

# 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)

8102  
Personal



**LEGISLATIVE RECORD**

OF THE

**Seventieth Legislature**

OF THE

**STATE OF MAINE.**

\_\_\_\_\_

**1901.**

and, on the further motion of that senator, the same was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Staples of Cumberland, resolve in favor of the Passamaquoddy tribe of Indians was taken from the table, and on the further motion of that senator, Senate amendment A was adopted, and the resolve as amended was read and assigned.

**PASSED TO BE ENACTED.**

An act to fix the salary of the judge of probate for Kennebec county.

An act to regulate the salary of the clerk of courts in Franklin county.

An act to regulate fishing in Lower Wilson pond, Prong pond and Horseshoe Pond.

An act to incorporate the Cumberland Trust Company.

An act to incorporate the Friendship Water Company.

An act to amend an act entitled an act authorizing and empowering the Great Northern Paper Company to erect and maintain piers and booms in the West Branch of the Penobscot river, Approved March 8, 1901.

**FINALLY PASSED.**

Resolve in favor of the town of Ashland.

Resolve in favor of the town of Adams.

Resolve in favor of the Augusta City Hospital.

Resolve in favor of Kenneth W. Sutherland, chairman of the committee on Maine State prison.

On motion by Mr. McFadden of Lincoln, the Senate adjourned.

**HOUSE.**

Friday, March 15.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Robbins of Gardiner.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Resolve in favor of the committee on education, comes from the Senate passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules.

In the House the rules were suspended, the resolve was read twice and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

An act relating to Sheridan plantation, comes from the Senate passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules.

In the House the rules were suspended, the bill received its three readings and was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

An act relating to railroads, railroad crossings, highways and town ways.

In the House this bill was referred to the committee on railroads, telegraphs and expresses and comes from the Senate that body non-concurring and referring it to the next Legislature.

On motion of Mr. Pratt of Veazie, the House receded and concurred with the Senate in its reference.

Mr. Sutherland of Biddeford, presented resolve in favor of Maine State prison, and moved its reference to the committee on the State prison.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Briggs of Hudson, presented resolve in favor of the Maine Industrial School for Girls at Hallowell, and moved its reference to the committee on education.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Walker of Starks, Ordered, that the State superintendent of public schools be instructed to report to the next Legislature a list of the towns organized since 1878 and not formally parts of other towns and yet not having permanent school funds, together with an explanation given by town officials for the loss of such funds.

Mr. Webb, from the committee on the judiciary, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to amend Section 4 of Chap-

ter 132 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the criminal jurisdiction of magistrates."

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported ought to pass in new draft under same title bill, an act to amend an act entitled an act to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery.

Mr. Spofford, from same committee, reported on bill, an act relating to and amendatory of Chapter 376 of the Private and Special Laws of 1889, entitled an act to incorporate the Crystal Ice Company.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported same on bill, an act to establish a municipal court in the town of Skowhegan.

Mr. Chase, from same committee, reported same on bill, an act to reorganize the fire department of the city of Portland.

Mr. Powers, from same committee, reported same on bill, an act to provide for the recording of documents of unorganized places.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported same on bill, an act to establish certain penalties for the use of public funds by public officers for any purpose not authorized by law.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported same on bill, an act to prevent the use of trading stamps and other similar devices.

Mr. Libby, from the committee on legal affairs, on bill, an act to abolish the bureau of industrial and labor statistics, reported that same be referred to the next Legislature.

Mr. Harris, from same committee, reported same on bill, an act to supply the town of Lubec with pure water.

Mr. Chase, from same committee, reported ought to pass in new draft under same title bill, an act relative to actions for libel.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to incorporate the Prouts Neck Water Company.

Mr. Powers, from same committee, on order reported bill, an act relating to the duties and compensation of the reporter of decisions of the supreme judicial court.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported ought to pass in new draft under same title bill, an act to amend Chapter 66 of the Public Laws of 1899, relating to the jurisdiction of municipal and police courts.

Mr. Carleton, from same committee, on joint resolution, passed by the General Assembly of the state of Colorado, relating to the question of equal suffrage, reported that legislation thereon is inexpedient.

Mr. Harris, from same committee, on bill, an act amendatory to Chapter 507 of the Private and Special Laws of 1889, entitled an act to establish the Dover municipal court, as amended by Chapter 196 of the Private and Special Laws of 1899, reported that same be referred to the next Legislature.

Mr. Spofford, from same committee, reported ought not to pass on bill, an act to amend Chapter 337 of the Public Laws of the year 1885.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported same on bill, an act to enlarge the powers of the Oakland Electric Company.

Mr. Carleton, from the same committee, on petition of M. A. Meserve and 28 others of Atkinson, and various others praying that women of the State of Maine may be granted full right of suffrage, reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Allen, from the committee on legal affairs, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to amend Section 145 of Chapter 82 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 174 of the Public Laws of 1893, entitled an act relating to exceptions and stenographers.

Mr. Walker, from the committee on education, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to amend Chapter 142 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the Maine Industrial School for Girls.

Mr. Mead, from the same committee, reported ought to pass in new draft under same title resolve in favor of the Maine Industrial School for Girls.

Mr. Hill, from the committee on commerce, reported ought to pass on bill, an act authorizing the construction of a wharf into the tide waters of Casco bay in Phippsburg, county of Sagadahoc.

Mr. Putnam, from the committee on legal affairs, reported same on bill, an act to supply the town of Houlton with pure water.

Mr. Beal, from the committee on financial affairs, on report of the special committee appointed in 1899 to ascertain how many reports of the several departments are printed each year and the cost of the same, and to recommend to the Legislature how many it is desirable to have printed, reported that same be referred to the Governor and Council.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported legislation inexpedient on bill, an act to amend Section 49 of Chapter 2 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the treasurer of State.

Mr. Briggs, from the committee on education, reported ought not to pass on bill, an act to provide for the expenses of the Maine Industrial School for Girls, because provided for by a resolve.

Mr. Walls, from the committee on military affairs, reported ought to pass in new draft under same title bill, an act to establish a State flag.

Mr. Swett, from the same committee, reported ought to pass on resolve in favor of Rev. C. S. Cummings, chaplain of the 1st Regiment, National Guard.

Mr. Shaw, from the committee on interior waters, reported ought to pass in new draft under same title, bill, an act to amend Chapter 213 of the Private and Special Laws of 1895, authorizing Simon G. Davis, his associates and assigns, to construct and maintain a wharf and boat house in Lake Maranocook, in the town of Winthrop.

Mr. Irving, from the committee on State lands and State roads, reported ought to pass on resolve in favor of repairing Mattawamkeag bridge.

Mr. Hammond, from the committee on agriculture, on petition of Samuel Hill and others for a dairy commissioner, reported that same be referred to the next Legislature.

Mr. Boothby, from same committee, on order from the Legislature relating to an act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 38 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 125 of the Public Laws of 1887 providing for an election

of a secretary of the board of agriculture, reported legislation inexpedient.

Mr. Peabody, from the committee on interior waters, reported leave to withdraw on petition of H. J. Bailey of Howland, for an amendment to Chapter 130 of the Private Laws of 1886, entitled an act to incorporate the Sebec Dam Company.

Mr. Shaw, from the same committee, on bill, an act to amend Chapter 130 of the Private Laws of 1866, entitled an act to incorporate the Sebec Dam Company, as amended by Section 6 of Chapter 26 of the Private and Special Laws of 1899.

Mr. Carr, from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to amend Chapter 130 of the Private Laws of 1866, entitled an act to incorporate the Sebec Dam Company, as amended by Chapter 26 of the Private Laws of 1899.

Mr. Morin, from the committee on ways and bridges, on resolve for repairing of highways in Upton, Lincoln plantation and township C, in the county of Oxford, reported that same be referred to the next Legislature.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported same on resolve in favor of the town of Trescott.

Mr. Eaton, from the committee on State lands and State roads, reported legislation inexpedient on order to inquire into the expediency of the State buying wild lands available for farming purposes, to be sold to intending settlers upon the same.

Mr. Ross, from the committee on temperance, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to amend Section 33 of Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Section 4 of Chapter 140 of the Public Laws of 1887, prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Pending acceptance the report was tabled on motion of Mr. Shaw of Bath, and Tuesday next assigned for its consideration.

Majority report of the committee on legal affairs, reporting ought to pass on bill, an act to repeal Section 62 of Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Section 7 of Chapter 366 of the Public Laws of 1885, relating to State constables.

(Signed) Messrs. B. Putnam, W. R.

Pattangall, O. F. Fellows, Fred J. Allen, L. M. Staples.

Minority report of same committee, reporting ought not to pass on same bill.

(Signed) Messrs. George H. Allan, Newell T. Noble, J. M. Libby, Stanley Plummer.

Pending acceptance of either report both were tabled on motion of Mr. Hill of Belfast, and with bill accompanying, ordered printed, and Tuesday next assigned for their consideration.

Mr. Webb from the joint select committee on legislative apportionment, on petition of the town of North Yarmouth that it may be authorized to elect a representative for such portion of time and such periods as shall be equal to its share of representation, instead of being classed with any other town, reported that said committee has heretofore reported a resolve entitled "resolve to apportion one hundred and fifty-one representatives among the several counties, cities, towns, plantations and classes in the State of Maine, and that provision has been made therein granting said town the authority prayed for."

