

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

SENATE.

Tuesday, March 30, 1915.

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by Rev. Henry E. Dunnack of Augusta.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the House disposed of in concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair wishes to state to the Senate before business commences that this being the last week of Legislature, and that we hope to adjourn on Friday at the farthest, there are a great many matters going through both Houses, and we intend to be in session today both morning and afternoon, at least, so that matters coming to either one of the Houses can be sent back and forth. The delay in the Legislature at this time will be in regard to the engrossing, and the quicker we can get matters into the hands of the engrossing clerk the earlier we can finish our business.

There should be no difficulty about second reading. Second reading should go through under suspension of the rules. To assist in reading proof, so as to dispose of the second and third readings and hasten matters, the clerks of the committees on second and third readings will be in attendance in the office of the Secretary of the Senate and the office of the Clerk of the House.

If you will bear in mind not to table matters or allow them to be tabled, but to dispose of them at once, and what is to go on let it go on at once. I hope you will all be at your posts so that nothing will go by that ought not to go by.

From the House: An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to fishing in Violett Brook, in Van Buren, in the county of Aroostook, above Hammond's Mill.

In the House this bill was amended by House Amendment A and passed to be engrossed as amended.

The Senate adopted House Amendment A in concurrence and passed the bill to be engrossed as amended in concurrence.

House Bills in First Reading.

(Under suspension of the rules these bills were given their two readings and were passed to be engrossed.)

House 926. An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to fishing in Great Brook and in Dixon Brook, in York county.

House 922. An Act to authorize the Norway and Paris Street Railway to purchase or lease the property and franchises of the Mechanic Falls Electric Light Company.

House 927. An Act to amend Section 29 of Chapter 93 of the Revised Statutes relating to mechanics' liens on buildings.

House 928. An Act to authorize the Maine Water Company to take water from certain lakes in Washington county.

House 929. An Act to authorize the town of Eden to own, maintain and operate an electric lighting plant.

Bills in First Reading.

(Under suspension of the rules these bills and resolves were given their second reading and were passed to be engrossed.)

Senate 440. An Act for the better protection of children and to amend Chapter 61 of the Revised Statutes of 1903 and Chapter 123 of the Public Laws of 1905, as amended by Chapter 43 of the Public Laws of 1907, and Chapter 109 of the Public Laws of 1909.

Senate 441. An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 93 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 169, Public Laws of 1913, relating to the registration of chattel mortgages.

Senate 442. An Act to incorporate the Hartland Water District.

Senate 444. Resolve to provide for the payment of telephone service for members during the present session of the Legislature.

Senate 445. Resolve appropriating

money for the purchase of filing cases for the offices of the Secretary and President of the Senate.

Senate 446. Resolve in favor of the official reporter of the Senate.

Mr. SWIFT of Kennebec: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present out of order report of the committee on railroads and expresses, on An Act to provide for the reorganization or consolidation of the railroad companies constituting the Boston and Maine Railroad system.

The report was received and on further motion by the same Senator the rules were suspended, and the bill was given its two readings and was passed to be engrossed, without reference to a committee, and sent down for concurrence.

Mr. SWIFT of Kennebec: Mr. President, I again ask the indulgence of the Senate to introduce a resolve out of order, and in explanation I wish to say that yesterday afternoon Mr. James Smith, an old time resident of Augusta, came to me asking if there was not some way in which State aid—he only receives \$2 per month, might be increased. I accordingly went with him to the pension department, and the pension agent after noting his condition and his circumstances expressed the opinion that possibly an act should have been passed granting him a State pension at this session. Acting upon this suggestion I had drawn this resolve and ask unanimous consent to introduce it, granting to him a State pension of \$10 per month. He is now 72 years of age with a wife dependent upon him for support. He lives in a rented house, paying \$10 a month, and his only income is a United States pension of \$24 per quarter and State aid of \$2 per month.

For years he has suffered from shaking palsy and for five years he has been unable to feed himself. He was present in the State House yesterday afternoon and I know that many members met him. If there is any disposition on the part of any members to oppose this resolve I wish

they might meet Mr. Smith and note his condition. I have no desire to take up the time of the Senate but I wish to say further that if there is anywhere a man or group of men who command my respect, and whom I believe should receive favorable consideration at our hands, it is those who are left of the noble band of men that comprise the Grand Army of the Republic. I move that the resolve be received.

The motion was agreed to, and on further motion by the same Senator the resolve was given its two readings and passed to be engrossed and sent down for concurrence.

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Boynton from the committee on appropriations and financial affairs, on Resolve in favor of C. R. Tupper for services in formulating bills for the committee on salaries and fees, reported same ought to pass.

(The report was accepted, and under suspension of the rules the resolve was given its two readings and was passed to be engrossed.)

Mr. Peacock from the same committee, on Resolve in favor of the Commissioner of Pharmacy, reported same ought to pass.

(The report was accepted, and under suspension of the rules the resolve was given its two readings and was passed to be engrossed.)

Mr. Cole from the committee on judiciary, on An Act amendatory of and additional to Chapter 129 of the Public Laws of 1913, entitled "An Act to create a Public Utilities Commission, and prescribing the duties and powers thereof, and to amend certain provisions of the Revised Statutes and of the Public Laws of the State of Maine relating to public utilities, reported same in a new draft under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(The report was accepted, and under suspension of the rules the resolve was given its two readings and was passed to be engrossed.)

Mr. Swift from the committee on railroads and expresses on An Act to amend Section 32 of Chapter 129 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to

leased lines of railroad companies, reported same ought not to pass.

Mr. Cole from the committee on revisions of the statutes, on Resolve to provide for a revision of the laws relating to banks and banking, reported that legislation thereon is inexpedient.

The reports were accepted and sent down for concurrence.

From the House: Resolve in favor of Arthur C. Smith, Secretary of the committee on State school for boys and industrial school for girls.

In the House this resolve was given its several readings and passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules.

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

From the House: An Act to amend Chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes authorizing the land agent to lease camp sites on lands belonging to the State, and repealing certain obsolete portions of said statute.

In the House this bill was given its several readings and passed to be engrossed under the suspension of the rules.

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

Passed to Be Engrossed

House 672. Resolve appropriating money to improve a certain road through the property of the school for feeble minded. (House Amendment A adopted in concurrence.)

House 837. An Act relating to the scaling of round timber and marking the contents of same.

House 843. Resolve providing a State pension for Mary J. D. Arkett.

House 849. An Act to provide for publicity respecting membership of mercantile partnerships and for the identification of individual merchants in certain cases.

House 851. Resolve appropriating money for the restacking and arranging of the Maine State Library.

House 866. An Act to create a commission to act in conjunction with the State Armory Commission.

House 867: An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 48 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 12 of the Laws of 1909, relative to the employment of clerks by the bank commissioner.

House 886: Act relating to abolishment of grade crossings of railroads.

House 897: An Act to amend Section 13 of Chapter 67 of the Revised Statutes relating to the return of commissioners of partition appointed by probate courts.

House 899: An Act to amend Chapter 39 of the Public Laws of 1911, as amended by Chapter 26 of the Public Laws of 1915, relating to the weekly payment of wages.

House 902: An Act authorizing Mousam Water Company to increase its capital stock and to contract with the city of Biddeford for hydrant service.

House 903: An Act to amend Section 4 of Chapter 73 of the Revised Statutes relating to notices upon petitions for sale of real estate.

House 904: An Act to amend Section 25 of Chapter 101 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the authority of bail commissioners.

House 905: An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 133 of the Revised Statutes authorizing clerks of courts to administer the oaths required by law.

House 906: An Act to amend Section 7 of Chapter 66 of the Revised Statutes, relating to Proofs of Wills.

House 907: An Act to Confer Jurisdiction in Equity upon the Probate Courts.

House 908: An Act to amend Section 32 of Chapter 69 of the Revised Statutes, relating to Petitions for Adoption of Children by Non-residents.

House 909: An Act to Provide for the Binding of Original Papers Filed in Probate Courts.

House 910: An Act to amend Section 9 of Chapter 65 of the Revised Statutes, relating to Transcripts of Examinations or Testimony Taken in the Probate Courts.

House 911: An Act to amend Chapter 1 of the Public Laws of 1907, providing for notice to Registers of Probate of the

names of Corporate Surety Companies qualified to do business in the State.

House 912: An Act to Provide for the Record in the Registry of Deeds of Notices Waiving Testamentary Provisions for Husband or Wife.

House 913: An Act relative to the Employment of Minors.

House 919: An Act to Divide the Town of Kennebunkport and Incorporate the Town of North Kennebunkport.

Senate 312: An Act to amend Section 9 of Chapter 284 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Hiram Water, Light and Power Company", and extending and enlarging the rights and powers of said company.

Senate 437: Resolve reimbursing C. W. Dutton for certain expenses incurred in his capacity as clerk to the committee on mercantile affairs and insurance.

Senate 438: Resolve in favor of the commission on the revision of forms and procedure in probate courts.

Senate 439: An Act to define county lines in the waters of the State.

Passed to Be Enacted.

An Act to amend Section 51 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to Non-resident Hunting Licenses.

