

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Legislative Record

OF THE

Seventy-Fifth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1911

filed. At that time the report had not been prepared as it was to be in a new draft and would incur considerable trouble. Later on I have been informed that there is an amendment which will be offered at the proper time, which will meet my objections. I therefore have no intention of filing a minority report. With the understanding that an amendment will be filed later, I want the Senate to understand that the minority report which I suggested at the time, will probably not be filed.

I now yield to the senator from Knox.

Mr. STAPLES of Knox: Mr. President, I am very glad that the senator from Oxford has taken that course. It leaves me with only one thing to do this morning in regard to that bill, and that is to move the acceptance of the report of the committee.

The motion was agreed to and the bill was tabled for printing under the joint rules.

On motion by Mr. Stearns of Oxford, Pill, An Act to enlarge the Rumford Falls Village Corporation, was taken from the table.

On further motion by the same senator, the vote whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed was reconsidered.

Mr. STEARNS: Mr. President, I will say that the purpose of this motion is to place the bill in a position where it can be re-committed to the committee on judiciary in order that there may be additional territory included in the Rumford Falls Village Corporation, which was not taken care of at the hearing, on the petition now in the hands of the committee, asking for further enlargement of the same Village Corporation.

I now move that the bill be re-committed to the judiciary committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STAPLES of Knox: Mr. President, I desire to give notice at this time that tomorrow morning I will take from the table Senate Document No. 22. I should take it from the table this morning but Senator Donigan, who put in the amendment, is not

present. He will be here tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to and the bill was specially assigned for tomorrow.

On motion by Mr. Osborn of Somerset, the House order, in relation to the Governor appointing three attorneys-at-law who shall constitute a committee to examine the municipal courts of the State, was taken from the table. On further motion by the same senator, the Senate non-concurred in the action of the House, and referred the order to the committee on judiciary.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Fulton of Sagadahoc, Adjourned.

HOUSE.

Tuesday, February 28, 1911.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Mosher of Augusta.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

The following petitions, bills, etc., were presented and referred:

Judiciary.

By Mr. Williamson of Augusta—An Act to amend Section 20 of Chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes, relating to polling places. (Tabled for printing pending reference on motion of Mr. Williamson.)

Legal Affairs.

By Mr. Pattangall of Waterville—An Act to abolish the office of State auditor of printing.

Also, An Act for the creation of water districts, and the control and regulation of water storage and water power companies. (Tabled for printing pending reference on motion of Mr. Pattangall.)

Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

By Mr. Pattangall of Waterville—An Act to repeal Chapter 142 of the Public Laws of 1905, relating to the support of alien paupers.

Inland Fisheries and Game.

By Mr. Campbell of Cherryfield—An Act to regulate the disposal of fish and game seized by the Commissioners of Inland Fisheries and Game, or any officials empowered so to do.

By Mr. Clark of Portland—An Act to regulate the sale and purchase of game birds.

By Mr. Austin of Phillips—An Act to amend Section 31 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the penalty for trapping fur-bearing animals in any of the unorganized townships or on the wild lands of the State, and for operating a sporting camp, without first procuring a license therefor.

By Mr. Berry of Fayette—Remonstrance of F. L. Pray and 50 others of Belgrade against any change in the regulations for fishing in Belgrade stream, so-called.

By Mr. Percy of Bath—Petition of Harry Farnham and 43 others, residents of Sagadahoc county, asking that the duck law in Sagadahoc county be amended so that it shall be lawful to hunt ducks in said county from March 15 to April 15, in addition to the open season now provided by law.

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Clark from the committee on inland fisheries and game reported "ought not to pass" on Bill, An Act to prohibit ice fishing in Virginia lake, formerly called Upper Stone pond, in the town of Stoneham, in the county of Oxford; also remonstrance of C. L. Bartlett and 30 others of Stoneham against restriction on ice fishing in Upper Stone pond, in Stoneham.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to regulate ice fishing in Greeley pond, so-called, in the county of Kennebec, with petition asking for same.

Mr. Skehan from the committee on State lands and State roads reported same on Resolve for the repairs of highway in Upton, Megalloway plantation and Township C in the county of Oxford, with a statement of facts.

Same gentleman from same committee, on Petition of M. J. Myers and 62 others, citizens of Rangeley, Dallas plantation and Eustis, asking for an

appropriation on the Dead River road in Dallas plantation reported that the petitioners have leave to withdraw.

Mr. Clark from the committee on inland fisheries and game, on petition of W. W. Perkins and 31 others, in favor of amending the law relating to marking of traps, reported that petitioners have leave to withdraw.

Same gentleman from same committee, on Petition of W. L. Hodgkins and 18 others, residents of Lambert Lake plantation, in the county of Washington, asking that Lambert Lake, in said county of Washington, be closed to all ice fishing for a term of years: also remonstrance of James Clarry and 71 others, relating to ice fishing in Lambert lake, reported that petitioners have leave to withdraw.

Same gentleman from same committee, on Petition of Nathan Reynolds and 50 others, residents of Canton and Hartford, in Oxford county, asking that ice fishing be permitted in Lake Anasagunticook, in Canton and Hartford, during the months of January and February, and that the number of lines to be used be limited to five to each man, reported that petitioners have leave to withdraw.

The reports were accepted.