Same gentleman from same committee, reported same on petition of the town of Harpswell that it may be authorized to elect a representative for such portion of time and such periods as shall be equal to its share of representation instead of being classed with any other town.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported same on petition of the town of Scarborough that it may be authorized to elect a representative for such periods as shall be equal to its share of representation, instead of being classed with any other town.

Mr. Wilson from the committee on inland fisheries and game, on petition reported bill, an act to protect screens in lakes, erected by authority of the State, and to permit ice fishing in Green lake in the county of Hancock.

Mr. Jackson from same committee, on petition reported bill, an act to open Main Stream, a tributary of Moose pond, above the dam near the outlet, to fishing.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, an act additional to and amendatory of Chapter 230 of the Private and Special Laws of 1901, relating to ice fishing in Boyd lake in the county of Piscataquis.

Mr. Jones from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, an act allowing the propagation of beaver in the waters of Enchanted Stream, Somerset county.

Report A of the committee on inland fisheries and game, on petition reported bill, an act to amend Section 21 of Chapter 30 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 42 of the Public Laws of 1899, relating to the taking of deer in September for food purposes, and relating to non-residents going upon the wild lands of the State.

(Signed.) Messrs. Albert A. Burlleigh, Ethan Little, Isaac Cushman, P. H. Jones, H. V. Noyes.

Report B of same committee, on same petition, reporting leave to withdraw.

(Signed.) Messrs. P. O. Vickery, F. H. Wilson, N. P. Noble, J. W. Brackett, A. F. Jackson.

Pending acceptance of either report, on motion of Mr. Wilson of Brunswick, both were tabled, and with bill accompanying ordered printed and Tuesday next assigned for their consideration.

Mr. Thompson from the committee on shore fisheries, reported leave to withdraw on petition of George O. Grady and Company, and others, that a law be enacted permitting the seining of herring in Washington county.

Mr. Haskell from the committee on towns, on petition of H. F. Williams and others that a law be enacted compelling residents moving from town to town to notify clerk of same.

Mr. Kneeland from the committee on pensions, reported ought not to pass or resolve in favor of Geo. W. Rollins for a State pension.

Mr. Ross from the committee on temperance, on bill, an act to permit registered apothecaries to sell pure liquors for lawful purposes, reported that same be referred to the next Legislature.

Mr. Wilson from committee on inland fisheries and game, on bill, an act to prevent the taking of fish from Ross lake in the town of Littleton in the county of Aroostook, Maine, and on bill, an act to prevent the taking of fish from Conroy lake in the town of Monticello in the county of Aroostook, Maine, reported ought to pass on bill in new draft, an act to prevent the taking of fish from Ross and Conroy lakes, in Littleton and Monticello, in the county of Aroostook.

Mr. Harris from the Androscoggin county delegation, reported ought to pass bill, an act to fix the compensation of the county commissioners of the county of Androscoggin.

Mr. Kneeland from the Waldo county delegation, on petition reported bill, an act to regulate the killing of deer in the county of Waldo.

The reports were accepted and bills and resolves ordered printed under joint rules.

#### READ AND ASSIGNED.

Bill, an act to authorize the town of East Machias to erect and maintain a half tide dam across the East Machias river on or near the site of the former dam.

Bill, an act to amend the charter of the Springvale Aqueduct Company.

Bill, an act to amend Chapter 167 of the Laws of 1888, incorporating Mount Hope Cemetery Corporation. (Read the third time and passed to be engrossed on motion of Mr. Fellows of Bucksport.)

Bill, an act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 91 of the Revised Statutes, relating to fees of town and city clerks for recording mortgages.

Bill, an act to amend Chapter 42 of the Public Laws of 1899, relating to the taking of black bass in certain lakes in Kennebec and Somerset counties, also Sabattus pond in Androscoggin county.

Bill, an act to amend Section 14 of Chapter 134 of the Revised Statutes, relating to criminal proceedings in court.

Resolve in favor of the Maine Insane Hospital.

Resolve in favor of the Castine State Normal School.

Resolve in favor of the Madawaska Training School.

Resolve in favor of Max Dondas. (Tabled pending second reading on motion of Mr. Chase of Portland.)

Resolve in favor of normal school trustees. (Tabled pending first reading for statement of facts on motion of Mr. Deering of Saco.)

An act to amend Sections 5, 9, 16 and 17 of Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes, relating to malicious mischief.

An act to establish the East Machias Light and Water Company.

An act to incorporate the Jonesport Light and Water Company.

Resolve laying a tax on the counties of the State for the years 1931 and 1932.

An act to incorporate the Co.umb.a Falls Water and Electric Light Company.

An act to supply the people of South Gardiner village in the city of Gardiner with pure water. (Read a third time and passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules on motion of Mr. Lawrence of Gardiner.)

An act in relation to corporations and to provide for a revenue therefrom.

#### PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED.

Bill, an act to ratify the lease of the Patten and Sherman Railroad to the Bangor and Aroostook Railroad Company.

Bill, an act to regulate proceedings on certiorari.

Bill, an act to cede to the United States jurisdiction over certain lands in Augusta.

Bill, an act to incorporate the Masonic Trustees of Fairfield.

Bill, an act authorizing the Fryeburg Horse Railroad Company to maintain steamboats upon the waters of Upper Kezar pond.

Bill, an act to authorize Warren Sawyer to build and maintain a wharf in the tide waters in the town of Milbridge, county of Washington.

Bill, an act to extend the charter of the Sebastacook Manufacturing and Power Company.

Bill, an act to incorporate the trustees of Lincoln Lodge, No. 99, Knights of Pythias.

Bill, an act to amend an act to establish a municipal court in the town of Waterville.

Bill, an act to extend the charter of the Manufacturers' Trust Company.

Bill, an act to incorporate the Solon Academy.

Bill, an act relating to the Maine State Sanatorium Association.

An act to incorporate the Sanford Trust Company.

An act to amend Section 11 of Chapter 30 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 42 of the Public Laws of 1899.

On motion of Mr. Chase of Portland, this bill was laid on the table pending its

third reading for an amendment to its title.

An act to prohibit the killing of deer in the town of Swan's Island in Hancock county.

An act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 191 of the Private and Special Laws of 1899, relating to the taking of salmon in the Penobscot river above the Water Works dam at Bangor.

An act to authorize cities and towns to establish manual training schools.

Mr. Chase of Portland offered an amendment by adding the following section: "Cities and towns may receive gifts and bequests for the use, maintenance and support of manual training schools."

The amendment was adopted. The bill was then passed to be engrossed as amended.

Resolve in favor of William J. Maybury, surgeon general, National Guard, State of Maine.

Resolve in favor of the town of Meddybemps.

An act relating to hawkers and peddlers.

An act in relation to the annual town meeting of the town of Boothbay Harbor.

An act to amend Chapter 279 of the Public Laws of 1897, relating to the packing of sardines.

An act to incorporate the town of Crystal.

An act to fix the salary of the register of deeds for the county of Androscoggin.

An act to prevent the throwing of sawdust and other refuse matter into the tributaries of the lakes and ponds in Vivenna and Mount Vernon.

On motion of Mr. Pettengill of Rumford bill was laid on the table and assigned for Thursday of next week.

An act to prevent the catching of trout in Tufts, Dutton and Grindstone ponds and their tributaries in the town of Kingfield, Franklin county, for sale.

An act to prevent ice fishing in Bonneg Beg and "L" ponds, situated partly in North Berwick, Sanford and Wells, county of York.

An act relating to the Standish Water and Construction Company.

An act to amend Section 6 of Chapter 132 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the issuing of warrants by magistrates.

An act to authorize the Skowhegan Hall Association of Skowhegan in the county of Somerset and State of Maine, to issue bonds to the amount of \$25,000 to pay the outstanding indebtedness of said corporation known as preferred stock.

An act to amend Chapter 237 of the Private and Special Laws of 1883, entitled an act to amend an act to incorporate the city of Auburn, relating to assessors of taxes and overseers of the poor.

An act to amend Chapter 60 of the Public Laws of 1895, entitled an act to amend Chapter 21 of the Public Laws of 1887, entitled an act to amend Chapter 280 of the Public Laws of 1885, entitled an act amendatory of Section 29 of Chapter 31 of the Revised Statutes, relating to liens.

An act authorizing the construction of a wharf or wharves into the tide waters of the Penobscot river in Bucksport.

An act to authorize the judge of probate for Kennebec county to grant administration on the estate of James Lamb.

An act to legalize and make valid the acts and doings of the city council of the city of Saco, pertaining to the annual appropriations and the commitment of taxes for the year 1900.

**PASSED TO BE ENACTED.**

An act to amend Section 55 of Chapter 3 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the taking of lands for public parks and squares.

An act to amend an act to incorporate the city of Augusta.

An act to incorporate the Pistol Stream Dam Company.

An act in relation to the salaries of the justices of the judicial court.

On motion of Mr. Walker of Starks, this bill was laid on the table, pending its passage to be enacted and assigned for Wednesday of next week.

An act to amend Chapter 168 of the Private and Special Laws of Maine for the year 1875, entitled an act for supplying the city of Bangor with water.

An act to amend Chapter 55 of the Public Laws of 1891, relating to the incorporation of churches.