An Act Establishing a Close Time on Lobsters in the Towns of Cutler, Prescott and Lubec, in Washington County.

An Act to Repeal Chapter 87 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, Relating to the Taking of Lobsters within Three Miles of the Islands of Matinicus and Criehaven.

An Act to amend Section 56 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, Relating to the Registration of Guides.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, Prohibiting Fishing in Belgrade Stream, in the County of Kennebec.

An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to Fishing in Shagg, Abbot and Little Concord Ponds and Their Tributaries, in Oxford County.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to Fishing in Carrabassett River and its tributaries, above the Bridge at Bigelow.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 125 of the Private and Special Laws of 1907, entitled, "An Act to Incorporate the Carrabassett Dam Company.

An Act additional to Chapter Thirty-two of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter Two Hundred Six of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Thirteen, prohibiting fishing in Mud Pond, Mirror Lake, sometimes called Parkis Pond, and their Tributaries, and Bog Stream and its Tributaries down as far as North Pond Stream, in Franklin and Kennebec Counties.

An Act to amend Section One of Chapter Forty-four of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Seven, relating to the ages between which persons may be admitted to the Maine School for Feeble Minded.

An Act to provide for safety appliances upon cars running upon street railways.

An Act to amend Section Five of Chapter Two Hundred and Nine of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Thirteen, relating to the time within which dealers in securities must renew their registrations.

An Act to amend Section Four of Chapter Four Hundred Eighty-one of the Private and Special Laws of Nineteen Hundred One, entitled, "An Act to incorporate the York Harbor Village Corporation."

An Act additional to Chapter Thirty-two of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter Two Hundred Six of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Thirteen, prohibiting fishing in Booker Brook, in Levant, in the County of Penobscot.

An Act to incorporate the South Berwick Sewer Company. (Tabled temporarily on motion by Mr. Cole of York. Subsequently, on motion by the same Senator the bill was passed to be enacted.)

An Act to amend Section Sixty-three of Chapter Fifteen of the Re-

vised Statutes, as amended by Chapter Seventy three of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Seven, as further amended by Chapters Sixty-two and One Hundred Sixteen of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Nine, and as further amended by Chapter Fifty-seven of the Public Laws of Nineteen Hundred Thirteen, relating to the tuition of pupils in Second schools.

An Act permitting the use of automobiles in the Town of Mount Desert.

An Act to restore the jurisdiction in Criminal Offenses to Trial Justices in the Towns of Kittery and York.

An Act to amend Section Eight of Chapter Three Hundred Twenty-five of the Private and Special Laws of Eighteen Hundred Ninety-seven, fixing the salary of the Recorder of the Municipal Court of Waterville.

Finally Passed

Resolve reimbursing Joseph J. Roberts, an agent for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, for money expended and services rendered in the discharge of his duty.

Resolve in favor of relief of the heirs of Revolutionary Soldiers.

Resolve for laying the County taxes for the Year Nineteen Hundred and Sixteen.

On motion by Mr. Emery of York, it was

Ordered, The House concurring, that the committee on appropriations and financial affairs be directed to make up the pay roll of the officers, employes and chaplains of the Senate and House in accordance with the Laws of 1915, relating thereto and that the said committee be directed to make up the pay roll of the members of the Senate and House in accordance with the law relating thereto.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Walker of Somerset, it was

Ordered, That the secretary of the Senate prepare and cause to be printed under his supervision and direction three hundred copies of the Jour-

nal of the proceedings of the present session.

From the House: An Act providing for the destruction of dogfish and other members of the shark family.

In the House this bill was given its several readings and passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules

In the Senate the rules were suspended on motion by Mr. Allen of Kennebec, and the bill was given its several readings and passed to be engrossed. (House Amendment A adopted in concurrence.)

From the House: An Act to enlarge the duties of the medical examiners.

In the House this act was given its several readings and passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules.

In the Senate the rules were suspended and the bill was given its several readings and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the House: Senate 956: An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 71 of the Private and Special Laws of 1891, incorporating the city of Old Town.

In the Senate under suspension of the rules, read and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the House: House 943: An Act to amend Chapter 7 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, relating to the Bar Harbor municipal court.

In the Senate read and passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules, in concurrence.

From the House: House 955: An Act to amend Chapter 42 of the Public Laws of 1911, relating to the appointment of guardians by consent.

In the Senate read and passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules, in concurrence.

The conference committee on the disagreeing action of the two branches on An Act to fix the salary of the Governor, reported that the bill ought to pass in a new draft.

The report was accepted, and under suspension of the rules the bill was

given its several readings and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Specially Assigned

The President laid before the Senate House 735, An Act relative to the granting of licenses by Municipal Officers of the City of Portland.

The question being on the adoption of House Amendment "A" in concurrence, on motion by Mr. Murphy of Cumberland, the amendment was rejected in non-concurrence, and the bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence, and sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate House 895, An Act to amend Sections 17 and 20 of Chap. 41 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the measurement of lobsters.

The question being on concurrence with the House in the adoption of House amendment "A" (Senate 436), Mr. Price of Sagadahoc moved that the Senate non-concur with the House.

Mr. PEACOCK of Washington: Mr. President, as Chairman of the Sea and Shore Fisheries Committee, I signed a majority report that this act ought not to pass, but am ready to endorse report B if amendment "A" is accepted, and I think this needs some explanation.

The present law makes it legal to take or catch all lobsters above ten and a half inches long. The bill before you, as amended, makes it legal to catch or take lobsters from ten to thirteen inches.

A hearing on this lobster question was held February 18th on a bill introduced by Mr. Goldthwait, making it legal to catch lobsters down to nine inches; and that a ring be put in the head of each trap of three and one-half inches in diameter, on the assumption that the lobsters above thirteen inches could not get into the trap, and therefore would not be caught. This ring idea was abandoned, and shown it was not practical.

At this hearing, Prof. Herrick first addressed the committee for about an hour and a half on the scientific method of conserving the lobster

business. He recommended a double-gauge law from nine to twelve inches, advocating that the fishermen should release all lobsters above twelve inches. At the same hearing a very large number of lobster fishermen appeared protesting against any change in the law at all, but at the same time admitting the fact that as the Massachusetts law made it legal to handle lobsters as small as nine inches, that practically 75 per cent. of the lobsters from nine to ten and one-half inches that were caught were saved and sold to Boston dealers, in direct violation of our State of Maine law.

Now, the question before the committee was, what was the best legislation for the State of Maine, realizing that at least 3000 fishermen, and that an industry that brings into the State of Maine over \$1,500,000 would be effected by this legislation.

With the present law the lobster fishery business was gradually being depleted. Something should be done to protect this industry or within the next few years it would be practically destroyed, and this was the question that faced the committee. From what information they could get we believe that we should pass some law that would conserve the large lobsters, meaning by this the large lobsters above thirteen inches, as it was shown that the lobsters above thirteen inches were the lobsters which we had to depend on for breeding purposes, as one lobster thirteen inches in length would at least deliver three times as much seed or spawn as one 10½ inches long. Therefore, it looks necessary that we should make some arrangement that these seed bearing lobsters should be conserved, both female and male lobsters, and at the same time protect the interests of the fishermen, whom as we have stated above number some 3000, and we did not want to recommend any laws effecting their earnings.

After a lot of discussion four of the committee signed the report under a new draft recommending that a law be passed making it legal to catch lobsters from nine to thirteen inches long (or from 4¼ to 5¾ back meas-

urement) which is the same thing as nine to thirteen. Six of the committee signed a report, ought not to pass, which would leave the law as it is at present. Later amendment "A" was discussed which would make the law from 10 to 13, and this was agreed to by all the committee as the best law we could recommend, and our reason for advocating this is from investigation it was found that if we passed a law that no lobsters above thirteen inches was taken that the fishermen would be compelled to release or throw back into the water about 15 per cent. of their catch in weight. Now, in order not to curtail the fishermen's earning capacity something should be done, therefore we recommend that the minimum length be made 10 inches instead of 10½, and from the best information we could get the difference between ten and ten and one-half is about 15 per cent. the same amount we are asking them to release above thirteen inches. This we figure would allow the fishermen to earn the same money as before, with this exception, that from all information we could get that all lobsters now caught under the present law that is sold below 10½ inches they receive only 10¼ per lb. which is half the price of legal ones. Now in making it legal to catch as small as ten inches for the difference between 10 and 10½ they would get full price which last year was 20c. per lb. Therefore, for this 15 per cent. of their catch the difference between 10 and 10½ they would get double their money which would really increase their earning capacity and at the same time we believe that this law would in a measure conserve the industry.

We realize that different sections of the State are effected differently by this law, from what we can gather the lobsters in York county are very much smaller than what they are in Washington county and this condition is largely brought about by York county being closer to the state of Massachusetts and therefore, find a more ready market for the smaller lobsters than Washington county does. I don't claim that Washington

county fishermen are more honest but that they have not so good a market for these small lobsters. This was one of the hard things the committee was up against to harmonize any change in the law. Our fishermen in Washington county claim that lobsters run a very much larger proportion above thirteen inches than they do in York county. York county catches very few lobsters above thirteen inches therefore this law would not work any hardship on York county. A good many of our fishermen in Washington county believe that it would be a hardship to them, but at the same time for the whole business along the whole coast we believe it is the best law we can recommend and a step in the right direction to conserve the business.