Mr. Sleeper from the committee on inland fisheries and game reported "ought to pass" on Bill, An Act relating to the payment of damage to growing crops by deer.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to prohibit the catching or taking of eels in Saint Georges river, in Warren, in the county of Knox, in any other way or manner than by hook and line or with spears.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to amend Chapter 407 of the Private and Special Laws of 1993, as amended, relating to ice fishing in Eagle lake, in the town of Eden, in the county of Hancock.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to regulate ice fishing in Fitts pond, sometimes called Little Fitts pond, in the town of Clifton, in the county of Penobscot; also petition of W. W.

Byther and 22 others of East Eddington, to prohibit ice fishing in Fitts pond in the town of Clifton.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to repeal Chapter 326 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909, relating to fishing in Webb's river, and its tributaries, in the county of Franklin, with petition of D. W. Berry and nine others, residents of Carthage, asking for same.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 117 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to the taking of white perch.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to repeal Chapter 398 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909, relating to fishing in Royal's river.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to prohibit the throwing of sawdust and other mill waste into Duck Puddle pond, so called, Pemaquid pond, so called, Biscay pond, so called, and Boyd's pond, so called, all in the county of Lincoln.

Mr. Dunn from the committee on legal affairs, on Bill, An Act relative to the Bangor and Brewer highway bridge, reported that the same ought to pass, in new draft accompanying.

Mr. Sleeper from the committee on inland fisheries and game, on Bill, An Act to prohibit the throwing of sawdust and waste into the South Branch of the Piscataquis river, with petition of C. M. Drew and 242 others, reported the same in a new draft, under the title of "An Act to prohibit the throwing of sawdust and other mill waste into the South Branch of the Piscataquis river, in the town of Kingsbury, and in the tributaries to said South Branch of Piscataquis river in said town of Kingsbury, and in Thorn brook, so called, and its tributaries, in the towns of Abbot, Kingsbury and Blanchard, in the county of Piscataquis," and that it ought to pass.

Same gentleman from same committee, on Bill, An Act to regulate fishing in the Fenderson brook, reported the same in a new draft under the

title of "An Act to extend the provisions of Chapter 361 of the Private and Special Laws of 1907, relating to fishing in the Fenderson brook and its tributaries, in the town of Parsonsfield," and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Clark from same committee, on Bill, An Act to regulate fishing in Hall pond in the town of Paris, reported same in a new draft, under the title of "An Act to regulate fishing in Hall pond in the town of Paris, county of Oxford," and that it ought to pass.

Same gentleman from same committee, on Bill, An Act to amend Chapter 160 of the Private and Special Laws of Maine for the year 1909, in relation to fishing in Spear stream and its tributaries in the town of Peru; also petition of W. S. Arnold and 31 others, residents of Peru, Oxford county, asking for a law to make it lawful to fish in Spear stream at any time; also petition of Walter L. Gray and 33 others, citizens of Oxford county, in favor of regulating fishing on Spear stream, reported the same in a new draft, under the title of "An Act to amend Chapter 160 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909, relating to fishing in Spear stream and its tributaries in the town of Peru, in the county of Oxford," and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Sleeper from same committee on Bill, An Act to amend Chapter 347 of the Private and Special Laws of Maine for the year 1905, in relation to fishing in the tributaries of Big Concord pond in the town of Woodstock; also petition of Walter L. Gray and 37 others regarding the same, reported the same in a new draft, under the title of "An Act to amend Chapter 347 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905, relative to fishing in the tributaries of Big Concord pond in the town of Woodstock, county of Oxford," and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Clark from same committee on Bill, An Act to regulate ice fishing in Whetstone pond, Piscataquis county; with petition attached signed by W. A. Purington and 37 others, reported same in a new draft under the title of "An Act to regulate fishing in Whetstone pond, so called, situated in the town of Kingsbury and

in the town of Blanchard, in the county of Piscataquis," and that it ought to pass.

Report of committee on shore fisheries on Bill, An Act for the better protection of the fisheries of Maine, reported the same in a new draft, under the title of "An Act for the regulation of the herring fisheries," and that it ought to pass.

(Signed)

A. A. PERCY.

C. E. BOMAN.

J. P. McCURDY.

W. G. HODGKINS.

(Tabled pending acceptance of the report and specially assigned for Thursday, on motion of Mr. Heffron of Eastport.)

Mr. Skehan from the committee on State lands and State roads on Resolve in favor of repairing the road across Townships number five, Range seven; six, Range seven; six, Range six; and six, Range eight, in Penobscot county, reported same in a new draft under title of "Resolve in favor of repairing the road across Townships number five, Range seven; six, Range seven; six, Range six; and six, Range eight, in Penobscot county," and that it ought to pass.

Same gentleman from same committee on Resolve in favor of repairing the road known as the Lake road in Township C and C Surplus in Oxford county, with a statement of facts, reported same in a new draft under title of "Resolve in favor of repairing the road known as the Lake road in Township C and C Surplus in Oxford county, with a statement of facts," and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Lawry from the committee on ways and bridges on Resolve in favor of aid in building bridge across Moose river in Jackman plantation, reported the same in a new draft under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

Same gentleman from same committee on Petitions of M. L. French, Edward J. Hinds and 77 others asking for \$3000 in aid of repairing road from The Forks to Lake Moxie Station, praying that the sum of \$3000 be appropriated for the purpose of repairing and rebuilding the highway leading from The Forks, in The Forks plantation and county of Somerset, to Lake Moxie, in said The Forks plantation, the same to be repaired and rebuilt

under the supervision of the State superintendent of public highways and the county commissioners of said county of Somerset, reported a Resolve entitled "Resolve in favor of aid in repairing road from The Forks to Lake Moxie Station."