An act relating to the filing of papers in cases argued before the supreme judicial court, sitting as a court of law.

An act to legalize the doings of the town of Leeds.

An act additional to Chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes, relating to bowling alleys.

An act to extend the charter of the Maine Water and Electric Power Company.

An act to authorize the Machias Lumber Company to acquire by purchase all the rights and property of the proprietors of Machias Boom, and to confirm all purchases of said rights and property already acquired by said Machias Lumber Company.

An act to amend Sections 28 and 35 of Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Free High school year.

An act relating to trust and banking companies.

An act to amend Section 29 of Chapter 92 of the Revised Statutes in relation to mills and mill dams.

An act to authorize Manley Morrison to erect and maintain booms and piers in the Sebasticook river.

An act to prohibit the dumping of herring and all fish offal in the waters of Moosabec Reach in the town of Jonesport.

An act to regulate winter fishing and to close the tributaries to certain lakes and ponds in Somerset, Penobscot and Washington counties.

An act to regulate the taking of deer in Androscoggin county.

An act to allow open time on deer in certain towns in Cumberland county.

An act relating to compensation of county commissioners of Franklin county.

An act establishing a salary for the sheriff of Kennebec county.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY.**

Special assignment: Majority and minority reports, committee on judiciary, reporting ought to pass on bill to supply the town of Camden with pure water and ought to pass on bill in new draft under same title.

The pending question was the acceptance of the majority report.

Mr. WEBB of Portland: Mr. Speaker, the matter of this subject of water for the town of Camden, which was referred to the judiciary committee, came before as impartial and as unprejudiced a tribunal as could have been selected from this Legislature. No member of the committee came from Knox county or was influenced in the slightest degree by local considerations; no member of the committee entered upon that hearing and upon the determination of that question biassed in the slightest degree by any feeling of prejudice. The hearing was very long, it attracted great attention, evidence was introduced on both sides, both sides were represented by able counsel and the matter was fully and clearly and ably argued to the committee. When the committee considered the question it was found that upon two points they were unanimous, first that every member of the committee believed, and still believes in the principle of municipal water companies; second, that no member of the committee believed that the bill as presented to the committee ought to pass. The committee



are still unanimous upon those two points, today. A majority of the committee were of the opinion that towns should be granted municipal water plants, towns should be authorized to build and to own or to purchase and own their own plants for municipal water supply first, in cases where there was no company whatever organized and already supplying the community with water; second, in such cases as when the town being already supplied by another company, that other company might be bought out as a whole and no injustice be done to any interest or to any property; and, third, in such cases where although there was a company in the field the service that it was rendering to the people was so bad, the supply of water so inadequate or so impure or the rate so unjust and so exorbitant, as to make it seem a case where the Legislature should step in and interfere, should see to it that the people of that particular town should have a good water supply. Upon those points a majority of this committee stand. The minority go a little farther and they do not put the same restrictions to the principle of municipal water work; possibly some of them may consider that in this case the demand exists where there should be legislative interference.

Camden is one of three or four towns already supplied by the Camden & Rockland Water Company, the same company supply besides Camden the city of Rockland, the town of Rockport and, I believe, also the town of been made to this Legislature by certain people of Camden as to the character of the water supply. No complaint whatever has been made upon the question of rates. In fact the evidence before the committee was that the rates charged the people of Camden for their water are lower than the average rates in any town or city in New England. Not the slightest complaint came upon that point. Complaint was so conclusive that in the minds of all the members of the committee it was completely without foundation. In fact it appeared conclusively that the water supply to the people of that town is of the very

purest obtainable anywhere in the State of Maine. Everything is done that any water company is able to do to prevent the introduction of anything of a foreign character into those water pipes. Furthermore, the sources of supply from which the movers of this bill propose to take their water is of exactly the same character as the source from which they now receive their supply. There was no complaint whatever before the committee as to the amount of water supplied for domestic purposes the supply at all time was adequate and sufficient. One further point in complaint was made at the hearing, that in times of fires there has been inadequate pressure at the various hydrants in the town; and upon that point considerable evidence of a more or less conflicting nature was introduced. There was evidence of the fact that at some of the fires with which this town has been visited there was not at the nozzle of the hose the force of water or the amount of water that was necessary. Now that may be explained in several instances in several ways. It may have been in one instance that the water was not turned on in the hydrant; it may have been in another instance that the distance from the nozzle of the hose to the hydrant was too great, because as everyone knows the friction of the water through the hose detracts from the pressure to be delivered at the nozzle of the hose; another explanation of some of the instances may have been that the hose had kinks in it; and another explanation may have been, and it may have been an explanation covering every case, that there was not as a matter of fact sufficient pressure at those hydrants to give the town an adequate supply for fire purposes. In this connection, however, there was one piece of evidence which to my mind was of great importance, and that is that in the 10 or 11 years that this company has been supplying this town with water and during which time the water supply of this company has been the only water available for fire protection, there has been no increase whatever in fire insurance rates. The fire insurance people keep very close watch upon such things, and

when it appears that any town is not properly protected against fire, up go the rates. In this case rates have actually fallen within 10 years, but granting for the sake of argument that inadequate pressure exists at the hydrants in that town, what is the remedy, what would naturally be done by the municipal officers? Would it not be to call attention of the company to that fact and request the company to make alterations? And yet it does not appear that at any time since the disastrous fire of 1892 has this town through its municipal officers made any such complaint whatever. On the contrary with the experience of that fire fresh in the mind of every resident of that town, when the contract for municipal water with this company expired in 1896 or 1897 the town renewed that contract in substantially the same terms as it was before. If this evil exists of insufficient pressure there is still the remedy open to apply to the company and request the company to make such changes as may be necessary to remedy this defect; and I told that I may have authority to assure this House that it is the purpose of that company to place upon the Camden part of its works one of the best hydraulic engineers in this country, and to direct him to make a thorough examination, and if any defects whatever exist, if there is any lack of pressure, the company stands ready to follow out his recommendations in that line; and this assurance is made to me by a gentleman whose assurance I am bound to accept and whose assurance every gentleman in this House and every person in this State is bound to accept, for he is a man whose word is known to be good and reliable and whose character is respected and honored in the town of Camden quite as much as in the city of Portland which is now the place of his residence—I refer to the Honorable Henry B. Cleaves, ex-Governor of Maine.

Now, it would seem as if there was no necessity for legislation upon this matter. And with this statement of the case I might perhaps stop were it not that my associates upon this committee, members of the minority, had seen fit to present with their report a bill in a new draft and advise its passage. I have been at some pains to study this bill, House document No. 393, in connection with House document No. 9, the first bill presented to the committee; and I have sought for the charges that have been made in the original bill, and I think I have found them and the only charges that there are. The first nine sections of the original bill are identical with the first nine sections of the bill in its new draft. In the tenth section there are two changes. In the 51st line of House document No. 9 these words are added: "Together with such a sum as the commissioners shall deem an equitable reimbursement for such expenditures as the Camden and Rockland Water Company of the Rockland Water Company have made on their water system outside the limits of Camden for the benefit of the water system in Camden." In the 78th line where provision is made

for the town of Camden to purchase or not to purchase the property, a change is made by striking out a few words so that the town shall have under this new draft no option whatever to take the property at its appraisal. A further provision is made that the bill must first be submitted to the town meeting and approved by a majority of the people of the town. And those are the only changes made in the original bill, and in those particulars and those particulars only does this new draft differ from that first bill which no member of the committee was willing to recommend to pass.

Section 10, which is the largest part of this act, provides for several law-suits. It provides for application to the board commissioners. Those are instructed then to appraise the water works in the town of Camden, and for that purpose receive evidence. From their decision an appeal may be had to the judge of the supreme court and from his decree a further bill of exceptions will lie to the supreme judicial court sitting as a law court. Now it is evidence from the character of these provisions that the enactment of this bill plunges the people of the town of Camden into a lawsuit. And the litigation that would result would be carried through no one knows how many years. Let me suggest that the real question to be put before the commissioners appointed under the authority of section 10 would be, What is the value of that part of the water company's property lying in the town of Camden? That question may be viewed from two different standpoints, the value of the property to the company and the value of the property to the town. The expense of laying 10 miles of pipe connecting the pond with the town is substantially the same whether that pipe supplies the water to 2000 takers or 2500 takers, yet the difference between 2000 takers and 2500 takers may be a difference between bankruptcy and prosperity. Have the people of Camden contemplated that as a result of this transaction, at the final close of this litigation, they are liable to have on their hands so many miles of iron pipe laid in the ground which can be duplicated in the open market at a certain price, for which they would be obliged by decree of the court to pay perhaps twice or three times that amount? And the second amendment of the minority goes to that very point—the town of Camden has no discretion whatever in the matter but is bound to accept and to pay the price fixed, while in the original bill the town was allowed to accept or reject it. The commissioners have also the duty to perform of apportioning upon this part of the property the mortgage indebtedness now outstanding against that plant. There are three classes of bonds issued and today outstanding, covering that water system, not covering the Camden part of it to the exclusion of the Rockland part of it—not covering the Rockland part of it to the exclusion of the Camden part, but covering it all—every single bondholder holding a lien upon every foot of that pipe and that property and every part of that franchise. There are \$125,-

000 of 6 per cent. bonds due in 1905; \$275,000  $\frac{1}{2}$ 's due in 1907; \$225,000 of 5's due in 1919. Is it going to be easy to apportion that amount of indebtedness upon this amount of property? Is it not going to be a problem fraught with great difficulties? Is it not going to be almost if not quite impossible to do it fairly and equitably? But supposing it to be done, the bill further provides that the town of Camden shall pay for the water works the amount found by the commissioners less the amount of the mortgage indebtedness, and the amount of mortgage indebtedness is to be subtracted from the amount placed by the commissioners on that plant. Who is going to pay those mortgage bonds when they become due? Does the town agree to pay the mortgage? The bill says nothing of the sort. It says: "When said conveyance is made, as aforesaid, to said town, or trustee, the town shall thereupon enter into and upon possession and control of the property, rights, privileges and franchises therein transferred, subject to be divested thereof only upon a failure to pay the said pro rata proportion of the mortgaged indebtedness."