The argument before the committee was that the present law was not being enforced, but that if it was being enforced we would not see the decrease in the lobster business that we do. During this session of the Legislature we have recommended that there will be passed a license law whereby every fisherman will have to have a license to operate his traps, also all dealers and smackmen before they can get a license to carry lobsters will be compelled in addition to a license to deposit a bond for \$500.00 which will be forfeited if caught in any way violating the law. We believe this will go a large way toward having better enforcement, and if the present law recommended be passed and the enforcement we have made arrangement for be put into effect not only requiring a license law but also appropriating money and install a fast power boat to assist the warden to visit the smacks and also fishermen along the coast and giving the wardens more power to enforce the law we believe we will have better enforcement in the next two years, and we hope with the enforcement laws we have passed this year and with the adoption of this law that it will demonstrate the business is being conserved.

At a hearing held February 18th, A. R. Nickerson, former State commissioner of fisheries, stated that without any doubt

in his mind, if Prof. Herrick's recommendation should be accepted, that it would improve the lobster industry of the State of Maine, but it would work a hardship on the fishermen for a few years. This recommendation was on the basis of from nine to 12 inches. Your committee, in order to take care of the fishermen, have recommended a law from 10 to 13 inches, which we believe will go a long way towards conserving the industry. They have also recommended that a commission be appointed to meet Massachusetts and other states which handle lobsters, with an idea of making a uniform law and that this law be placed under Federal jurisdiction. If this can be done, we believe that it will harmoize all interests in this business, and also conserve the industry. This commission is to report at the next legislature, and we believe, pending the report of this commission, that we should accept the report of the committee and its recommendations, as they have thoroughly investigated this and given it a lot of study the last month. While we realize it does not meet with the full approval of the lobster fisherman, or dealers, we believe that it is the very best proposition that can be handled at the present time, and we hope that the Senate will accept the amendment and the minority report of the committee.

Mr. SCAMMON of Hancock: Mr. President, considerable has been said in regard to this bill working a hardship upon the fishermen. I think that investigation will show that is not the case. Of course it is a fact that anything which is brought about to conserve interests of any kind, especially in matters of this kind, may work a slight hardship, and the question is are the hardships commensurate with the results obtained.

I would like to go into the work of the committee and bring out some of the things that caused the committee to make this report. There is not a doubt but this industry is getting into a bad condition. I think there were two or three fishermen who appeared before the committee who said there was a small increase in the number of lobsters in their section, but that was probably due to the small number engaged in the business, and where the prices had been much higher for the past few years.

I think the general testimony is from everywhere, on our coast and other fishing sections that the lobster business is getting to be in a bad condition. The Government has taken hold to save this once prosperous industry.

There are a great many conditions which arise to destroy the lobsters. Perhaps a great storm, and then other fish and their own carnivorous habits, and man I think is the most important cause. If man has not brought about the present conditions I hardly see how we can explain some of the testimony before the committee.

I think this great scarcity has arisen largely from the constant acquisition of wealth in this country and the demand for this dainty, which has brought about its value, as a food product. I have no doubt that the conditions of enforcement which have been lax, and perhaps the obsolete laws, have had a great deal to do with it. In conversation with wardens and fishermen there seem to be three reasons assigned by them for the falling off. One is the number of small lobsters used for bait, and another is the influx of summer visitors, who seem to demand the small lobsters, and third the illegal taking and carrying away of the short lobsters by Massachusetts boats, or smacklers as they are called.

Now it is a fact that the three thousand fishermen along the shore of Maine have been greatly blamed for taking short lobsters and disposing of them. I say to you if the three thousand fishermen, a great many times take these short lobsters under stress of hardship and toil and privation, and if they have got to live they cannot be blamed for this. But what should we say to the thousands of people that come to our shores and demand these short lobsters? They are sportsmen, and teachers and ministers, teachers of ethics in our schools and colleges, they come here and demand our nine inch lobsters and it seems to me that these people who stand for better things, if they would take a right attitude it would have a great deal to do with the proper enforcement of the law.

I do not deny that the present amendment may cause some slight hardship for a short time. It would be impossible for it to be otherwise. But I do not think

the hardship will be commensurate with its importance to the industry. We know that from the large lobsters must come the future supply.

There has been some demand for the nine inch lobster to be made legal. The time which is required for a nine inch lobster to become a 10 and 10½ inch and a bearer of eggs is short. It is a critical period. No man owning timber land that increased the size of the trees fast, would think of cutting off such timber. If they did cut such timber in some cases the Government would step in and stop it. Nothing has been said about the Government interfering in this business.

I would say that it is evidently the fishermen that have brought this condition of affairs upon themselves and it is up to them to do something to get it back to its former prosperous condition.

It seems to me that under our license law, and with the swift motor boats that will be arranged for, and with this amendment that we shall have done a great deal toward bringing this industry back. I will say that hundreds appeared before the committee. We had a number of executive sessions. All the committee have been invited freely to give all the information they could, and to get all the information possible from their constituents.

I believe that if this amendment is carried through it will be the solution for a great many years of a very difficult problem.

Mr. COLE of York: Mr. President, I dislike very much to take any position which would cause any hardship to the fishermen of Maine. I believe they are willing to earn an honest living if given an opportunity. I believe at the same time there is a tendency, as I have said before in this Senate, to so surround them with laws which take away their rights of earning an honest living that we make criminals of them.

This lobster law is not a new one, but has been before the people of the State of Maine ever since 1848, when we first began to legislate upon this subject. We have had a close time upon lobsters, we have had nine-inch laws, and since 1895 ten and a half inches has been the legal length.

The ten and a half inch law was amended in 1897 because of the tendency of the fishermen or dealers to "pull" the lobsters, pulling the tail away from the body when the length fell an half inch or so short, so that it would reach ten and a half inches; so that the amendment of 1897 did not change the length of the lobster, but was simply an amendment against the pulling of the lobsters. Even that didn't stop it, and a few years ago it became necessary to again change the law regarding the measurement, simply making it a body measurement instead of from the end of the snout to the end of the middle flipper of the tail.

If the State of Maine stood alone, any law making any legal length would be satisfactory to the people; but the State of Maine is in competition with other states, and the people of the State are in competition with the people of other states. In the section which I have the honor to represent, the fishermen of New Hampshire and the fishermen of Maine set their traps side by side in the waters of Maine. If our fishermen throw away their nine inch lobsters, the fisherman from New Hampshire catches them in his pots within a day or two and takes them to New Hampshire, where they are of legal length.

Consequently an injustice is done to the people of Maine, by penalizing them and making it illegal for them to catch a lobster which it is legal for a New Hampshire man to catch in the same waters, and which he does catch in the same waters and takes back to New Hampshire.

If our Maine men take these from those waters, and the New Hampshire men take them from the same waters, fishing as they do side by side, and the New Hampshire man goes back to New Hampshire with his lobsters, he sells them at the market price, because he has a right to have them in his possession, while the Maine man, who has gone out to dig at the same time, having drawn his pots at the same hour, and brought his lobsters in, is obliged to sell his lobsters at a great deal less, because he is dealing

in illegal lobsters, and they know that he is dealing in illegal lobsters, and he has got to take the best price he can get, and he is at the mercy of the wholesalers. You can easily see how that is. He cannot find a market in his own state, and is obliged to sell them for any price he can get for them. The New Hampshire man knows that he cannot sell them in Maine, and that he can buy them at almost any price in New Hampshire.

For that reason it seems to me that the fishermen of the state are put to a great disadvantage; and still something ought to be done, and while it is necessary that something should be done to conserve the lobster, if he is going to exist many years in the future, yet it seems to me that we ought to conform to the laws of other states.

Now at the present time we are shipping all of our lobsters out of the state. There are few people in the State of Maine ever get the taste of a lobster who are natives and residents of the State of Maine. Our summer guests who have the price to pay buy them and pay a dollar apiece for broiled live lobsters and 75 cents apiece for a lobster-stew; but the ordinary working man is unable to get the taste of a lobster. The high-brows and the silk-stockings of our cities are getting the product of Maine and paying a dollar apiece for broiled lives, and the only man who can get a lobster in the State of Maine is the man who violates the law by buying short lobsters, who is a native of Maine and works for a day's pay.

As many of them that live on the coast hardly know the taste of a lobster, perhaps a little description will show the changes that have come over the lobster industry to those who traffic in them.

I was born and raised upon the tidal waters of the Piscataqua, and as a boy in my boyhood days I drifted around on that river. As boys we used to go into the shipyards, and get the strands of tarred rope which made the riggings, and then go to the grocery store and get a sugar barrel, take and weave a net and take the hoops off the barrel and make handles,

buy a piece of cotton line, steal a stake and make a buoy, and we have been able to set these in the Piscataqua river and in those harbors and in an hour or two catch a bushel or two of lobsters, some long and some short. There were no wardens, there were plenty of lobsters. You could catch a hundred in an evening, if you had good luck. Those boys took those lobsters home and borrowed someone's wash boiler, and boiled them and retailed them for two cents apiece. They have even sold for a cent apiece, and I have seen them sell for six cents a dozen, good big lobsters 13 inches long.