Passed to Be Engrossed.

House Bill, No. 90, An Act relating to public school attendance.

House Bill, No. 264, An Act relating to the creation of a board of trustees for the Sullivan-Franklin bridge.

House Bill, No. 265, An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 38 of the Public Laws of 1905.

House Bill, No. 266, An Act to extend the rights, powers and privileges of the Hancock and Sullivan Bridge Company.

House Bill, No. 270, An Act to incorporate the Monmouth Electric Company.

House Bill, No. 272, An Act to authorize the Bangor Railway and Electric Company to take water from Brewer pond and its tributaries.

House Bill, No. 278, An Act relating to agents of schools in unorganized townships.

House Bill, No. 279, An Act to extend the charter of the Winter Harbor and Eastern Railway Company.

House Bill, No. 280, An Act to incorporate L'Association d'Epaignes de Waterville.

House Bill, No. 281, An Act relating to fishing in the tributaries of Jim pond.

House Bill, No. 282, An Act to prohibit the throwing of sawdust into the outlet of Worthley pond.

House Bill, No. 283, An Act to incorporate Fort Kent and Clairs Toll Bridge Company.

Finally Passed.

Resolve in favor of William R. Roix.
Resolve in favor of S. C. W. Simpson.

Orders of the Day.

Today assigned: Resolve providing for an amendment to the Constitution by abrogating and annulling the 26th amendment, relating to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors

This resolve came up on its final passage.

Mr. Peters of Ellsworth moved that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The motion was agreed to.

YEA—Allen of Columbia Falls, Allen of Jonesboro, Ames, Austin, Bearce, Bisbee, Bogue, Boman, Burkett, Campbell, Chase, Clark, Clearwater, Connors, Copeland, Couture, Cowan, Cronin, Cyr, Deering of Portland, Deering of Waldoboro, Descoteaux, Dow, Doyle, Dresser, Dufour, Dunn, Dutton, Farnham, Files, Frank, Gamache, Goodwin, Gross, Harmon, Hartwell, Hastings, Heffron, Hodgkins, Hodgman, Hogan, Jordan, Kelley, Kelleher, Knight, Lambert, Lawry, LeBel, Libby, Littlefield of Bluehill, Mace, Macomber, Mallet, Manter, Marriner, McAllister, Merrifield, Miller of Hartland, Mitchell, Mower, Murphy, Otis, Packard, Pattangall, Patten, Pelletier, Percy, Perkins of Kennebunk, Perkins of Mechanic Falls, Peters, Phillips, Pinkham, Plummer, Pollard, Porter of Pembroke, Putnam, Robinson of Peru, Ross, Sawyer, Scates, Shea, Skehan, Sleeper, Small, Smith, Active I. Snow, Alvah Snow, Snow of Bucksport, Stetson, Strickland, Thompson of Presque Isle, Thompson of Skowhegan, Trafton, Trask, Trim, Trimble, Tucker, Waldron, Weymouth, Wilkins, Williamson, Wilson, Woodside, Morye—104.

NAY—Anderson, Andrews, Averill, Benn, Berry, Bowker, Briggs, Brown, Buzzell, Colby, Davies, Davis, Drummond, Emerson, Fenderson, Hedman, Hersey, Johnson, Kingsbury, Littlefield of Wells, McBride, Merrill, Morse of Belfast, Morse of Waterford, Newcomb, Pike, Porter of Mapleton, Powers, Quimby, Robinson of Lagrange, Russell, Soule, Stinson, Weston, Wheeler, Whitney, Wilcox—37.

ABSENT—Emery, Greenwood, Kennard, McCann, McCreedy, McCurdy, Monroe, Noyes, Turner—9.

So the resolve was finally passed.

Today assigned: House Bills No. 36 and 37, An Act to annex the town of Isle au Haut to the county of Knox.

An Act to annex the town of Stonington to the county of Knox.

Mr. Peters of Ellsworth moved that the majority report of the committee, voting ought not to pass, be accepted.

Mr. HARMON of Stonington: Mr. Speaker, I wish to state the reasons why I signed this majority report. The town of Stonington is situated on the island of Deer Isle in the most southwestern part of Hancock county, situated farthest from the county seat of any town in Hancock county excepting the town of Isle au Haut.

Stonington and Isle au Haut are bounded on the west by East Penobscot bay, on the east by Bluehill bay, on the south by the Atlantic ocean. Isle au Haut is situated about six miles from Stonington in a southerly direction. Isle au Haut is about 44 miles from our county seat, while Stonington is about 37 or 38 miles. We have no regular way of conveyance, by steamboat lines, between Stonington and Ellsworth. The only way we have of reaching Ellsworth, our county seat, is by driving 12 miles to Stonington to the north end of Deer Island and crossing Eggemoggin reach which is about one mile wide, and reaching Sargentville and driving by team from there 10 or 11 miles to Bluehill and thence 10 or 12 miles to Ellsworth. Now the people of Stonington claim it is a great hardship upon them to attend court and court affairs. The only other way of reaching Ellsworth is by taking a boat at Stonington in the morning, going to Bar Harbor which is about 35 miles distant, crossing the ferry to Hancock and thence by train to Ellsworth, which takes the entire day. Our courts are holden in October and April, and at this time of the year it is very hard driving, and takes all day long to drive from Stonington to Ellsworth. We often have to change teams at Bluehill, and we often in the spring of the year when it is very bad going take the boat at Stonington to Rockland, thence electric cars to Camden, from Camden to Bucksport by boat, Bucksport to Bangor and from Bangor to Ellsworth which consumes the entire day, and the expense is very large. The expense of driving from Stonington to Ellsworth is about \$5 or \$6 when it is good going. When it is very bad going it costs \$10 and sometimes as high as \$11.50. We have one other way of reaching Ellsworth, that is by motor boats, which is a distance of about 35 miles, and at low tide it is hard reaching Ellsworth. You have to go by the Union river and it is very narrow water and there is the danger of getting into trouble up the river in motor boats; and sometimes we have had storms and the cost of a motor boat to Ellsworth is from \$10 to \$15.

