoption of Senate Amendment B in concurrence.

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Sanborn, just how this amendment stands with relation to the recommendation of the committee on salaries and fees?

Mr. SANBORN of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I will say for the information

of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, that the original figures in the bill corresponded with the figures recommended by the committee. I haven't it in mind at the present time, but I recall the amendment as read with reference to Kennebec county changed the twenty-five hundred to twenty-eight hundred, but twenty-five hundred was the figure recommended by the committee. I haven't the figures in mind, but as I recollect that corresponded with the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. PIERCE: The amendments are increased above the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. SANBORN: In each instance, as I understand it.

Mr. PIERCE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House non-concur with the Senate in the adoption of the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Brown of Auburn moved that the House now take a recess until 4.30 o'clock this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to.

#### Afternoon Session

(Mr. Connellan of Portland in the Chair.)

The SPEAKER pro tem: Through an inadvertence this morning Senate Doc. No. 149, bill, An Act to equalize the salaries of registers of deeds received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed without the acceptance or rejection of Senate Amendments A and B.

On motion by Mr. Ricker of Castine, the vote was reconsidered whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, and on further motion by the same gentleman the vote was reconsidered whereby this bill received its third reading.

The question being on the acceptance of Senate Amendment A, to amend by striking out the words "twelve hundred dollars" in the 10th line of Section 1 and inserting in place thereof the words "thirteen hundred dollars."

Mr. Ricker moved that the amendment be adopted in concurrence.

The motion was agreed to.