Those days have passed, and the lobster has departed somewhere, I know not where. That was a great many years ago, but before then it was considered necessary to legislate upon the lobster, because in the statutes of 1883—and it was passed in the year that the statutes were revised—there was a closed time from the fifteenth of August to the fifteenth of November, when they couldn't be fished for under a penalty of fifty dollars; the canning industry was also stopped, and no lobsters could be canned under that law between April 1st and August 1st.

Again, in 1889, the length was ten and a half inches between July 1 and May 1, and during the months of May and June it was nine inches.

Now while we have been legislating all the years, we have not been increasing the number of lobsters. That is a self-evident fact. The market for lobsters has grown, but it has grown in the distant cities. The lobster in your boyhood and mine was not considered a particularly great delicacy. The great tide of summer travel had not started. The people had limited vacations, and the lobster was like the codfish and the haddock and the mackerel. It could be bought for a reasonable price within a reasonable distance from the seashore, and the fisherman who got a dollar a day for his catch was pretty well fixed and they lived within their means. To-day the fishermen are able to make a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars, but they don't make it selling legal

lobsters. They are selling legal lobsters and everything else. Now if we know that that condition does exist, and that our fishermen are bound to sell short lobsters at some price, why isn't it just as well to put the length the same as Massachusetts and New Hampshire have?

I believe the thirteen-inch provision is proper. I believe we ought to throw over our long lobsters, and that from those long lobsters we will get our supply, but I can't see any good reason why we should make illegal both ends, and subject our fishermen to becoming criminals twice instead of once. If you put it down to nine inches then there is a tendency for them to throw away those over thirteen inches, but when you reduce it only to ten, and then say that they shall throw away those over thirteen, human nature isn't so constituted that it will do it that way. But if you make it nine inches, so that they can double their price, you will give them some inducement to throw away their long lobsters, because their good sense will tell them that if they catch the breeders there won't be any in a few years. But when they can't catch any under ten or over thirteen, they will become violators of the law, and there are men who will buy and take them off the hands of the wholesalers and sell them. But if you put it down to nine inches, and hold your gauge at thirteen, I believe you have benefited the fisherman, you have given him an opportunity to live honestly, you have given him an opportunity to compete with his competitors, you have given him an opportunity to throw away his large lobsters and at the same time earn a living; and you are giving the people of the State of Maine an opportunity to get a few of those nine-inch lobsters which cannot be sold at the present time; and it seems to me, Mr. President, that that is the only step to take.

If the other states of New England were going to put it up to ten inches and make the same gauge that we are asked to make in Maine, it would be better.

But we are told this is the best that can be done; that we better take this than nothing. That may be true, Mr.

President, and I don't believe that we should vote down something because it isn't what we want. If we can't get something better, I should like to see this a law, because it is an improvement over the ten and a half inches; but I do sincerely believe that if we drop the first measurement to nine inches and keep the second at thirteen, we would be meeting the interests of the cause, we would be bettering the condition of the fishermen, we would be protecting the lobsters, and we would make a law that would conform to the laws of other states, whereby by making it only ten inches we are out of harmony with the laws of other states, and our fishermen will be obliged to do illegal fishing, to become criminals twice instead of once, and we shall not benefit the people of the State of Maine by making any market in the State of Maine, or giving our people an opportunity to buy, because we know that a ten and a half inch lobster is too high priced for the ordinary sized man to buy. A nine-inch lobster, even, by the pound he cannot afford to buy.

Mr. CHATTO of Hancock: Mr. President: After listening to the eloquence of the fishermen and the lobster dealers and Professor Herrick, I signed the minority report, ought to pass, on this proposed bill calling for a double gauge law. Before the amendment was proposed it called for a minimum length of nine inches and a maximum length of thirteen inches.

Now it was shown by all concerned that the supply and the catch and the revenue from the business were declining at an alarming rate. I can remember a few years ago when every fisherman could catch all the lobsters he wanted in all of the shoal bays in Penobscot bay. At the present time they cannot catch any lobsters in the inlets and shoal harbors; they have to go on the outside shores, and it has been conclusively shown that there are hundreds and thousands of nine-inch lobsters shipped to New York and Boston in violation of the Maine law.

I wouldn't have signed that report if it had been from ten to thirteen inches, but I want to make this point clear to this Senate—that this amendment has been passed by the House, and it's

quite certain that if we pass this amendment we can get a law that prohibits the taking of lobsters under ten inches and over thirteen inches, that is, returning to the waters all of the seed lobsters, and taking about half of their catch, in pounds, below ten and a half inches. That is, from all the evidence that we have heard here, the lobsters between ten and ten and a half inches will weigh about the same number of pounds as the lobsters between nine and ten inches. We are giving the lobster fishermen the chance to catch one-half the lobsters between nine and ten and a half inches.

Now the committee were not agreed upon this bill. Six members signed the report ought not to pass and four ought to pass. I believe I was the only member from the Senate that signed the report ought to pass. Now we are all agreed that a law from ten to thirteen inches should pass. I recommend and hope that this amendment will receive a passage.

Mr. BUTLER of Knox: Mr. President, I don't know as the condition of my voice this morning will permit me to be heard, but I feel that I must give expression to the voices of a great many fishermen whose voices I heard during the interim since I went home after the adjournment of Friday.

We all recognize the difficulties that confront this committee this morning to determine this vital and important question. What the gentleman from Hancock has just said tells us how difficult it has been for that committee. After they heard all the evidence a large delegation of fishermen and a large delegation of dealers from all over our State—you remember the hearing in the House of Representatives, they were unable to agree, and stood six to four for the old law.

The matter, as has been explained, comes to us this morning on Amendment A, upon which they have finally agreed unanimously. I supposed it would be the easiest matter in the world for the fishermen and the dealers to agree on this very important matter, for they are like the Siamese Twins, they are so inseparably linked together that while one lives the other

may, and when one dies the other must. The dealer can not prosper unless the fisherman has plenty of lobsters to sell him, and the lobsterman cannot prosper unless he has a market for his lobsters; and therefore I supposed that both being interested in the conservation of the industry, it would be a simple matter for them to agree upon.

I believe both sides have acted in good faith, and have tried to be honest with each other; but they differ in opinion.

The fishermen—and there are many of them in my locality, many in my immediate neighborhood, and I know many of them personally and call them by name—I know that last year some of them didn't pay their bills. It was a poor year for them. Now they are afraid of this law. They are afraid they will be unable in the future to make a living. Now, mind you, gentlemen, that this is their livelihood, it is all the business they know, and of course they are deeply interested in it.

Now I want to read you a letter which expresses better than I can how the fishermen feel about this matter: "Of course you are aware that we are interested in the lobster legislation at Augusta. I notice in the last Courier-Gazette that the latest measure introduced proposes to save only lobsters from nine to thirteen inches"—(of course that should be ten)—"prohibiting all over thirteen inches. Now this bill and a similar one introduced before would mean death to the business in this locality, as nearly all fish taken about the islands in upper Penobscot Bay are overgrown ones. If either of the above measures becomes a law, the fishermen might just as well keep their traps on the bank. What the fishermen in general want is the present law retained, or one similar to Massachusetts as proposed. I wrote to Mr. Lewis some time ago about this matter, but have heard nothing from him. Will you see him and take the matter up and write me."

I will be fair with the Senate and read the whole letter.

"Why the dealers want the law to prohibit the taking of the large lobsters is because they don't sell or deal in them, but I think the fishermen ought to know what they want."

Now the letters I have received are all along that line. All the conversation I had while I was at home recently was along that line, and I heard from fishermen beyond the confines of my county and far down into Hancock County, as far as Long Island, Swan's Island, Vinalhaven, North Haven, South Thomaston, and the smaller islands in Penobscot Bay. One lady who owns a large island in Penobscot Bay and hires fishermen to fish for her, telephoned to me that if she was obliged to throw away lobsters exceeding thirteen inches in length she would throw away one third of her entire catch. This may not be so. This of course is her honest judgment; she might have overstated it, but I simply have read this letter to express as best I can the feeling of these fishermen in my locality.

I think the fishermen should be heard here, and I think that whatever we do in the Senate, we should endeavor to do justice to that large class of our people that lead a hard life, and they do not lead that life—the most of them—to make money—but they do it for a livelihood. It is the only business they know.

I hope the motion of the Senator from Sagadahoc will prevail.

Mr. DUNTON of Penobscot: Mr. President, I wish to say a word upon this matter, because I see the honorable gentlemen ahead of me differ upon some things, and then upon others.

We are facing in this State, in this industry, which is a very important one, a condition, and that condition—it is not surprising when there are three thousand men engaged in it that they would be divided upon the best way to get around a bad condition. It is true we have heard both sides represented here this winter, and the committee has worked hard and long upon this, and they first brought a report four to six, but eventually they agreed upon a bill which they thought would

be good for the fisherman and at the same time conserve the industry.