Now the people of Stonington and Isle au Haut believe that their wishes ought to be considered by this Legislature. We made an attempt two years ago to become annexed to Knox county but we were unsuccessful. This is the third attempt the people of Isle au Haut have made to be annexed to Knox county, and there have been many changes made in the towns of Hancock county at different times. Greenfield was at one time set off from Hancock county and annexed to Penobscot county in 1858; and this Legislature decided that it was for good and sufficient reasons. Their claims were the same as we make, for the convenience and the saving of time and expense in attending court affairs. Castine was at one time the shire town of Hancock county, but for the convenience of the people it was changed to Ellsworth. At the time that the shire town was changed to Ellsworth the inhabitants of Ellsworth were very few, only a very few houses; since that time the inhabitants have increased and it has become a village of 2060 inhabitants; and we believe the wishes of the people of Stonington should be considered in the matter. We claim we have a great grievance and that it is not more than right that we should be set off and annexed to another county. It is true that there were a number of remonstrances from nearly every town in Hancock county against Stonington and Isle au Haut being set off but that was only natural. We are all naturally very selfish in some things, and they do not wish to lose of course any part of Hancock county. But we claim we have been a burden to Hancock county. Two criminal cases came up in the last four years which cost the county nearly \$2000, and we claim they would be better off without us. The remonstrances that came in against our being set off did not originate in the town. The remonstrances were drawn up by the members of the House from Hancock county and sent out to the different towns urging them to sign these remonstrances, not against Stonington and Isle au Haut but against the proposed division of

Hancock county. At that time there was a rumor about the county that Bucksport wished to be annexed to Penobscot county, that Castine wished to be annexed to Waldo county; but this was not true, it was just a rumor, and I think those that signed the remonstrances would not so many of them have signed them if they had known it concerned Stonington and Isle au Haut only.

Two years ago soon after this matter came up in the Legislature an informal vote was taken in the town of Stonington to ascertain if a majority of the people were in favor of annexing to Knox county. It was the unanimous vote at our town meeting excepting one dissenting vote for annexation to Knox county. At the State election this fall there were 376 votes cast for Governor, and our petition is signed by 351 tax payers and voters of Stonington asking for annexation. In the case of Isle au Haut there were I think 41 who signed for annexation and there are only 54 voters in the town of Isle au Haut, and no remonstrances came from that town against it.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that the motion to accept the majority report, ought to prevail.

Mr. SNOW of Bucksport: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, in behalf of the constituency which I represent I ask you to accept the majority report of this committee. The only reason advocated for accepting the minority report is as to a matter of convenience. If the minority report is accepted it will establish a precedent which is inimical to the great interest of the whole county. While the county as a general thing is loyal to its principles, what is to prevent at some future time some dissatisfied and disgruntled people from petitioning the Legislature to set off their town? What is to prevent the inhabitants of my town of Bucksport from asking to be set off an annexed to the county of Penobscot which is only 10 miles distant from Bucksport which would convene our people very much better? What is to prevent the beautiful town of Castine from petitioning the Legislature

at some future time to be set off and annexed to the county of Waldo? So I might go on, gentlemen, but is it expedient that the wishes of the few should stand in the way of the good of the many? From a financial point of view I object to the acceptance of the minority report of the committee. We are a poor county. We can ill afford to lose these towns. My town of Bucksport now is paying the interest on an issue of bonds of nearly \$100,000, which she is not getting a particle of benefit from. Gentlemen, I beg of you not to take away our assets. I wish to assure you that those towns in my section are overwhelmingly against the minority report. My motive and my attitude in this matter is not a selfish one. They are rather the motives which actuated our brave boys of '61 to die upon the battlefield that they might preserve their country undivided; they are the motives of one who considers the wishes and feelings of the many. Gentlemen, as you would hate to see the county dismembered, disintegrated and divided, I ask you to support the majority report of this committee; and I know that your sense of justice will prompt you to do so and I believe you will keep Hancock county undivided.

Mr. OTIS of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that the most difficult task in connection with this matter will be to untangle the maze of facts and grotesque fancies which have been woven about it by the gentlemen who have been opposing these measures. These seem to have swept a majority of the committee off their feet, and judging by the chorus of "yes" on the viva voce vote this morning, it would seem that it has affected the House also; but gentlemen I wish you would bear with me while I bring this thing right straight down to the question at issue which is simply the matter of the convenience and material interest of the people at Stonington and to their political situation, whether it is one county or the other.

The opponents of the division have brought themselves to look at the matter—or pretend to do so—I do not question their sincerity—they have

brought themselves to look at this matter as if it were a contest between Knox county and Hancock county for these two towns, the same as two countries might contend for a bit of territory without the least interest in the welfare of the people of that territory, simply for their aggrandizement, the same as France and Germany have for 20 years quarrelled about Alsace and Lorraine and especially as one becoming stronger has assimilated these two unhappy provinces without attempting to do anything for them but simply to fix the matter as they pleased.