In other words in 1905 if the town of Camden becomes sick of the municipal water plant they may simply refuse to pay the bonds and that property then goes back, or perhaps it does, it probably goes back to the Rockland and Camden Water Company subject to all sorts of liens and incumbrances that they have placed upon it in the meantime.

There is something to be said in regard to the holders of these bonds. I have here a list of the savings banks in Maine which own these various bonds, a total of \$289,500 out of a total issue of \$625,000 held by these various savings banks of Maine. Now what do you propose to do with the security upon which those bonds rest? Do you propose to so cripple that company as to render it doubtful if the company can in the future continue while you make no satisfactory provision whatever for the ultimate payment of the principal? The policy of this State toward our savings banks has been one well understood and one which has been consistent from the beginning. It is to throw about the trustees of these institutions intended for the savings of the poor the strictest limitation as to the authority that they shall have in the investment of the funds entrusted to their care. We specify in the law certain States in which they may invest their funds thereby by implication excluding all other States. We do this because we distrust the Legislatures of those States. It is because we apprehend that we will pass just such legislation as proposed here, that, after having granted a legislative charter practically pledging the credit of the State to those who may be induced to invest their money there, the Legislature may at some subsequent session by some such legislation as this take the security out from under those bonds and leave the bank investor to whistle for his money. Now I apprehend that the time has not come when the State of Maine proposes to go back upon its long financial record.

There is more in this question than the question simply applying to the people of Camden. It is a question going to the very credit of the State. It is a question which will make every investor in other States view with new suspicion, and with suspicion which he has not before had, all securities which are issued by corporations chartered by authority of our Legislature. It affects you, Mr. Speaker, and me, and all of us who may have one dollar invested in the stocks or bonds of any Maine corporation. It affects all of us throughout the State who may have one dollar in savings banks if the bonds which those banks are authorized by law to buy are to be so treated by legislation as to become of doubtful value. (Applause.)

Mr. COOK of Vassalboro: Mr. Speaker, my sympathies would naturally be with municipal ownership, but in this case, early in the session I got an impression that this was an exception and I voted with the water company in the reference to a committee; and the more I have investigated it the more confident I am that the proposed legislation is wrong, that it is wrong so far as the water company is concerned, that it will be wrong for the people of Rockland and wrong for the investors who have been invited to go there and invest their money. Some this winter have believed in further taxing savings banks and have claimed that the banks did not invest in Maine, that a large portion of their money was invested to build up the West. If, then, by our action today we strike a blow at the investments of these savings banks which have been investing in Maine industries, how do we invite them further to invest in the East instead of going to the West?

A good deal has been said here about the question of fires. You must not lose sight of the fact that we have had fires in other places than Camden, and because there has been a disastrous fire there it does not of necessity argue that the water supply was insufficient. They have more pressure there than they had in the city of Portland, more pressure than in any other place in Maine except in the city of the cliff-dwellers in Augusta. (Laughter and applause.) This is the only place where they have a greater pressure than in Camden. The fault in the supply of water for fires is that they only have one-third as many hydrants as they ought to have, and that is the fault of

the town. The company will put in as many hydrants as the town will pay for. This company has been at a great expense to put that part of their plant into Camden, an expense without the town that need not have been incurred if they had not put the works into the town of Camden. That would not be paid for under this bill. The town of Camden is one of the most beautiful sites in all the world, and they have got some of the most expensive cottages on all our seaboard, and those people go there in part at least because they could get pure water, and if you take away this water as is contemplated and draw it from these other ponds where the water is less pure, do you not strike a blow at that cottage industry and that summer resident industry of which so much has been said on this floor during this session? There is a class of taxpayers there, the single women of Camden, and nine-tenths of this class of women taxpayers of Camden are in remonstrance against complicated action of this bill. It is claimed that the taxpayers who are in here with this remonstrance only pay \$7000. I claim that that is a wilful deception. Besides this \$7000 that is conceded there were remonstrances in here by letter of the citizens of Camden paying \$3000, and remonstrances of non-residents by letter, which were in evidence before the committee, paying \$4000, and there is another class of taxpayers, the corporations there, and that tax should be counted, and that would be a matter of another \$3000. And then there is a tax of firms and estates represented by remonstrance of \$2000 more, making the amount claimed by the company, \$19,000.

To repeat, I believe we should be in sympathy with the municipal ownership but not to the extent that we should do so great a wrong as the one contemplated here, a wrong to the Rockland Water Company, because it will so cripple that plant as to take away their dividends, and a wrong to the people of Camden, which would make them establish a water plant that would not pay a dividend—in other words, the water would cost them more than it does now—and by the

way, they get water there cheaper than in almost any other municipality in the State; and it would be a wrong again to these savings institutions which have put their investments in there in all confidence. (Applause.)

Mr. LIBBY of Poland: Mr. Speaker, beautiful Camden by the sea is not my home. I have no interests tied up there that I am aware of, and I am acquainted with very few people within its borders; but I recognize in this conflict here an old and familiar one which has been fought over in the State of Maine before today, and simply comes up again in new phase and form and will not down at any man's bidding until finally the people of this State shall have declared what shall be its policy or its rights and whether they shall be maintained and upheld in the future. Every time that any municipality appears here before the general court of this State asking for the undoubted right, a right vouchsafed by the common law and by the decisions of every court in every nation and in every time since the law began, to own and maintain those things which tend to its necessary affairs—I say that every time one appears here it is met square in the face by this opposition. It has been contested and was tried out in the now celebrated case of the city of Auburn ten years ago. The citizens of Auburn came before this general court and they were met here by every opposition of a corporate kind in the State.

And, today, it is just the same in my opinion here, that we are not in this matter contending simply with the Camden and Rockland Water Company, but it is a contest between the citizens of the town of Camden claiming to own and maintain and regulate and govern affairs upon their own territory, affairs which pertain to them alone and to nobody else, and affairs which pertain to their rights and their existence and their right to exist, and I say they are met here not only by the Rockland and Camden Water Company, but they are met by the combined interest of every water company in the State of Maine, in my opinion.

It is a joining of drives, it is a joining of interests, I believe, and nothing

has appeared yet in this case up to this time to change my belief. I believed 10 years ago, when the city of Auburn came here asking for the right to maintain their own water works, that they had that right, and time has vindicated it. I believe in standing upon the constitution of the State where every man must stand and where these quasi-public corporations must stand, and that is that their property cannot and shall not be taken without compensation; but I believe that when a town of \$2,000,000 valuation against a water company worth a quarter of that sum, when a town of 5000 people comes here and asks for the right to maintain their water plant themselves, when they don't propose to confiscate, when they have safeguarded every interest—I say that that is enough and sufficient.

There is no force or importance in this talk on the other side that Camden should not be allowed to do this thing because they will run into debt, because it will cost them more. The intelligent, respectable men of Camden who will have the bills to pay in any event ought to be allowed to say something about it. They are not proposing to confiscate any man's property or to violate pledges, neither are they proposing to loot upon the savings banks of this State by this bill which has been amended and amended in the committee in order to safeguard every interest. And I say if the town of Camden desires to pay these bills, should she not have a right to do it?

There are two millions of taxable property behind their promises and agreements. What has the Camden Water Company with which to back up their agreements?

If the town of Camden cannot underwrite its proportionate part of those bonds so as to make them at least as good as they are now, I don't know why that proposition is here—not to wreck the savings banks, not to destroy their investments—but actually to put the town of Camden under a large part of these same bonds to guarantee the payment of them—will that make them any poorer with the property that they now have secured by every pound of iron and every

foot of pipe in the town of Camden? And it must remain so until every bond is cancelled to the last dollar. And then setting apart every dollar of that bonded indebtedness that the commission appointed by the supreme court says it is worth and that this town shall assume and pay, then under-writing that, I ask you again if the security held by the savings banks of the State are to be made any less valuable?

I believe that all this talk about a loot upon the savings banks is made to prejudice the minds of men who are to vote upon this proposition. And I want to call attention to one fact, that while the parties in issue here are nominally, the town of Camden and the Rockland & Camden Water Company, the real parties in interest here are the people of the State of Maine against the corporations and quasi corporations who have been loaned the franchises of the State. These Napoleons of finance, men who have an eye to the coming times and the coming fancies before the people of the State were awake to their rights and duties in this matter, had taken possession of the State of Maine practically to the last inch. Everything that was worth a dollar had been covered by a charter of some kind. But now the people are awakening. The idea of municipal control and ownership has been gaining ground. If this question is settled right it will make it easier for the next town to maintain its rights. If you beat down the principle here upon this proposition it will make it harder for the next municipality that comes here. Therefore I insist on settling this question right.