The industry is badly off. To put it plainly to you, it has declined from a catch of fifty-three lobsters per trap to thirty, showing conclusively that there has been a rapid decline in the last few years. Now there are three thousand men engaged in the business, at least one thousand heads of families, and they had a good business over the last twenty years. They were living the ideal way of living along the coast, but the business went on a decline, and it became so unprofitable that they cannot pay their bills, and it seems to be up to us to do what the most of these men have told us to do. It is conceded without contradiction that the only way that you can conserve this industry is to preserve or conserve the large lobsters. I am not so particular about the size of the small lobsters, for the only ones that can give us any future small lobsters—that is, thirteen inches and upward, would be saved.

Upon the agreement of that committee to make this a unanimous report, in the interests of the fishermen, that we are all interested in, in the interest of the merchant who deals in this product, in the interest of the State of Maine, which has received an income of \$20,000,000 every year. I think it behooves us as legislators to legislate so that the future may not be obliged to put a close time upon these lobsters, and drive these three thousand men entirely out of business, and I believe the present bill is the most scientific bill in that respect, and I believe the fishermen will not be hurt much, and the industry will have a chance to organize so that these fishermen that our sympathy is with today—that their life may be improved.

Mr. AMES of Washington: Mr. President, a great deal has been said about the lobster industry upon the coast, and I note that many special laws making a close time on different sections in the month of July and August have been passed, and it seems to me as though the fishermen have a peculiar interest in the propagation of lobsters, and perhaps it would be well for me to read

a letter I have received from a man very well known in this industry, Mr. Jasper Wyman of Milbridge.

"I noticed the lobster bill which is called the 'compromise bill' passed the House, much to my surprise, as from every source of inquiry I was informed there was little hope of its passing.

"Being unable to attend the hearing, I hope your honorable body will permit you to read this letter.

"I am located on the western part of Washington County, buy lobsters every season for market, which brings me directly in touch with the fisherman. I do not know and have not seen any fishermen who favor this bill, every fisherman I have seen, and many come to me, and asked if it isn't possible to keep the present law.

"Lobsters are migratory to a degree. Grand Menan lies ten or fifteen miles from our county. What prevents the Canadians from catching the lobsters that are on our shore this season, next season? The same thing applies to Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

"Lobsters over thirteen inches that our fishermen feed and throw back in the ocean this season are caught by the Canadians next season and sold in competition to ours.

"How absurd and unjust it is for our lobster fishermen in Maine to fish under a law that is not in substance like New Brunswick and Massachusetts. There is difference enough in the present law, but when the fishermen have to sort and measure both sizes it is killing to them.

"The fishermen believe the present law enforced will maintain the supply and why should it not be enforced? If this 'compromise bill' can be enforced the present law can.

"For the poor fishermen with the high cost of living the conditions are bad enough; we should not put anything more on them, and I hope the Senate will defeat this bill."

The question being on the adoption of House Amendment A to House 895, a rising vote was taken, and four Senators voting in favor, and twelve opposed, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AMES: Mr. President, I move the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. COLE: Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator through the Chair if the indefinite postponement of the bill, leaving the measurement as it is at ten and one-half inches, would not be a mistake unless we in some manner tried to get an arrangement with the House whereby something can be accepted? The House, as I understand it, has passed this. The original bill was nine inches, and the idea of those of us who voted or a large number of us, was to see if the House would not come down to nine inches. We do not want to vote for the indefinite postponement of this bill because we favor some change in the law. Our idea of voting for the indefinite postponement of the amendment was to see if some arrangement could not be made in the House whereby the measurement could be reduced from ten to nine inches.

Mr. AMES: Mr. President, it is the desire of every fisherman along the eastern coast of Maine, as near as I can find out, to have the law remain as it is. And they said their reason, it would be just as reasonable to catch the nine-inch lobster as for the man on a stock farm to kill off his veal calves. I shall stand upon my motion to indefinitely postpone.

The question being on the indefinite postponement a rising vote was taken and 16 voting for indefinite postponement and 8 opposed, the motion was adopted and the bill was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate, Senate 429, Resolve in favor of building a State Road from Jackman in Somerset County to Rockwood on Moosehead Lake.

The pending question being the adoption of House Amendment A.

Mr. COLBY of Somerset: Mr. President, I do not know what the intention of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Moulton, was when he tabled this bill and amendment.

As I have already explained to the Senate this amendment has simply to do with the maintenance of the road, and has met with the approval of the highway commission. They helped to draft it. It was also gone over by

the attorney general in regard to the legal points.

I see no reason why the amendment should not have a passage, and I move that the bill as amended be passed to be engrossed.

A rising vote was taken on the adoption of House Amendment A, and 22 Senators having voting in favor of the amendment and none opposed the amendment was adopted. The resolve as amended was then passed to be engrossed and sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate. Resolve appropriating money for the construction of one brick dormitory for inmates at the Maine School for Feeble Minded. (Senate 362.)

In the House this bill was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Boynton of Lincoln the Senate voted to insist and ask for a committee of conference.

The Chair appointed on such committee on the part of the Senate, Messrs. Boynton, Jillson and Garcelon.

The President laid before the Senate An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 80 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the powers of the county commissioners of Cumberland county.

The pending question being the adoption of Senate Amendment A.

Mr. SWIFT of Kennebec: Mr. President, I move that Senate Amendment A be adopted.

A rising vote was taken and 21 voting for the amendment and none opposed the amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was then passed to be engrossed and sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate House 885, An Act for the temporary licensing of automobiles and motor vehicles.

Mr. Swift of Kennebec offered Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

Senate Amendment A. Amend House Doc. 995 by adding after the last word "a person receiving such tag shall return same to the officer or person from whom obtained within ten days."

Senate Amendment A was adopted and then the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed and sent down for concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate House 893, An Act to amend Sections 56 and 57 of Chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes, relating to rights of minority stockholders.

The pending question being its passage to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Swift of Kennebec the bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate Senate 431, An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 244 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to transmitting of electric power beyond the confines of the State.

Mr. BOYNTON of Lincoln: Mr. President, I move the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. COLE of York: Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which heard this matter, I simply want to state the position of the committee regarding this bill. The bill came into the Legislature early in the session, was referred to the Judiciary Committee, and State-wide notice was given for a hearing, and at the hearing only two or three people appeared in favor of it, and not a single individual against it.

The committee held the bill some time, knowing that it was a matter of State-wide importance, and wondering if the people had any objection through the State, and if so whether the newspapers would take it up. So far as I know or have been able to observe, but one paper has said anything against this measure. Others have written editorially in favor of it.

The bill as it is at the present time covers the ground a little differently than the bill before this Legislature a few years ago, because the bill at the present time has in it a provision that the transmission out of the State shall be under the direction of the Public Utilities Commission, and at any time when the power is needed in the State for the development of the State or the use of the people, the

Public Utilities Commission has the right to enjoin the company from transmitting the power out of the State, after giving two years' notice, in order that its customers out of the State may have an opportunity to get new power, or affect the required changes.

That is not an unfair provision of the bill. It seemed to your committee, after hearing, that if for a hundred years, nearly, these water-powers have been running and spending their energy in the broad Atlantic, and doing nothing more—the water-powers of Maine are not 50 per cent. developed—if there is to be any development it must come from without; it hasn't come from within.

Now we might say that we want to save them until such time as Maine shall need them. That may be true. We might say that our forests should remain here. We might say that many things should not be utilized until the population of Maine is greatly increased, until there should be some use for them, that we shouldn't ship out of the State any of the products of the State. Now electricity isn't any different from potatoes or lumber, or brick or granite or anything else. It is a product of the water-powers of Maine, if those water-powers are developed. There is no one here who would be foolhardy enough to say that the farmer of Aroostook county should not ship his potatoes out of the State, that he should not ship out his lumber, that any man should not be able to ship his products—even the lobstermen—out of the State. The markets of the world are open to the products of the State. Electricity is a product, and I can see no reason, if the people of the State of Maine are surrounded by laws which so absolutely protect them, so that whenever they need this power within the State they may have it for their own use, and so long as they do not need it it may be carried beyond the State—I can see no reason for any great fear or any damage.

We all know that the water-powers of the State are removed back from the coast. The coast towns and the

border towns can never get power unless it is carried to them. Now if this power is developed back in the central and northern parts of the State, and is to be transmitted by transmission lines through the State and out of the State, every little country hamlet through which that line passes will have an opportunity to get some of that power for lighting and heating and power purposes, when perhaps unless something of that kind happens, it will be years and years and years before any power company will go anywhere near those small towns. Every farmer along the pole-way can proceed to get power from it, and so long as we have protected ourselves, Mr. President, so long as we have seen that our own people are protected, and so that they have the power at a reasonable price if they need it, I don't care where the surplus goes. If we need it, we have the right to use it, but for hundreds of years these water-powers have gone to waste. Is it good business to allow them to go to waste another hundred years, or another fifty?

It seems to me, Mr. President, there can be no harm in having them developed that our people may get the benefit of the labor of developing, and in the process of caring for them after they are developed, and in the number of people who will be employed in the transmission, and in the great number of people who will enjoy the benefit of these improvements, and in the ultimate use by the people of our State of all the power that may be developed.