Now the gentlemen look at it in the same light. It is nothing of the kind. Some of them even have talked as if we expected to tear up from their granite foundations these two towns and carry them off somewhere. Those towns are going to stay right there just the same if they are in Knox county as if they remain in Hancock county. All their business and social relations with their neighbors will remain exactly the same. And there is nothing sacred about these county lines any more than there is about district lines, or about our representative district or councillor districts. There is nothing sacred about those lines. Every time the census is taken the congressional districts are reorganized, so are our legislative districts reorganized, reapportioned, and not simply with relation to the population as shown by the census but in regard to their continuity and their community of interest and their commercial interest; those things are all taken into consideration and that is done once in ten years. The law requires it should be done. All of these changes are made without wrenching anybody's heartstrings and without creating any feeling that they have been disintegrated. The opponents of these bills say that we are disintegrating Hancock county. Now with regard to the county lines they are necessarily more permanent, but yet they are founded on precisely the same things, for the convenience of the people. The representative from Stonington has stated the situation. There can be no question about it, there is no question. All the reply that is made to this is, "True, it is inconvenient,

but it may be inconvenient for other towns;" and they say if you put in this entering wedge as they call it by setting off these towns, other towns will ask to be set off on similar grounds. Well, if other towns are similarly situated they certainly have a perfect right to come before the Legislature, and if they make out their case as we have made out our case there is no reason why they should not be changed. But, Mr. Speaker, I challenge anybody to find a case in the State of Maine that is anywhere near approximately like Stonington and Isle au Haut.

Now in most that has been said—I am alluding now to the discussion in the lobby, for there has been very little discussion on the part of the other side in the House here—they have not fully developed their case. I am going to assume that they talk the same as they have in the lobby and as they did before the committee—the only thing that they say is that there is something about a county that every citizen in it owes an allegiance to it, that they must fight to the death against any change in their lines. The proposition to set off these two towns appears to affect the gentleman from Hancock as if we were planning to do them some material injury. Now speaking for the people of Knox county, and I think I may say for the people of Stonington, for I know them well, and of Isle au Haut, I say there can be no more friendly feeling than that which we entertain for the people of Hancock county; and at this stage of the debate if these gentlemen will show me that the county of Hancock is injured in any material sense, or if any man, woman or child in Hancock county is to be injured by the setting off of these towns and annexing them to Knox county, I will lay right down and give up the fight. I might, gentlemen, except perhaps a few lawyers in Ellsworth, a few hotel and boarding house keepers; they might say that their interests are affected, but certainly not the county of Hancock, because Stonington pays a large tax and the tax is growing, for it is a growing town: their valuation has been, I fancy, something like doubled in the last ten years and it is a substantial sum: still the expenses which are charged against the county on account of these two towns

generally have exceeded the expenses of court proceedings which the county has to pay. The expenses of the court which the county has to pay from cases originating in Stonington, especially criminal cases, are so very heavy that it would be a positive benefit for the financial interests of Hancock county to let the petitioners have their will and go to Knox county where they can conveniently attend court and at little expense.

Some two years ago there was a murder case in Stonington and it cost the county of Hancock considerably more to try that one case than they got from taxes from Stonington for that year. There are several cases where precisely that same thing has happened. In regard to one of those cases a gentleman this morning gave me some figures which I will give, in the case of an Italian who was indicted for an attempt to kill. The gentleman who gave me this information was a practicing physician who was summoned as a witness in the case. When the grand jury met he was summoned before it to give his testimony. He went and came home, in the roundabout way that the gentleman from Stonington has described. Then when the case was assigned for trials he went again and stayed around there two or three days and the court were not ready to hear the case for some reason or other, and he returned home and had to go a third time. In all he spent in going and coming and the few moments that he was giving his testimony, some seven or eight days. He got from the county some \$18. If he had come to Knox county he would not have got nearly so much, but he got \$18. His actual expenses were between \$50 and \$60, on that trip. That is what you are subjecting the inhabitants of Stonington to in their attendance upon the courts. He went by motor boat, and on the way his boat gave out and he was rescued by a life-saving station the same as any shipwrecked mariner would be; and all that to give just a little testimony in a homicide case. Now that thing has happened right along at every term of court, and it can all be avoided by simply chang-

ing this county a little in the most natural way. I am sorry that the proponents of this bill are not able to go to the expense of having maps made that would particularly show in regard to that, but if you will look at any good map of Maine you will find where the line of Knox county goes across these islands—we have got some big islands in our county—the line runs just north of North Haven, and carrying it right straight along only a mile or two it will strike right across a division between the town of Deer Isle and Stonington and carrying it just a little way it would take in Stonington and Isle au Haut into Knox county. From the standpoint of physical geography it is a most obviously natural division. I wish the members would refer to the map and see how it looks, and look at the distance that it is from Stonington to Ellsworth and then from Stonington to Rockland, and from Rockland to Bangor, from Bangor to Ellsworth. I met a gentleman last night who came around this way, he stopped here in regard to this bill, he had been clear around to Ellsworth in a little disclosure process and he had to go around in this way that I speak of. These are cases that are happening all the time. Every month their probate court meets and they have to go this roundabout way to reach Ellsworth, whereas if a man could go to Rockland instead, he could just take the boat in the morning, go across, have all day in Rockland to attend to his business, could get home the same night before supper. All these things are happening all the time. It is a constant thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I take it you will not suffer yourselves to be led away by this utterly irrelevant talk about the disintegration of Hancock county but you will get right down to this matter and consider fairly and sympathetically the grievances of those men and women of Stonington and Isle au Haut. Mr. Harmon has given an outline of the situation, but any gentleman ought to be able to fill in the outline with his imagination and see the whole situation and find out