I listened through the hearing on this matter before the committee; and I would not advise the ousting of this company from this territory unless the facts show a good case and unless the facts proved that these people are in earnest and mean what they say. I never would lift my voice or say one word in favor of their proposition, but when I see 200 people coming from a distance of almost 100 miles and attesting their loyalty to the ideas which they are addressing to you, when I

see that they came here with their tax payers, their reputable men, their leading citizens, testifying to the inadequacy of the service of this plant and their intention to go forward and take care of this matter themselves, I am compelled to believe that it is not a mere makeshift for the purpose of hurting somebody, but that it is a movement in real dead earnest. If it is not, then this bill can do the Camden & Rockland Company no harm. For this thing must still go back to the town of Camden and there, if there is such a tremendous majority against this municipal ownership, they will still have a chance to express their opinion and stop the matter there. I believe in the referendum, I believe in keeping down near to the people who have the thing at heart and who are to pay the bills in either event. (Applause).

Even in poorer places than Camden which has a population of 5000 and a valuation of \$2,000,000 the people can be trusted to act for their own interest. They say the town of Camden cannot afford this. Who says it that has the authority to say it? But these bonds and securities of the Rockland & Camden Water Company are threatened from another quarter. The people of this town of Camden, having a record of 90 fires in 13 years, have got tired and sick at heart. They swear by all the powers above that they will not continue the Water Company under the conditions of service that they have been having. I say that there will be a decrease of income to this company from the fact that town of Camden has refused and will refuse hereafter to renew a contract with this company. They feel that they might just as well burn up without a water system in name as to be burned up with one. Therefore, they say that never again will this contract be renewed which expires next July.

When the proposition is made that they will go to work now and remedy the defects it is an admission and needs no other proof that that system has been insufficient and inadequate and is so today. Why are they going now to put on an expert engineer?

They had one on there and I heard him testify before the committee; and while I knew he was testifying to sustain his own reputation as an engineer, he did not and could not dispute the fact that the system has been insufficient and is insufficient, today, although the people of Camden for 13 years have been paying \$1000 a year for that very service for fire purposes, and have lost in that time certainly more than a quarter of a million dollars by fire, not at some great conflagration but scattered over the 13 years, 90 fires, and never one of them as I remember the testimony that was handled in such a way as you would expect with an adequate supply of water to handle a fire.

Now, are we to send these people from Camden back to the sea shore again without having granted their request to even give them a chance? They do not ask you to grant them a charter outright, they are not asking you to rob anybody of their vested rights. If you grant this bill you are taking the property of this quasi public corporation just the same as you allow them to take my property. Do they stand on any better ground than any private individual in this State? Their vested rights are not to be regarded any more than the vested rights of any citizen however humble. I say that your commission created by the terms of this bill have a right to take into account every proposition and every question that is equitable, legal, just, right and proper, and give this water company every dollar of value that they are entitled to on any ground, and then compel the town of Camden if they want to go into this thing to pay over and above this bonded debt and these mortgages whatever this commission determines.

This question of danger is brought forward to prejudice people in passing upon this question. There is no danger about it. If the town of Camden gets hurt in this operation that is not your fault of mine: they take their chances. The only question is, will we let them try it if they want to. I sincerely and firmly believe that the people of the State of Maine who have been advised

of this discussion, today, are listening with intent ears to hear what the verdict of this Legislature is to be upon this question. They are anxious to know how this Legislature feels about it and upon which side it is going to line up in this irrepressible conflict which is bound to go on from now out. (applause) because the people will triumph if they do not triumph today. (Applause).

On motion of Mr. Walker of Starks, Adjourned.

#### Afternoon Session

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Mr. Dudley, from the committee on ways and means, to which was referred bill, an act to assess the State tax for the year 1901, reported ought to pass.

On motion of Mr. Dudley the rules were suspended, the bill received its three several readings and was passed to be engrossed.

Bill, an act relating to the fees of the sheriff of Cumberland county, was read twice.

On motion of Mr. Webb of Portland. the rules were suspended, the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

An act to create a State department of agriculture, was passed to be enacted.

Resolve in favor of summer training schools for teachers and the distribution of educational documents, was finally passed.

Resolve providing means for examination of claims for State pensions, was tabled on motion of Mr. Bird of Rockland pending its final passage.

Resolve providing for the screening of Sebago lake, was finally passed.

On motion of Mr. Pettingill of Rumford, bill, an act to prevent throwing refuse matter into the tributaries of lakes in Vienna and Mount Vernon, was taken from the table.

The House reconsidered the vote whereby this bill was assigned for Thursday. Mr. Pettingill offered an amendment: "This act shall take effect January 1, 1902."

The amendment was adopted and the bill was read a second time.

On motion of Mr. Pettingill the rules were suspended, the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended.

Mr. Parkhurst, from the committee on the judiciary, reported in a new draft and ought to pass bill, an act in relation to political caucuses in the city of Bangor. (Printed under joint rules.)

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported in a new draft and ought to pass bill, an act in relation to political caucuses in the city of Lewiston. (Printed under joint rules.)

#### CAMDEN WATER BILL.

Mr. CARLETON of Winthrop: Mr. Speaker, I am extremely reluctant at this time to undertake to address this House upon this subject. Especially so after it has been handled with such consummate skill, eloquence and ability by the gentlemen who have preceded me. Mr. Speaker, I would not presume upon the patience of the members of this House now but for the fact that I was a member of the judiciary committee which considered this bill. Were I to cut loose from the facts and give free course to vivid imagination, I could not then hope to equal the fine efforts of the gentlemen from Portland and Poland. I shall not indulge in sneers or innuendoes—they are not argument. I take it that however much we may be charmed by eloquence, cold facts will decide what should be done. I entered upon the hearing in favor of this measure because of the fact that whenever a municipality wants its own water works I am in favor of it, when conditions are such that it can do so without unwarrantably interfering with or injury to the rights of others. Municipalities are not denied—have not been denied.

The proposed bill is not the one presented, and upon which the exhaustive and extended hearing, lasting from 2 o'clock in the afternoon to 2 o'clock in the morning, was held. Nobody now, as far as I know, wants that bill to become a law. But we have a new draft upon which no hearing was held, that the minority of the committee have reported, ought to pass, and that is the question for us to decide.

Now everybody, I take it, in the State of Maine is proud of the beautiful town of Camden—proud of her people, proud of their business enterprise, and no one would lift a finger, say a word, or do a thing to injure her; but on the other hand everyone is anxious to do that which will be for her true interests and greater prosperity; and I take exceptions to the statement that this is a fight between the people and corporation who don't want this bill. Now what are the undisputed facts in this case?

Up to a few years ago Camden had no water works. True, she had then as now—some of the most lovely lakes in all the State of Maine, beautiful beyond description, in the midst of a cluster of grand mountains, with an abundance of the purest water within her very gates. These conditions had existed from the dawn of creation—since the morning stars sang together, but nobody in Camden had ever made a move to supply her with water. A few public spirited men, citizens of our grand State, who believed in Maine, who were loyal to her interests, undertaking to develop her resources and invest their money at home rather than sending it to Fort Payne or Cardiff for investment and loss, organized a water company. They procured a charter of a Maine Legislature; they invested large sums of money, \$176,000 of their own, and supplied Rockland and Thomaston with pure water. Camden wanted this company to run a main to her village; it was done, and for 10 years this water company supplied water to her citizens; and from the time the first contract was made, from that day to this no complaint by the town of Camden has ever been made to this company, officially or otherwise.

It is an undisputed fact, and I challenge successful contradiction, that the waters of Mirror lake, from whence is this water supply, is absolutely pure water. No complaint has ever been made of the domestic supply, nor as to the price, for it is a fact conclusively proven and not denied, that the prices are considerably less than the average prices for water for like service in Maine or Massachusetts. Does Camden

want this charter? I challenge anyone to prove by the testimony that one-third even of the voters of Camden have ever asked for this charter, or want it. The proof is, there are 750 voters in the town, with a population of 2825. The largest vote ever cast in town meeting, when this water question was considered, was 316, and that was the vote cast for a selectman at the election in the forenoon. Now the town clerk, a former member of this House, and a man whose word is as good as gold anywhere, testified that is the afternoon, when this matter of applying for a charter came up, there were not more than 250 present, and never did more than 200 vote for it. I am fully justified, therefore, in saying that the people of Camden have never asked for this charter. There are no petitions here for it, the vote of the town is looked upon. Moreover, it was demonstrated at the hearing that those who pay a majority of the tax in Camden are opposed to this charter.

The total valuation, in round numbers, is \$18,000,000; their total tax, in round numbers, is \$37,000,000. Those who have signed the remonstrance against this charter, or have sent letters remonstrating against it, pay a tax of \$19,250.

Three things were relied upon at the hearing:

First, the impurity of the water.

Second, an inadequate domestic supply.

Third, inadequate supply for fire purposes.

The first two points were entirely abandoned, as the proof was overwhelming against these propositions.