I believe it is wise, just and proper that we should allow outside capitalists, if outside capital is needed, to come in here and develop the use of the surplus water that we don't get in our own State.

Mr. WALKER of Somerset: Mr. President, while the men who are chiefly interested in the passage of this bill are among our best business men and are highly honorable gentlemen, yet I feel that we should make a grave mistake to grant this present request. I have always been in favor of retaining our water powers within

the boundaries of Maine for the benefit of our entire people. It was a part of my declaration of principles on which I was nominated and elected. I should be false to those principles if I allowed this measure to pass without entering my protest. Our water-powers are the last great, valuable natural resource of Maine, and I hope this Senate will consider well what it might mean to the future of our State and its people if you pass this bill.

Mr. MURPHY of Cumberland: Mr. President, I can remember distinctly that in the previous legislatures many bills passed to keep in Maine the power that is here now. As a man interested in getting as much as I can for my money, like any ordinary citizen, my reason for sustaining Senator Walker's argument is this, that electricity can now be used in houses for lighting and heating them and many other purposes.

If they are allowed to send the electricity out of the State it will prevent the people in the State from getting it at a low price. There was a day when everybody had to have in their houses stoves to burn either coal or wood. The day came along when nearly everyone, up to date, put in the gas stove, and the day is coming when in the great apartment houses we can use electricity for cooking, heating and lighting.

If we are going to provide for carrying electricity outside of the State I don't see why anyone will move to the State to take advantage of the price of power. Coal is climbing higher and higher, and here is a State that has everything to give us, heat, light and power.

Mr. GARCELON of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I kept quiet while the fishermen were talking lobsters, but I can't keep quiet when a proposition of so much importance is presented here for your consideration.

The State of Maine is the northeastern state of our Union. Every manufacturing industry is hampered by the disadvantage in freight rate. We have lost industries in my own city simply because of the excess freight from Massachusetts to Maine. What would have happened to the State of Maine if

50 years ago it was possible to transmit electricity manufactured by our water falls? Every hamlet and village and industrial center in Maine would simply have remained a power-house. You would have had no Rumford Falls development and you would have had no development of the falls of the Androscoggin. That little river, by the report of the national conservation committee, ranks seventh in the development of water power.

It is simply a question whether you want to transmit your power from Maine and remain a power station only.

This proposition is simply the entering wedge to open the door, and then many arguments and many a justification will be urged upon the legislature to extend this privilege, to enlarge this privilege, and then this comes to me: whose power is this? I understand that the potato grower produces his potatoes, but who owns these water powers? It is one of the assets of the State of Maine. We would be happy people if we had not disposed of our timber land. The same thing will revert to us if we dispose of our power privileges and transmit it out of the State.

It is said that these transmission companies wherever they run will furnish power to our people. True enough, but it will be power in competition with a larger demand and it would be a higher power to each user in our State. Who does it benefit? It benefits the power people. The people are compelled to pay higher prices for whatever electricity they desire to use.

A unanimous report of the committee! Nobody appeared to protest against! The fight occurred in this legislature four years ago and the proponents of the bill moved its reference to the next legislature. The next legislature voted it down.

Have the people of the State of Maine to conserve their natural resources got to appear at every call? The committee would say to them, "Who do you represent?" "The people." And then the committee would say, "We can't listen to the protests of the people."

We suppose that our committee would exercise some independent judgment of their own, rather than throw away this

gift of the people robbing the people of the natural resources.

The great fight for conservation of energy in this country has been fought too long for the people to employ attorneys to protest against every applicant that appears before a legislative committee.

Mr. COLE: Mr. President, I have no personal interest in this matter, so far as representing any geographical section of the State is concerned, unfortunately the county of York can never be a power station. Its rivers are not adapted to that purpose, and are fully developed.

But if the Senator from Androscoggin asks who these water powers belong to, I would like to have him reply—who do they belong to? Not the people. If he thinks so, let him go before any of these committees and find out that the State long ago let go its last hold on them, and they all belong to private individuals or corporations.

Now there is a legal aspect of this case which we have considered. There is a doubt in the minds of the best lawyers in the State of Maine regarding the constitutionality of any such law as this. I am not able to pass upon it. I do not pass upon it, but broader minds than mine are passing upon it, and there is a doubt. Let us look at it. The State has given away its water-rights until everywhere that there is a fall in the State of Maine it is today in the hands of private individuals. It being their property, they having started in to develop it, and they having developed it, and having spent their money on it, having carried their system through Maine and got their pole rights through the various towns and cities to the borders of the State, I want to ask what power on earth, under our Federal system, under which the products of one state shall have an equal market with the products of every other state—what is to hinder them from sending that power two feet further, over the line into New Hampshire? They have complied with every local law to get it to the New Hampshire line. It belongs to the people who produced it.

The electricity is the result of machinery. It is the result of labor. It

is the result of effort, just as the raising of potatoes, or the weaving of cloth, and it is a product recognized in the law. That being the case, has the State of Maine a right to say that a person producing something shall not find a market beyond his own State? There is a constitutional doubt.

We are told that these water-powers should never be carried beyond the State, but they must remain where they are, and the Senator from Somerset made a declaration of principles when he became a candidate that he would fight for in office.

Supposing the three Senators from York had made the same declaration, that in order to get the power into the County of York, where we need it, we would fight for this bill, because it is the only way we can get it. I want to ask if we would have had just as good a right to fight for it as he would against it, and whether we wouldn't have been just as consistent in trying to get it as he would in trying to prevent us from having it.

It seems to me unwise to allow these waters longer to go to waste. They are not even 25 per cent developed, and in the next fifty years may not be 50 per cent developed unless we go faster than we have. Why let them go to waste? If we had never done anything except what we do on the capital of the State of Maine, we should be in the position the State was in 1820. Go to the manufacturing interests of Lewiston, Waterville, and Biddeford, and ask whether they would have grown up on local capital? They state that Rumford Falls would never have grown under this bill; but Rumford Falls is not there because of anything in this bill. Rumford Falls is there because there was something there that made pulp, and their power would grind their wood into pulp. They can well go out of business so far as the demand for water-power is concerned; there will be no further business for them.

I say to you that every bit of electricity that is transmitted beyond the borders of the State can be purchased by every citizen, and at a reasonable price, because this bill says that un-

der the Public Utilities Commission every consumer shall have the product at a reasonable price, and there can be no exorbitant price; there can be no hold-ups. So long as this bill is surrounded by the protection that it is surrounded with, so long as the people of the State are granted a reasonable price, I don't care where the surplus goes. I have no fear for the future. The present is what we need. We have need to look forward to the future, to establish great manufacturing interests on account of our water-powers.

How many industries, outside of the pulp-mills, have been established upon our water-powers in the last ten years? What great manufacturing town has arisen anywhere? What great water-power is developed for a new industry anywhere, unless it be the pulp industry? None of them, Mr. President, and if the people of the State of Maine are going to get the benefit of this, they must get it as it is coming by their doors. They are not going to the water-powers; they will not go to the water-powers. New methods of power, compressed-air, tidal power, are being experimented with today. The power will be found wherever anyone wishes to locate an industry before our great water-powers are developed, if we hold on to this old, antiquated principle that business must go to the powers instead of the powers being carried where the business is.

Mr. COLBY of Somerset: Mr. President, four year ago in the other end of this building I dropped a similar bill into the hopper, and the next morning great headlines came out in the papers "Colby Fathers The Octopus Bill."

We had great discussions and great times, as some of you will remember. During the discussion and before the adjournment of the legislature I became almost ashamed to be the father of that bill, and when the final vote came I voted against my own bill. I thought at the time I was right. I still think so. At this session of the legislature I was asked by a good friend to drop this bill into the hopper and I did so.

The headlines were not quite so conspicuous as before. I am not ashamed of the bill. I have followed the matter quite closely. Whether the killing of the bill four years ago has had anything to do with it, I don't know, but we all know that during the four years there has an octopus grown up in the State of Maine, perhaps greater than the one this would have been. I say that with all respect to the officers of the company. We all know the condition of the electric proposition in central Maine.

As I have said, I have looked into this matter carefully, and it seems to me that under the present bill, it is carefully guarded, and we have a unanimous report of the committee that has given it a great deal of time and study. Today I am not ashamed to vote for the bill.

Mr. SCAMMON of Hancock: Mr. President, we have heard a great deal in the closing days of this session in regard to the conditions of the manufacturer in the State of Maine. Part of this is owing, perhaps, to freight conditions, and possibly some of it is due to tariff conditions.

I want to know if you carry this power out of the State if it is not a self evident fact that they are going to get something cheaper from here than they get out of coal from other States, and if these manufacturers are not to be put in a great deal worse condition?

As a matter of fact power will be higher here if power is carried outside of the State. I admit that these powers now belong to private individuals. I heard the story on John E. North, a man no less noted for business acumen than generosity to business employees. It is said that at one time when he had 1800 men employed he gave them an order to chose for themselves a suit of clothes from the store. It seemed that all used him fairly except one young man, who selected a \$75 suit of clothes. When the bills came in he called the young man into the office, and asked him in regard to his suit, if he got one to his liking, etc. The young man was pleased and began to thank Mr.