how he would feel. Put that question to yourselves, gentlemen. How would you feel if you lived down there? and then I beg that you will consider that nobody else has any interest in this matter except the people of Stonington. We of Knox county in a general way would be glad to have them, it would be a material benefit to our people in Rockland, that is, to a few hotel keepers and to our lawyers. That is all the material interest that we have got in it; as the people of Knox county we do not ask anything of this Legislature only in behalf of Stonington. Their interests are to be considered entirely. I don't want you to consider ours or the outside towns of Hancock county. It may be brought to your attention as it was to that of the committee that a large number of people in Hancock county outside of Stonington and Isle au Haut brought in remonstrances. You might as well have brought them from Calais, or from San Francisco for that matter, for they know nothing about it. It is none of their business. They have no material interest in it, and the sentimental interest that they appear to have is a mere reminiscence of loyalty to some fixed government, like a feeling of patriotism, which is all right but it does not apply to counties. There is no reason why we should have a feeling of loyalty toward a county any more than a legislative district which changes every 10 years, or toward a congressional district; and who would think of howling because we are going to disintegrate the congressional and legislative districts of this State?

And now, gentlemen, I wish you would take these things into consideration. I am presenting them, I am aware, very badly, but I think you can get at what I mean; and what I mean is good common sense.

Mr. PETERS of Ellsworth: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I feel perfectly sure that this House will not vote to divide Hancock county against the wishes of 99 per cent. of the inhabitants of the county. I would feel more certain of that action if the House could be thoroughly informed as to the actual merits of

the question, but it is impossible in the few moments that it is reasonable to discuss this matter to lay any great detail before the House. The matter was agitated and heard in detail before the committee very patiently, and the report which we have before us shows that the majority of the committee—I may say, I think properly, the unanimous report of the disinterested members of the committee, is against the proposed division. I disclaim any attempt to impute any improper motives to either of the two minority members of the committee. They are actuated I have no doubt by the highest of motives. Their location and their surroundings, I think, tend at least to prejudice them in their attitude towards the question. The other eight members of the committee are entirely unprejudiced by reason greatly upon the report of the committee which was able to get at the details of the subject, which is more than we can do here.

Now this question of setting off these two towns which has been agitated in former years is based upon the alleged inconvenience of the inhabitants of Isle au Haut and Stonington in getting from their islands to Ellsworth, the county seat. Stonington lies about 35 or 40 miles south of Ellsworth and has a population of 2000 inhabitants by the last census. It is part of an island called Deer Isle, which is situated about one mile off from the mainland of Hancock county and across the beautiful reach which can be rowed across or sailed across easily, especially during the periods of the year when our courts are in session. It lies perhaps ten miles from the northwesterly end of Deer Isle, it is a mile across the reach, some ten miles to Bluehill and 14 miles to Ellsworth. It was testified before the committee by the gentleman who runs the stage route that the distance is about 35 miles. The other island, the Isle au Haut, lies, as I think Mr. Harmon said, six miles southerly of Stonington. Now they say they want to be set off from Hancock county and annexed to Knox county because of the fact that it is inconvenient for them to come to court. It is inconvenient for them to

come to court, there is no question about that. One of their islands is a mile from the mainland and the other is six miles beyond that, but their quarrel is with their geography; they are an island and that cannot be helped, and no legislation will prevent their being surrounded by water. If they prefer, as they doubtless do, to live on this island they must expect some inconveniences due to their location. That cannot be helped. They say in coming to court they suffer hardships, that they suffer the hardships of Cook and Peary. The sufferings of Cook and of Peary would be inconsiderable in comparison with some of the difficulties which we have heard of in some cases which have been mentioned in connection with this matter. But, gentlemen, when they come to court it is said in the month of April or October. We used to have a January term of court at which time they perhaps suffered hardships in coming to our beautiful city of Ellsworth where our terms of court are held, but it is not a bad trip in the month of April although the roads are perhaps not so passable as they are in October.

Let us see how much inconvenience they have had to undergo in coming to the county seat during the April and October terms of court. I had the recent clerk of courts of our county examine the records for the past 14 years, since Stonington was set off from Deer Isle—before that time it was impossible to distinguish—and he informed me that the records showed that six civil cases were brought in Ellsworth in which the parties came from Stonington during that 14 years. That is not all, Mr. Speaker, because if this town were a part of Knox county and if a plaintiff lived in Hancock county he would have a perfect right to sue a defendant in Knox and get a trial in Hancock county. I don't know how many of those six cases in which the plaintiff lived off of Stonington. If half of the cases were that way then we would be left with three or four cases in 14 years in which the inhabitants of Stonington have been obliged to come to Ellsworth during either the month of April or October. I don't think that is a very serious thing to happen to these towns. It

seems to me that it hardly counterbalances the inconvenience which they would be sure to suffer if they were set off, in this respect. The most important place where they would be obliged to go on more than half of the business transactions at the county seat would be to the registry of deeds. Now if they are set off from Hancock county and added to Knox county their real estate titles will remain of course as they are recorded in Hancock county, down to the date of the setting off, and after that time they would be recorded in Knox county, and if any of the gentlemen living in Stonington or Deer Isle after the proposed setting off desire to examine their record title or the record title of their property they will have to make this arduous trip to Ellsworth and then make a further trip to Rockland, because they will have to examine the title in Ellsworth and afterwards in Rockland, and the same would be true of the records in the probate court office. It seems to me this inconvenience would be a very serious thing of these towns, if they will consider the facts fully along those lines. I do not propose to go into details in the matter. I want to say that every representative and senator from Hancock with the possible exception of one is opposed to this project of the division of the county, and I want to say that at the hearing before the committee it was admitted by the counsel for the petitioners that the whole of Hancock county outside of some people in these two towns were opposed to this division. I have heard of counties being divided and parts set off but, Mr. Speaker, but I never knew of a case where the division of the county was made against the almost unanimous objection of its citizens. If there is such an instance I am not informed in regard to it.