The third allegation, an insufficient water supply for fire, was insisted upon before the committee. The testimony, to say the least, is conflicting upon this point. They have had more than their fair share of fires since the water system was put in—90, the testimony showed, with an alleged failure of water supply variously stated as from seven to 17 of them. The big fire, so called, is held up as an awful example, but the proof was, no water service could have prevented it. And nobody at that time thought of attaching blame to the company. It is a remarkable fact that these merchants, business men whose stores were burned, are earnestly protesting against the granting of this charter. They don't mean to use this charter if they get it. The proof was that more than a dozen of those the most active in pushing it have said so; witness after witness so testified and they did not even deny it, though some of them were present and heard this testimony. Camden has a good water supply. She needs something more than she does this charter. She is in debt. She has \$35,000 town debt; to be exact, \$37,116. She has a village corporation with a bonded debt of \$35,000. A system of water works—the proof was from their own witness—would cost \$91,000. This is appalling for a town less than 3000 and a valuation less than two million dollars. Camden does need schoolhouses. The su-



perintendent of schools testified that no new schoolhouses had been built in 30 years—proposition to build a modern one voted down. They have not got a modern schoolhouse—they said they were too poor—too much in debt—hiring rooms in third story, over a naphtha and benzine paint shop only last year, down at the wharves, over a carriage storage and machine shop. I submit, a town too poor to build suitable schoolhouses is not in a financial condition to indulge in the luxury of a double system of water works.

This bill calls for an unwarrantable interference with vested rights—for a dismemberment of this system. Good Maine energy, pluck and money has been invested in this water company, \$625,000 in bonds issued by it. Our people have them, \$176,000 in stock has been paid in—all used in building these works. After paying interest, fixed charges, about 2 per cent. on stock remains. Four thousand, eight hundred and ninety-four shares have been issued—between 5 and 6 per cent. only on amount of stock actually paid in. This is Maine money, invested by Maine men under a Maine charter.

You will be very slow to strike a blow that will create distrust of these securities, held largely by our own savings banks. The gentleman from Poland says that he would like to have Camden get under some of these bonds. There is no such proposition in this bill. The framers have framed it with consummate skill to keep Camden from under.

No, gentlemen, you will treat this company fairly, even liberally, and future Legislatures can right any wrong, should any be found to exist. (Applause.)

Mr. PATTANGALL of Machias: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak at all upon this subject today. I was, in fact, somewhat in doubt how I should vote upon it. The argument of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Webb) this morning was a strong one, for I firmly believe in protecting in every way the property of the State. I believe that the vested rights of corporations, like the vested rights of individuals, are sacred and ought to be protected; but any doubts that I entertained in regard to this bill have been entirely removed from my mind by the able argument of the gentleman from Winthrop (Mr. Carleton). If it is, as he states, a fact that a majority of the people of Camden never are going to vote for water works then this bill can do no harm, and that leaves the simple question of whether or not the Legislature is going to grant to that municipality the right to sometime, if they like, do something that they may want to do.

So far as bonds are concerned, under the statement of the gentleman from Winthrop they are safe. So far as the rights of that corporation are concerned they are absolutely safe, for if he is correct, and I presume he is, this bill is the most harmless measure that was ever introduced to a Maine Legislature and I wonder that anybody is opposed to its passage. No danger exists in the passage of this bill, no harm can ever come to anybody and it would be a source of gratification undoubtedly to those few people

in Camden who desire this, to grant to those few people this little boon which they ask and are never going to use—a mere plaything, a toy for them to amuse themselves with. (Laughter and applause.)

I think we ought to give it to them out of the pure kindness of our hearts without regard to the serious side of the situation at all if the facts, the "cold facts" as the gentleman from Winthrop calls them, are in reality cold facts. I had supposed that there must have been some real strong local issue in Knox county last year. (Laughter). It had occurred to me that nothing else could account for the presence of the gentleman from Knox in the Senate this winter. (Laughter).

If there is not any quarrel down there, then of course we can pass the bill. But if, on the other hand, there are people who do want the thing and who want it seriously, whether they are in the majority or in the minority in the town of Camden, what right, in the name of Heaven, have a Maine Legislature got to deprive them of the right to have municipal water works? There has not been a charter which has gone through the legal affairs committee this winter, and I do not think there has been one that has gone through the judiciary, establishing water works in any town in the State where a clause has not been carefully inserted that the town at some future time should have the right to buy the water works of the private company located in that town.

I believe in the municipal ownership of electric light companies, of telegraph and telephone companies, and where private corporations have located in a town electric light companies or water companies I believe in the absolute right of the towns, under fair conditions, to purchase from the private corporations the water works or electric lights, as the case may be, and use them for the benefit of their citizens. Nobody proposes to take the property of the Camden and Rockland Water Company. This bill proposes that, if the people of the town of Camden so vote, and they cannot do it unless they so vote, they shall have the right to borrow money and purchase these water works, not confiscate them, and give back to the good citizens of Maine, whose enterprise I admire, the good dollars they have put into them with interest added if need be, for the bill says that if they have sunk money there or have improved their property, if they have made it worth more than the mere cost of the property, they shall be remunerated. Every right, every stockholder and bondholder in the company is carefully guarded in the bill. It is for us to see that the rights of the citizens of Camden are as carefully guarded. It matters not to me whether the service has been adequate or inadequate; it matters not whether the water has been pure or impure. It is not a question of one competing corporation against another. If it was, I would not agree to it for a moment. It is a question of the municipality resuming the right that the State gave to a corpo-

ration and paying for the resumption and paying for it in full. In the town in which I live is a water company, one of the best water companies in the State, and still, if the people of the town of Machias desired to purchase at a fair price that property from the Machias water company and the Maine Legislature refused them the right, I should feel that a gross injustice had been done the people of my town. The people of Camden are not forced to take this. They take it if they want to. And when they take it they must pay for it. Nobody is going to suffer by the passage of the bill in either event. In regard to the bonds—the savings bank in the town in which I live holds some of those bonds. I can see a danger to those bonds if this charter is refused. I do not believe that the people of Camden are going to come to this Legislature, as they have come, and ask for something that they want, that they ought to have, that they have a right to have, and be turned down by the Legislature and then vote to contract next summer to take any more water from the water company. I believe if you want to get our part of the income of that company and give them no return from it, you want to refuse Camden the right that they ask. I believe if you want to give away part of the income of that company and give them no return for it, you want to refuse Camden the right they ask. I believe that is the danger to the men holding the bonds, and the savings banks, and that no danger can come to those bonds from the town of Camden paying in cash for the part of the property located in the town.

It is true that this bill has been amended, but it seems to me that it is hardly a fair criticism. I understand that it was amended especially to meet the objection raised by the gentlemen who have signed the majority report. To turn around now and criticize the friends of the bill for having amended it to meet objections made by the enemies of the bill is not a fair argument for any man to make.

I do not desire to take the time of the House at any length. I do want to say one thing. Some of us are here representing not only our constituents and in a larger sense the State, but representing a party. Some of us still have some love left for the Republican party. Some of us remember the pledges that were made in the campaign and the pledges that earlier in the session were made on the floor of this House, and I submit that it is our duty to see that this Legislature does not do that which is directly opposed to the interests of the people. And I say that I believe from what I have learned in conversation with friends in Knox county and in that part of the State, that if this charter is refused, if the Legislature declines to grant to the town of Camden a right which I submit every gentleman who so far has spoken has said every town ought to have, in the next campaign in Knox county the Republican leaders will have more to answer for than they had in the last one and a harder campaign to fight. And this thing will go out of the county and over

the State, and if the Republican party once assumes a position, and lays down as its party policy—and this Legislature is acting almost entirely as a Republican Legislature—if it lays down as a part of its party policy that the rights of the municipality shall be disregarded at the request and behest of the private corporations, no matter how worthy, the party has taken a step from which it does not recede the people will drive it. I believe in the members of the Legislature individually doing what they please; but this matter is entitled to the same honest, careful, conscientious consideration that any other matter is which has come before you, and you should, I believe, think well and think long before you refuse to a town that which every one of you would demand for your own town if your town desired it. (Applause).

Mr. DEERING of Saco: Mr. Speaker, I am solicitous to have municipalities own and control water works or any other public corporations. Still, in this case, it does not seem to me to be a matter of consistency. The gentleman who last spoke and who says he is so much in favor of municipal ownership, had before his own committee on legal affairs the town of Waldoboro who asked that it be given a municipal charter. At the same time there was pending before that committee a private company, and the legal affairs committee, of which the gentleman from Machias is now a member, turned down the municipal charter and granted the charter to the private company. It seems strange to me that we should be faced with the bill of four or five pages going towards taking control and buying up some other company which is already in the field. I have been accused of inconsistency in this matter and I wish to make myself clear. I stood shoulder to shoulder with the gentleman from Poland (Mr. Libby) when we fought and strove to prevent any foreign corporation shutting out and curtailing the interests of any party of plain men from doing business in this State; and the gentleman from Poland says today that he believes in the referendum, and so do we all when it concerns the nearest and dearest interests of the people, but not so far that it lets citizens in one community at each other's throats in a financial and internal warfare. The friends of municipal corporations owning their own franchises, if they pass this bill, will give their principle a set back from which it cannot recover. I say to you that if we pass this bill as it now stands, municipal ownership will receive such a set back that forever after it will go begging for an audience. As I said, I did not intend to make any speech on it. I simply wanted to make my position clear as to why I vote against the new draft of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of Rockport: Mr. Speaker, I have been much surprised to find the true financial condition of the town of Camden, that some of the good people of that town, have stated here in the corridors of this State

House, and upon the floor of this room, which in my candid opinion are far from being correct. I still believe that Camden is financially all right and amply able to pay for any venture they may desire.