North very much for his generosity and tried to tell him how much the people thought of him. Mr. North interrupted him and said, "In my career I have bought and sold a good many thousand hogs, but you are the first one I ever dressed."

I think these people in coming to us display a good deal of this same disposition. I protest against the giving away of these rights.

Mr. BURLEIGH of Aroostook: Mr. President, I should not feel I was doing my duty unless I said something about this bill. I am opposed to this bill. I believe it is due to the State, where they have given away water-powers, to provide in this bill that they should have this power so that it may become a benefit to the State instead of being carried out.

If you let this power go out of the State you never will get capital to come back into the State, but if you keep the power here the capitalist is coming here to develop that power.

It has been only a few years since electricity could be transmitted. You take the powers of the interior of our State and development them and it can be carried to Portland, where they can get it cheaply transmitted. Keep the power within the State and capital will come here and develop this State instead of our carrying our productions to them to develop other states.

If it had been possible for the water powers to have been transmitted from Biddeford and Lewiston, those great manufacturing plants never would have been in Lewiston.

There is plenty of power in the interior of this State. Take the Penobscot River, there is power enough there to make Bangor one of the largest cities of our State. There is power enough in the Kennebec to make every city from Waterville to the coast a large manufacturing place. But if you let that power go out of the State, good bye to the State of Maine for future development.

What do we want to do? We have tried for the last year to organize an association to develop Maine, but if you develop Maine that way by send-

ing the power out of the State I don't want to be a party to it.

I wish simply to enter my protest against this bill.

Mr. WALKER of Somerset: Mr. President, when the vote is taken I move it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The question being on the indefinite postponement of the bill, the yeas and nays were ordered, and the secretary called the roll.

Those voting yea were: Messrs. Allen, Ames, Bartlett, Boynton, Burleigh, Chatto, Conant, Dunton, Flaherty, Fulton, Garcelon, Herrick, Jillson, Leary, Murphy, Price, Scammon, Thurston, Walker—19.

Those voting nay were: Messrs. Butler, Clark, Colby, Cole, Durgin, Emery, Peacock, Swift—8.

Absentees: Messrs. Hastings, Moulton, Weld—3.

Nineteen having voted in favor and eight opposed, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Allen of Kennebec a recess was taken until 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

Afternoon Session

Senate called to order by the President.

From the House: An Act to amend Section 42 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the use of motorboats in hunting sea birds, ducks, or water fowl.

In the Senate this bill was indefinitely postponed.

The House insisted on its former action and asked for a committee of conference. They appointed a committee of conference on March 26th. The committee of conference had a hearing and then made a report to the House, and the papers were sent to the Senate for concurrent action.

Mr. WALKER of Somerset: Mr. President, I move that we adhere.

Mr. ALLEN of Kennebec: Mr. President, there may be only three of us who oppose this motion, but as one of the three I stand ready to do that.

This has been taken, after the speech of the Senator from York, as a joke. The joke would be on the ones that in-

definitely postpone it, in my estimation.

Part of the coast of Maine already has a similar law, and this bill which has been before us provides for the rest of the coast having a similar law. But it appears, from the Senator from York, that they do not want to conserve the birds, but use motor boats, etc.

For one I am willing they should use motor boats, but I take my stand against the indefinite postponement of the bill. I move that when the vote is taken, it be by the yeas and nays.

Mr. COLE of York: Mr. President, the Senator from York would be very glad to conserve the game along the coast, but he would also like to conserve the morals of his constituents at the same time.

The question being on the adoption of the motion to adhere, and the yeas and nays having been requested, a rising vote was taken and a sufficient number arising the yeas and nays were ordered and the secretary called the roll.

Those voting yea (in favor of the motion to adhere) were Messrs. Ames, Bartlett, Butler, Clark, Cole, Flaherty, Fulton, Garcelon, Jillson, Murphy, Peacock, Thurston, Walker—13.

Those voting nay were Messrs. Allen, Boynton, Burleigh, Chatto, Colby, Conant, Dunton, Durgin, Herrick, Leary, Price, Scammon, Swift—13.

Absentees: Messrs. Hastings, Moulton, Weld—3.

There being a tie vote the President's name was called and he voted yes.

Fourteen senators having voted in favor of the motion to adhere and 13 opposed the motion to adhere was sustained.

House Bills in First Reading

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

House 931. An Act additional to Section 27 of Chapter 129 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to corporations for the operation of telegraphs, telephones and other public utilities.

House 930. An Act to amend Section 36 of Chapter 101 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 41 of the Laws of 1907, in relation to bail commissioners.

House 932. An Act in relation to certain rights and liabilities of husband and wife.

House 933. An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 24 of the Public Laws of 1907, as amended by Chapter 10 of the Public Laws of 1909, in relation to reports of hearings in vacation in law or equity.

House 934. An Act relating to procedure in the supreme judicial and superior courts.

House 935. An Act to amend Section 27 of Chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the record of attachment of bulky personal property.

House 936. An Act to incorporate the Maine Indemnity Company.

House 937. An Act to determine the approximate amount of money necessary to defray the expenses of the public service.

House 939. An Act to amend Section 72 of Chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes of Maine, as amended by Chapter 160 of the Acts and Resolves of 1909, by inserting after the word "day" in the fifth line or said Article 72 the words "Firemen's Memorial Sunday," so that said section as amended shall read as follows.

House 940. An Act to provide for State and county aid in the construction of highway bridges.

House 941. An Act to amend Section 18 of Chapter 65 of the Revised Statutes, relating to judges of probate.

House 944. An Act to amend Chapter 135 of the Private and Special Laws of 1875, entitled "An Act to establish a Municipal Court in the City of Auburn," as amended by Chapter 186 of the Private and Special Laws of the same year, Chapter 51 of the Private and Special Laws of 1881, and Chapter 152 of the Private and Special Laws of 1891, Chapter 62 of the Private and Special Laws of 1895, and Chapter 229 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903.

House 946. Resolve in favor of Kennebec County issuing bonds.

House 947. An Act authorizing the Secretary of State to Prepare and Publish Lists of Corporations Delinquent in Payment of their Franchise Taxes.

House 948. An Act to amend Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to Fishing in a portion of Cup-suptic stream in Oxford county.

House 949: An Act entitled An Act to create a State Fund to be known as the State Contingent Fund.

House 950: Resolve in favor of Gardner K. Heath for services performed as assistant to Fortunat Belleau while he was acting clerk pro tempore.

House 951: Resolve in favor of Gardner K. Heath for services in preparing a schedule of all Acts and Resolves carrying an appropriation or expenditure of money.

House 952: An Act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of Chapter 195 of the Public Laws of 1911, relating to the Extirpation of Contagious Diseases Among Cattle, Horses, Sheep and Swine.

From the House: Majority and minority report of the committee on judiciary, on An Act to amend the charter of the Portland Water District.

Majority report, ought to pass; minority report, ought not to pass.

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

On motion by Mr. Murphy of Cumberland the majority report was accepted in concurrence, the bill was given its several readings and passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules, in concurrence.

From the House: Majority report of the committee on judiciary, ought not to pass, on Resolve in favor of Michael Burns; minority report of the same committee, ought to pass.

In the House the report of the minority was accepted and the bill was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Cole of York, the Senate voted to non-concur with the House and on further motion by the same Senator the majority report, ought not to pass, was accepted and sent down for concurrence.

Specially Assigned

The President laid before the Senate, House 258, Resolve appropriating money for the completion of the purchase of the farm acquired for the purpose of scientific investigation in agriculture in Aroostook County, also for the erection of buildings on said farm.

Mr. MURPHY of Cumberland: Mr. President, as I understand it, in 1913 a resolve was passed by this Legislature appropriating \$10,000 for the purpose of purchasing a farm in Aroostook county to be used for scientific purposes. I yield the floor to any Senator that sees fit to advocate the passage of that resolve.

I would like an explanation as to why they exceeded their authority in spending \$23,000, when the appropriation calls for \$10,000.

Mr. BARTLETT of Kennebec: Mr. President: I hope that the members of the Senate will feel to agree with me that this resolve should have a passage. This matter came before the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, and the situation as it developed, and as I understand it, was as follows:

Two years ago it was supposed to the Legislature that an appropriation of \$20,000 should be made for this farm for experiment purposes, and a compromise was finally made on that and only \$10,000 appropriated.

The committee which had the carrying out of the purposes of the resolve went into Aroostook county and endeavored to get a farm on the basis of the appropriation, but were not able to do so, and I think all the members of the Legislature who are conversant with the situation in Northern Aroostook, in the valley of the Aroostook River, would know that while the prices of farms there it would be a very small farm that could be purchased for \$10,000.

They finally, in taking this matter up, came across this farm, about a mile from Presque Isle village, which was somewhere from two hundred fifty to two hundred seventy-five acres, and in taking the matter up they conferred with Governor Haines as to what they should do, feeling that that was the proper location for this farm, and that that was probably the most satisfactory thing that could be worked out for the benefit and interests of the State.