There are 35,575 people in Hancock county by the last census. Mr. Speaker, I represent 35,165 of those who are opposed to this division. The idea of setting off this town of Stonington which has been agitated for the last two years or more does not receive the unanimous support of the people of

Stonington. Where is the demand backed by the business interests of Stonington? Where are the selectmen and the postmaster? We have here some very estimable gentlemen from Stonington, one who is prominent, but where are the business interests demanding this thing? Mr. Speaker, at the committee hearing it developed that a remonstrance was circulated one day, before the hearing before the committee, by the chairman of the selectmen and the postmaster remonstrating against the proposition of division and it received some 70 odd signatures there in the business part of Stonington. This demand is not unanimous. A considerable portion, if not the largest portion of the business interests of Stonington appeared against the proposed division.

The people of Hancock county object to the division also on the ground that it would establish a bad precedent. There are other places in Hancock county that are no more inconveniently situated than these towns. Bucksport adjoining the Penobscot river is nearer by rail to Bangor than it is to Ellsworth, and in order to come to Ellsworth they are obliged to come through Bangor. I can easily see that this agitation will spread to other towns, if it goes out of here that this Legislature will divide a county and set off towns at the request of some dissatisfied citizens of the towns in question. I can see that the thing will ferment and that in time the towns of Bucksport, Verona, Castine, Orland and Dedham, towns adjoining the Penobscot river and being nearer in point of travel to Bangor than Ellsworth, and they will want to be set off, and it will lead to a very bad result if this practise is allowed to continue. The matter was thoroughly tried out two years ago. There was a unanimous report of a committee against this proposition. I do not claim that is conclusive upon this Legislature, but I simply say that under these circumstances where the committee has reported at a previous session of the Legislature and where the conditions have not changed that their verdict is entitled to great weight.

I want to say, further, that the people of Hancock county seriously believe after that decision that the matter was permanently settled, and that they have not taken this particular movement seriously on that account, and that they do not now in my county take this movement seriously because they believed that it was settled once and settled right at the last session of the Legislature, and that the conditions have not changed. I do not want to take up the time of this House in this matter but I believe where the sentiment is so unanimous in our section that the House will not interfere in this respect. Our county is a small county and has not increased in population; business is rather dull. Our geography is peculiar. We are cut up into islands and sounds and bays and inlets, but it looks good to us. We are satisfied where we are, and we do not want to lose one of those islands or one of those promontories or one acre of pasture. We believe if we are allowed to be let alone that we will take care of our own matters and work out our own salvation in this respect, that we want to live in peace with our friends in Stonington and Isle au Haut, and we can arrange some way I think to satisfy them. This matter of the courts is not bearing very heavily upon them. There is easily a manner in which that can be bettered. A municipal court operating in the western part of Hancock county can hold terms in Stonington as well as Bluehill and Jonesboro. I favor, if necessary, a proposition whereby they would be obliged to go to Stonington and hear any cases within that jurisdiction. Those criminal cases that have been talked about are where some Italians, workmen in the quarries, have got into some disputes among themselves. It is true it may have cost the county of Hancock perhaps two thousand dollars. I don't know what they have against Knox county that they want to take them over there and pay the expenses there. The population is growing there, they have increased very largely during the last 10 years and we will get back some of the money we have expended if they stay with

us a little longer, and their taxes will help us out. We do not want them to go over to Knox county and I cannot see why that should be desired. There is no interest in this matter in any particular locality, it is the same all over the county. It was unquestioned at the hearing as the opinion of all that were asked that you do not interfere with our affairs in this respect, but allow us to take care of ourselves, and I think in the long run that principle will work out all right.

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, the only reason I have to offer for saying anything in regard to this matter, which is perhaps a local one, is by reason of an incident which happened to me a few years ago which I think illustrates the conditions existing with reference to the inhabitants of Stonington and Isle au Haut and the courts of Ellsworth. Some 15 or 16 years ago I had to settle the estate of a man living in Stonington, and as incidental to settling that estate it devolved upon me to collect quite a number of executions against people living down there at Stonington. It did not occur to me that there was any great hardship in those gentlemen coming up from Stonington to Ellsworth their county seat to disclose. I never had been across there, and so I cited them to Ellsworth to disclose sometime along in August, during dog days. When I arrived in Ellsworth it was rainy, and the gentlemen had not arrived, four or five of them, and the disclosure commissioner and I waited around there for several hours and finally they came, walking through the mud, having landed somewhere down below Ellsworth and they had walked up, and the commissioner asked them how they got there. They said they thought it over and thought the best way to come was to hire a schooner and so they got the schooner and started two days before and they had taken that trip away around there to Ellsworth landing, and walked from there up to Ellsworth. We asked them why they couldn't get there some other way and they said there was no other way that they knew of getting there except to