I feel with pride the honor conferred in sending me here to represent Camden, a town which has no superior for scenery, location and able business propensities, and whose future prospects are without a par within our good State. I feel grieved to find a few of the people that I have considered among the foremost to proclaim her great advantages, now preaching her poverty. But Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, be not deceived by words, for let me inform you, that before the Camden & Rockland Water Company attempted to supply our town with water, many of the citizens of Camden felt, and so publicly stated that in their opinion Camden should put in a system of their own, just what the majority of the tax payers are praying to you today.

But, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I think that the question before this House, must be looked upon in a much broader sense that a mere charter for the town of Camden to supply itself with pure water, and that is the great and very important question, Whether or no municipalities shall control their own affairs. As regards water, lights, etc., or shall they be subject to corporation rule. We see all about us, and also throughout our entire country, a gradual consolidation of capital, and a tendency to control all branches of industry of any importance, hence I feel that it behooves us to look about us, to see what it means, and act accordingly.

I fail to see why Camden should not be permitted to have what it locally desires the Camden & Rockland Water Company, to the contrary notwithstanding, hence, gentlemen, I trust you will consider us fairly, and by your votes grant us the charter as prayed for, just as you would have us do by you.

In regard to an adequate water supply. I claim that the pond is over-taxed today, the claim was made by

Col. Fogler before the Governor and Council, that by reason of supplying the Maine State prison the company had to extend their system to the Thomaston brook at an expense of \$75,000. Now the engineer comes here and informs the committee that said extension cost \$47,000. Now as a matter of fact how much water does said extension actually supply? I have been at the dam across said brook several times, but never saw one drop of water in said dam.

Mr. BENNETT of Hollis: I hold in my hand a circular signed by nobody and which comes from nowhere. (Laughter). I suppose it comes from Camden; and as there has been a good deal said about the quality of the water in Camden I want to call attention to a letter from Professor Robinson of Bowdoin College. He analysed this water from Mirrow lake and he says that it is almost as pure as any pure spring water that he ever analysed. I have a letter from H. L. Bowker, State assayer for Massachusetts who says that this water is of remarkable purity, superior to any water that he has seen which came from this State. That disposes of the first statement in the statement of facts. I have another statement here in regard to the same matter. "I know of no better system of water supply in the State. We regard it as exceptionally pure. I know of no cases of typhoid fever except those who were imported here since the water supply was put into the town. I think the price of the water is very reasonable."

The bonded debt of the town of Camden at 4 per cent. is \$22,900. Temporary loans, \$13,250. That makes a total of \$35,000. There is also in addition to that, a debt of the Village Corporation of \$30,000 or \$40,000 which makes a total of \$70,000. That is quite a burden for that town to undertake to build water works with. Now here is the statement that the town of Camden has paid to this water company from \$8000 to \$9000 annually for the last 13 years. The real facts are that Camden has paid to the water company \$1000 for fire purposes and that the citizens of Camden have paid

\$6000 for domestic water during the past year. For the first six years the company received hardly anything. That disposes of three of the important statements in this thing. Consequently I do not think that much credence should be put upon anything that it contains. I do not believe that they are going to knock over the Camden water works today with any such weapon.

Mr. MADDOCKS of Boothbay Harbor: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: The case before us seems to me to be a business contract between the town of Camden and the Rockland & Camden Water Company. If the town of Camden's water service is insufficient, as they would have us believe it is, the remedy I would suggest would be that they make their complaint to the water company, and if they refuse or neglect to remedy the defects of the water system they have a right to appeal to the courts to enforce the conditions of their contract. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the town of Camden is a party to this contract and is morally bound to stand by the water company, which has expended so much money to afford them a water supply. This Legislature is asked in this case to relieve them of this obligation. Should we do it, it would be the beginning to undermine the policy under which every public corporation in our State has been organized.

Shall we legislate to depreciate the securities in our savings banks? A large per cent. of these water bonds are owned by them. They are the property of our citizens who deposit in these banks. Shall we create in the public mind any fear that our public corporations are to be interfered with and that their credit shall be jeopardized by adverse legislation? Would it not interfere seriously with the further development of our natural resources and retard our industrial progress? Can the State of Maine afford to trig the wheels of our industries which are being developed by attempting any adverse or unnecessary legislation at this time? Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I trust not, and I hope that this major-

ity report will be accepted. I further desire to set an example to those who may follow me to make short speeches, and believe that the case is well understood, and we only ask an opportunity to vote.

Mr. WALTER of Waldoboro: Mr. Speaker, the fast horses have all got through and the scrubs are now at it. (Laughter.) I have no hankering to take part in this discussion or any other, and I don't know as it will make one hair white or black by doing so. If questions could be settled right without discussion, nothing would please me more. But for three reasons I want to say a few words. First, I have a natural disposition to abhor the granting of a life lease of special privileges; second, I firmly believe in public ownership of public benefits when they desire it and can; third, but not least, I had a letter from a dear relative, a taxpayer in the beautiful village of Camden, asking me to stand upon the floor of this House in defense of this bill in question. I have climbed the steep of the mountain at the base of which nestles this thriving, growing village, a place where the summer tourists lavish their money and hold regal sway, and I have often commented, and heard others prophecy that the future prosperity and growth of the village is yet undreamed of. We talk about the town being unable to put in its own water works. Just as if we were its guardians, just as if a thousand men could not do what a dozen has done. Why don't we set up a howl when an individual starts an enterprise? We do not question his intentions or ability, because it is none of our business, in a way, whether he succeeds or not; it is his right to do as it seemeth good with his own. Let us give the town of Camden the privilege to exercise the function which is rightfully her own, and for which right she is here as a supplicant at the throne of this Legislature. See the efforts already spent in her behalf and the money her citizens have put forth in ample evidence that she is in dead earnest. There is no question but that the present company operating there has given very poor service for years, according to the evidence submitted at

the hearing, and that they know the conditions. Now I submit that if they had the interest for the Camden people that they pretend, this difficulty might have been remedied long ere this, and this Legislature could have adjourned perhaps, one day earlier, for this matter would not have been here for us to settle. I do not blame the corporation for holding fast until the last effort is spent. It is the natural right of mankind to buy and sell and get gain. This water company, I understand, has operated there for years and has already received ample payment for all capital invested. This bill takes nothing from them without adequate remuneration, and I submit that it would be unfair to deprive the town of Camden from operating a system of water works upon her own domain, but rather still continue to make her subject unto a few capitalists whom she has in no uncertain terms asked to be rid of. Not that they have any antipathy against the company or are not grateful for any favor they may have done for them; but because a man lends you money, and you pay him interest, does it signify that he owns you forever? Would it not be favor for favor? It has been said that the passage of this bill would discourage capitalists from investing their money for public benefit. Why did they not think of this when we passed the Eastern Telephone bill? As Mr. Pattengall said at that time: "Monopoly is a terrible thing unless you are in it." I notice the same gentleman who advocated the passage of the Eastern Telephone bill are opposing the passage of this bill, because I understand they are, or have personal friends who are in it. It seems to me that with them consistency has ceased to be a jewel. Gentlemen, I sincerely hope the majority report may have a passage.

Mr. HIX of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I think the details of this question are now fully understood. The members of this House know that the town of Camden is divided on this question. They know that the towns of Rockport and Thomaston and the city of Rockland are supplied by the same company through the same main without complaint. I have heard, this after-

noon, a fact which, if I knew it, I had forgotten, that the company has put in a pumping station and now takes water from Holman's pond to supply in part the towns of Thomaston and Rockland. That being the case the case the towns of Camden and Rockport must certainly now have the full benefit, or nearly so, of the waters of Mirror lake, and it is certainly an argument against the theory that they have not sufficient pressure, neither do I believe that all corporations are harmful to the communities in which they operate. I believe generally that majorities are right, but I also believe that some majorities make mistakes. Today on any public question like this there is danger that the particular case under discussion will be lost sight of by the prejudice existing in some minds against all corporations also by the belief that municipal ownership of water plants is always desirable. Now I believe that each case should be decided on its own merits. If the people of Camden were united in this matter, and did great defects exist, I should take another view, but with only one complaint, and that one which if it exists can be easily remedied, with many of the leading business men of the town protesting against it, I should show better reasons and a more united front before asking for this legislation. I am satisfied that when the people of any community are oppressed they will make the fact so evident that no question will arise in the minds of fair-minded men as to what course they will pursue; and with only such strength as we have seen behind this movement, the Legislature of Maine had better let existing conditions alone.

Mr. FULLER of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, this is a question that comes very near my heart.

I feel and have felt for a long time that every municipality should have the same. It is a prerogative belonging to every community.

The tendency now is in the direction of municipal ownership, and I trust this Legislature will take no step backward. I have some experience in

my own beautiful city of Auburn. A few years ago a corporation owned the water works and the city asked for a charter. We were told that it was wrong, illegal, unconstitutional, exceeding our debt limits and worse of all, terribly wicked to seize property from good, honest men who had in good faith, at a time when the city wanted them to do so, the same as Camden. Some of our taxpayers opposed it, but about 12,000 wanted to own the water works against about 12, who had honestly invested their money and either honestly or dishonestly were actually securing more than 20 per cent. We did not come here to legislate. Well, we came to Augusta and demanded a charter and got it. The result is that we have had very superior service at much reduced rates.