I understand that Governor Haines at that time told them that that was probably the best thing they could do, and this information came before the committee at the time of the hearing. The

committee co-operated with citizens of Presque Isle, with the result that the farm was purchased, and the State paid \$10,000, and the citizens of Presque Isle paid the balance, making a purchase price of \$20,000.

The farm had on it at that time a barn, but no other buildings, and the citizens of Presque Isle who had undertaken this matter, in connection with the State, went to work and built a dwelling house, at a cost, as I understand, of about \$3400, and since that time the State has had the benefit of this farm, and the ownership has been in that way.

The citizens of Presque Isle, at a town meeting recently held, have voted to assume the interest on this amount which has been advanced by them, as soon as the State takes over and pays the balance for the farm.

When this matter came before the committee, there was linked with it the matter of an appropriation to carry on the farm for the coming two years, and the committee, after considering the whole matter, felt that the State should not own the farm in connection with anybody else, felt that the committee and the Governor had really sanctioned the purchase of this farm, and felt it was a proper thing for the State to take over this farm and pay the remainder of the purchase price, and own it entirely. In doing this I understand that the people of Presque Isle throw in the building referred to, and also assume the interest of carrying the thing up to the present time.

The committee, in the matter of providing for carrying on the farm, cut that appropriation, \$10,000, which they recommended be put into this purchase, feeling that it is a proper thing for the State to buy the farm, and if there was any deficiency to be made up the citizens of Presque Isle would make it up on the appropriation and carry it on, and that they should be relieved of the burden of carrying the investment any longer time.

It seems to me that there is a moral obligation on the State to take this over, and I think they should pay the \$10,000, and own the farm and have it. And that is one of the worthy measures which this legislature should pass.

Mr. BURLEIGH of Aroostook: Mr. President: I would say just a word. The citizens of Presque Isle had their annual town meeting this year and made an appropriation to pay all the interest that the town had incurred and the extra amount that was paid for the farm, and that is to be presented to the State. They didn't except anything.

They also took a vote in regard to a schoolhouse that is worth \$1500 or more, a nice building that is situated on one corner of the lot; and the town voted that when the State paid for the farm and received a deed that the town should deed to the State the schoolhouse and the land upon which it stood. This schoolhouse is a fine building, and can readily be converted into a dwelling-house for the help that the State may need upon the farm. That is worth at least \$1500, beside the interest that they carried on the extra amount.

Now this farm is situated on the Presque Isle road, south of Presque Isle village. It is one of the nicest farms in that section of Aroostook county. There are between two and three hundred acres of it, and there are different qualities of land; there is high land which is very light loam soil, and then it goes down to a lower grade, so that there are different kinds of land on the same lot, by which they may carry on experiments which will apply to nearly every portion of the county and the State. It is an ideal farm. I doubt if you could find a farm in Aroostook county which will equal this farm for the purpose for which it is purchased; and the price is exceedingly low for the location and the quality of the soil there. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will pass this resolve to finish paying for the farm.

Mr. FULTON of Aroostook: Mr. President, I will not take up the time of the Senate at this late hour in the proceedings, but I wish to say that this matter of finishing paying for the farm for conducting scientific experiments in agriculture in Aroostook county is a matter of vital importance to that county. Unlike many other counties we are dependent upon our agricultural products for giving us everything that is needed. I do not think the committee that looked after the matter exceeded

their duty. They first consulted with the Governor. We are a family of counties, and assuming that each have a fair opportunity we certainly feel in our county that considering the amount of appropriations we have there, compared with the amounts given to other counties, that we are only asking a very moderate amount. I trust the Senate will see fit to favor us in this matter.

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. President: I am getting an education in the business of how to do things right without a guardian, the scientific way of doing things in Aroostook county.

This isn't the first time that just such a case as this has happened in Presque Isle. For instance, in 1907, as a member of the Legislature, as one of the committee that voted to make good just such a case as this, the building of a normal school dormitory. They exceeded the appropriation by \$13,000, more or less, proceeded to Bangor, and with a contractor made this arrangement; finish this building up and you can charge so much a day and so much an hour for every man for working, and so much for every article you put in here; fix your own price.

That is the way they did. I saw the bills and know what happened. That is fact. This man was good enough to trust the State of Maine, through these people, to the extent of \$13,000.

On another occasion, in order to show their gratitude for that man in this way, an appropriation was made for Fort Kent, to install a heating-plant there. Instead of asking for bids on that particular job, they handed it over to the Bangor man, because they owed him so much for trusting the State of Maine to the extent of \$13,000. Why, any of us will do a job like that; any of us will furnish goods, material and labor, and fix our own price. I would call your attention to the business methods employed there, gratitude at the expense of the State, handed out.

Now without any question some of the same men were interested in this case. I have heard the names mentioned, and I have heard them mentioned before. I know who did it.

Let me call your attention to this little item on here:

The tax valuation for 1913 on that

farm was \$7750. I wonder how many men here would give \$20,000 for a farm valued at \$7750. I don't think many of us would.

Again, I want to call your attention to this fact. They had no business, no right, to exceed their appropriation. It is a questionable transaction. It would look to any sane man it was a questionable transaction.

I want to read a section from the Revised Statutes, section 22 of chapter 2:

"No agent or officer of the State, or of any department thereof, whose duty it is to spend money under an appropriation by the legislature, and who exceeds in his expenditure said appropriation, shall have any claim for reimbursement. Any such agent or officer who shall violate the provisions of this section shall upon conviction be fined a sum equal to such excess of appropriation by him expended, and imprisoned in the discretion of the court. All prosecutions under this section shall be by indictment and the fine inure to the State."

There is the case, a business proposition. Now I have no doubt but what this will be voted for, but you want to distinctly understand that you know what you are doing, and that we do know a business proposition when we see it. This is a business proposition for Presque Isle and some of the people interested there in it.

I move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. SCAMMON of Hancock: Mr. President, I am exceedingly sorry for the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Murphy, in feeling that the people of Presque Isle are putting something over the State.

In regard to this farm in Aroostook county. This is not a DeForest Keyes or Michael Burns case, but it is a case where the people of Maine are putting out dollars and getting a good farm in return. I heard some of the testimony before the committee. I heard the full discussion in the House, as I was in there at the time, and on either hand it was understood that the State was getting full return for the money put out. Farms there are high, and in looking the situation over they found it neces-

sary to get a better farm for experimental purposes than for an ordinary kind of a farm. It was brought out at the hearing, and in the House, that the proper kind of a farm, necessary for a farm of this kind, if it was to be obtained there, if it was a case where the State was not getting its money, that would be one thing, but this is not the case. I think it is conceded that the money paid for this farm was not more than amounts paid for similar farms in that locality.

If the committee exceeded their authority and yet got good returns for their money, I do not see why this should not go through. This State is a great corporation, and I do not think we should quibble about \$10,000 that has been well expended.

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. President, I just wish to make this statement, that at Machias it would have been to the advantage of the Normal School authorities to have finished their job, but they did not exceed their appropriation. At Gorham it would have been to the advantage of the State to finish that building, but they did not exceed their appropriation.

If it was up to a committee they would have exceeded their appropriation, and in every case they go wrong when they do.

I move that when the vote is taken, it be by the yeas and nays.

The pending question being on the motion to indefinitely postpone, by Senator Murphy a roll call was had. Those voting yea (for indefinite postponement), were Mr. Murphy—1. Those voting nay were: Messrs. Allen, Ames, Bartlett, Boynton, Burleigh, Butler, Chatto, Clark, Colby, Cole, Conant, Dunton, Durgin, Emery, Flaherty, Fulton, Garcelon, Herrick, Jillson, Leary, Peacock, Price, Scammon, Swift, Thurston, Walker.—26. Absentees, Messrs. Hastings, Moulton, Weld—3.

The resolve was then finally passed.

On motion by Mr. Walker of Somerset, it was

Ordered: Whereas the Mayor and the music commission of the city of

Portland gave a special invitation to each member of the 77th legislature to be present, with ladies, at a grand concert in the City Hall Auditorium, Portland, on Feb. 18, 1915, and

Whereas many members availed themselves of the privilege to attend this splendid entertainment

Ordered, that the Senate and the House, by the passage of this order give public expression of their thanks and their deep appreciation of the thoughtfulness and courtesy on the part of those extending the above invitation.

Sent down for concurrence.

Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Cole of York, An Act relating to the use of automobiles in the Town of Mount Desert in York County was taken from the table.

On further motion by the same Senator the bill was given its several readings and passed to be engrossed, and sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Scammon of Hancock, An Act to repeal Section 24 and amend Section 25 of Chapter 3 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 138 of the Public Laws of 1905, relating to printing of the reports of the state department, was taken from the table.

On further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Swift of Kennebec: Senate Doc. 344, An Act to amend the charter of the City of Augusta, was taken from the table.

On further motion by the same Senator, House Amendment A (Senate 435.) was adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Final Reports

Committee on Railroads and Expresses.

(Presented out of order by Mr. Swift of Kennebec.)

On motion by Mr. Clark of York, Adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.