I trust and firmly believe that neither this Legislature nor any Legislature that will convene in this State in the future will refuse to grant any community a charter for it. (Applause.)

Mr. CRAMER of Washington: Mr. Speaker, stories are told in the town of Hope, which town I represent, and the town of Union, that Camden was going to come into the towns of Hope and Union and tap their ponds and their lakes and destroy their mill property and their lumber there. They believed it and thought it was true and therefore they were induced to sign a remonstrance against this bill. That remonstrance was brought here under those circumstances when it never should have gone to any committee in this House. It was a fraud on the face of it. Let us call things by their right name. I want to call attention to the fact that the old Rockland Water Company came here and got a charter many years ago. I think it was about the first water company in the State of Maine. The gentlemen composing the Rockland and Camden Water Company did not care anything about the rights of the old charter or the stock and bonds of the old company, and they asked for a charter to run their pipes parallel with those of the old water company. If it is wrong today for the people of Camden to fight with the Camden and Rockland

Water Company, I ask if it was not wrong for that Rockland and Camden Water Company to come here and ask for the right to compete with the old water company? They did not propose to pay them, either, but they proposed to drive them out, and they did so. But the people of Camden propose to pay spot cash for every dollar of bonds and stock that belong to them to pay this company; and they have got two millions of property behind them to back it. Is there any danger of the banks losing the money that they may have in these bonds and stocks? It has been stated upon the floor of this House that there are \$500,000 worth of bonds, and that is true. But how much money has this corporation put into this water company? They have put in \$177,000 and they have watered it to the tune of \$500,000, and they ask this Legislature to tie the good people of the town of Camden to the tail of a kite. Are you going to make the municipalities of the State of Maine to pay for the watered stock, watered to the tune of \$317,000. Is it right, is it just? We who are in favor of this bill demand justice. We ask nothing more and we hope that you will give us nothing less.

As to the property taxed in Camden—I have here a certified copy from the tax collector in the village of Camden, and he says that the whole amount committed to him was \$37,000, and that the amount that was committed to him to be paid by the remonstrants is \$7522. Now, gentlemen, I hope when we come to a vote upon this question our motto will be, equal rights and equal laws and equal justice to all and especial privileges to none. (Applause.)

Mr. LIBBY of Poland: Mr. Speaker, I move that the minority report of the committee be substituted for the majority report, and that when the question is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. BEAL of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, up to within 48 hours I have been in favor of voting for the town of Camden. I believe in municipal ownership of water works, but when I read this bill I cannot as a fair and honest man vote for it. It has just been stated by

the gentleman who preceded me that the town of Camden proposes to take and pay in cash for all they receive. It was stated, this morning, by the gentleman from Poland (Mr. Libby), that the town of Camden proposed to underwrite these bonds, or at least I understood it so. In this bill I find that the commissioners appointed by the judges of the supreme court have the right to go on and appraise the property taken for the town of Camden. their appraisal with the amount of. Then they find the relative value of their appraisal with the amount of bonds issued is more than the amount of the value appraised on the water works in Camden. the town of Camden simply pays the difference. They do not pay a cent of the bonds. They do not meddle with the bonds, and do not agree to pay them. Furthermore it states that if the value of the water works is not so much, as the relative value of the bonds upon the water works, the company shall pay to the town of Camden the difference which the commissioners find. Is that fair? I say, furthermore, that this bill provides that for running these water works for five or any number of years, if they become dissatisfied they can turn it back on the company without one cent of redress, and it says nothing about the \$10,000 which they have paid them more or less. Is that fair? For that reason I cannot vote for this bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Those who voted yea were:

YEA—Andrews of Norway, Andrews of Rockport, Briggs of Harrison, Jackson of Jefferson, Libby of Poland, Littlehale, McNamara, Pattangall, Putnam of Dixfield, Skidmore, Thornton, Trickey—12.

NAY—Adams, Allan of Portland, Allen of Sanford, Ballard, Beal, Bennett, Bird, Bodwell, Boothby, Brackett, Bradford, Briggs of Hudson, Burrill, Cain, Carleton, Carson, Cnase, Cook, Cordwell, Crosby, Davis, Deering, Dobson, Dudley, Dunn, Farnsworth of Beddington, Farnsworth of Pembroke, Fay, Fellows, Foster, Frederick, Fuller of Kennebunk, Gammon, Gooding, Hammond, Harvey, Haskell of Lewiston, Hix, Hodgkins, Hurd, Irving, Jackson of Monson, Jones, Kaler, Laliberte, Lawrence, Leathers, Libby of South Berwick, Little of Lewiston, Little of Monmouth, Loud, Low, Maddocks, Manley, McDougall, Mead, Minott, Morin, Moulton of South Portland, Noyes, Page, Parkhurst, Peabody, Pettengill, Pike,

Plummer, Powers of Pittston, Pratt, Purinton, Randall, Sabourin, Shaw, Smith, Some, Sprague, Staples, Stevens, Sturgis, Sutherland, Swett, Thompson of Bristol, Thompson of China, Vogel, Webb, Weymouth, White of Naples, Williams, Wilson—88.

ABSENT—Carr, Clark, Cushman, Dearborn, Dillingham, Farrell, Gardner, Hutchings, Hyde, Kneeland, Merritt, Porter, Sanborn, Tufts, White of East Machias—14.

The following pairs were announced: Mr. Boyd no, with Mr. Powers of Fort Fairfield yes; Mr. Brewster no, with Mr. Young yes; Mr. Coffin no, with Mr. Russ yes; Mr. Cramer yes, with Mr. Hinkley no; Mr. Daigie yes, with Mr. Phoenix no; Mo. Dodge no, with Mr. Knowlton yes; Mr. Eaton no, with Mr. Walker yes; Mr. Fuller of Auburn yes, with Mr. Mayo no; Mr. Gilmore no, with Mrs. Putnam of Houlton yes; Mr. Greene yes, with Mr. Sargent no; Mr. Harris yes, with Mr. Spofford no; Mr. Haskell of Windham yes, with Mr. Walter no; Mr. Hill of Belfast no, with Mr. Hill of Exeter yes; Mr. Hoxie no, with Mr. Kelley yes; Mr. Libby of Burnham no, with Mr. Young yes; Mr. Moulton of Bowdoinham no, with Mr. Walls yes; Mr. Ross yes, with Mr. Scammon no; Mr. Thomas no, with Mr. Weatherbee yes.

The majority report was accepted and the papers sent to the Senate.

Papers from the Senate.

Bill, an act to fix the compensation of the sheriff of the county of Lincoln, which passed to be engrossed in the House, March 5, came from the Senate amended by Senate amendments "A" and "B," and passed to be engrossed as amended.

The vote whereby the bill passed to be engrossed was reconsidered. Senate amendments "A" and "B" adopted in concurrence, and bill as amended passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Ordered, that the time within which the committee on legal affairs shall submit their final report be extended to Tuesday, March 19.

Was read and passed in concurrence.

Bill, an act to regulate junk and second-hand stores. Came up as a special assignment. and was read a second time. Mr. Fuller of Auburn, offered House amendment A which was adopted. The bill was read the third time under suspension of rules, passed to be engrossed as amended and was sent to the Senate.

Bill, an act to extend the charter of the Waldoboro Water and Electric Light and Power Company.

Came up as a special assignment, and read once.

Mr. Walter of Waldoboro, offered House amendments A, B and C. Pending their adoption, Mr. McDougall of Boothbay, moved that the bill of

amendments be laid on the table, and Tuesday afternoon next assigned for their consideration. The motion was lost. Amendments A, B and C were rejected. The bill was read a second time, and on motion of Mr. Allen of Portland, rules were suspended, bill read the third time, passed to be engrossed and was sent to the Senate.

Resolve in favor of the town of Brookton.

Came up as a special assignment and was read the second time. Pending passage to be engrossed, the resolve was tabled, on motion of Mr. Foster of Oakland. Subsequently, on motion of Mr. Foster, taken from the table, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

Bill, an act for the better protection of shell fish within the towns of West Bath and Brunswick.

Came up as a special assignment. On motion of Mr. Minott of Phippsburg, the bill was re-tabled and Tuesday next assigned for its consideration.

Bill, an act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 100 of the Public Laws of 1891, relative to campfires.

Came up as a special assignment. On motion of Mr. Fellows of Bucksport, the bill was re-tabled and Tuesday next assigned for its consideration.

Bill, an act to fix the amount of allowance for clerk hire in the office of the adjutant general.

Came up as a special assignment. On motion of Mr. Deering of Saco, the bill was re-tabled and Tuesday next assigned for its consideration.

Resolve in favor of repairing and rebuilding bridge across the Thoroughfare, which forms a part of the eastern boundary of the town of Orient. Mr. Putnam of Houlton, moved that the rules be suspended, the resolve take its two several readings and pass to be engrossed. Subsequently the motion was withdrawn, the resolve referred to the committee on legal affairs and sent to the Senate.

On motion of Mr. Pratt of Veazie, an act in relation to railroad crossings, was taken from the table, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

On motion of Mr. Walls of Vinalhaven,

Adjourned.