walk or to swim, and so they came in that way; and it took them about four or five days to make that trip up there and back.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that that same state of affairs exists now. I have here a letter from Ellsworth to a resident of Stonington telling him that the disclosure which has been continued would be in order Feb. 21 at Ellsworth and that he has got to come. I understand he did so. Now gentlemen, supposing one of us had been in Stonington and had been cited to go to Ellsworth, how would we have gone last week? I don't know. I know how this man went. He started from Stonington and took the boat for Rockland and went down through Wiscasset and then through Bath into Cumberland county and from Brunswick up through Augusta and through to Bangor and from there down to Ellsworth, 213 miles I think it is, through five county seats and through six counties, within ten miles of the distance he would have travelled if he had been cited to Boston. And the trouble is that there is no business connection between Ellsworth and Stonington or Isle au Haut, and the business connection is all over towards Rockland, and there never will be any connection with Ellsworth, there never will be a line of boats between Ellsworth and Stonington. That would solve the whole difficulty, but as conditions are at the present time there is no way for them to get there excepting the way the gentleman from Stonington has stated. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the people down there should have some consideration in this matter, the people living in Stonington, they are the ones who should be considered. Out of 376 people that live there 353 have asked for it. On Isle au Haut there are only 40 or 50 and as I understand they all ask it, but in Stonington 353 have asked for it, and there is a remonstrance signed by 74 people. Thirty-three of those are the same men who signed the other petition, so that there are 41, and those are almost all connected, as I understand it—and I get my information of course from the

people in that vicinity who have business interests there, who have the big quarries there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me these things should have some weight because those people know what they want. The only argument that I have heard against it, outside of sentiment, and I don't propose to talk anything about sentiment, although I believe we should have as much sentiment for people as we have for any matter of county lines—nobody knows where they are until they are located—the only arguments I have heard are in regard to the county debt. Now, if I understand it rightly, Hancock county is out of debt so that Stonington will not get out of paying anything on her account. I think I have heard the matter of county lines discussed, that we ought not to split up islands. When you take a town out of a county that is inland, of course you are going to change some 12 or 18 miles of county lines. If you make this change you will only change about four or five miles of county line, so that in that line the argument is in favor of division. Now I have heard it spoken about these deeds, and the great expense which it would be to take the deeds down to Knox county and have them recorded down there, or copies of them. That would not be necessary and it has never been done by any town that was removed. And even if it was necessary, there are only 89 deeds recorded in Hancock county from the town of Stonington last year, and of course when you go back for thirty years there were very few. A good man in a couple of weeks and two girls in three months would draw every deed there is down there and take them into Knox county, and Knox county of course would have to pay the bills, Hancock county would not pay anything.

Now the question of precedent has been brought up. If I understand it the precedents in this matter are all in favor of the division. In 1838 the town of Vinalhaven which lies four miles to the west of this island was a part of the county of Hancock. At that time the shire town which had

been at Castine was removed to Ellsworth, and Vinalhaven files this petition in the Legislature which I will read:

"The undersigned inhabitants of the town of Vinalhaven humbly represent that should the shire town of Hancock county be removed from Castine to Ellsworth, that the said inhabitants of Vinalhaven would be subjected to very great inconveniences as to attending courts and as to all county records we therefore humbly request that should the shire town of said county be removed to Ellsworth that said town of Vinalhaven with the inhabitants thereof may be taken from the county of Hancock and annexed to the county of Waldo."

It was the same reason in that case and the same situation. They said it was easy for them to go to Belfast the shire town of Waldo county, more so than it was to go to Ellsworth the shire town of Hancock county, and the Legislature set them off, and later when the county of Knox was established and it being easier for Vinalhaven to go to Rockland they set them off again and put them into the county of Knox. But, gentlemen, why was there no opposition to it at that time, if there was not? Wasn't there every reason then for the county of Hancock to oppose this division that there is now to oppose the division of Stonington? And if they did not oppose it, as I am informed they did not, didn't they have every reason to do so that they now have, and wasn't the only reason why they did not oppose it because they believed it was just and fair and that the rights and the wishes of the people of Vinalhaven should govern? And if it was just and fair and right that the people of Vinalhaven should govern back in 1838 why isn't it just and fair to the people of Stonington and Isle au Haut that they should govern now?

Now that was not the only time that a piece of Hancock county was set off. Pieces of other counties have been set off. In 1858 the northwestern corner was a perfect square looking at it on the map, and now it is a reg-

ular saw tooth with the town of Greenfield taken out, and the reason was that they wanted to go to Bangor which was nearer.

Now, gentlemen, when you stop to think of it what representative is there here that comes from a town of 35 or 40 miles from a railroad so that he cannot get to a railroad without going 35 or 40 miles? I doubt if there is one. And that is the question here. It is not a matter of distance that makes it but it is the question of accessibility, it is a chance to get there. Isle au Haut and Stonington never can get any nearer to Ellsworth than they are now unless there is some business, of which there is no prospect.

The only other reason which I have heard argued is that in the last fourteen years there have been no trials to amount anything, only six in the last fourteen years from Stonington up to Ellsworth. Think that position over a little. Here is Stonington, a town of something like 2000 inhabitants in a small area down to the south end of the island, the inhabitants composed of quarrymen crowded together, and it is in reality a town where you would naturally expect a good deal of litigation. Why don't they have more trials up there? Gentlemen, if this county seat instead of being in Ellsworth had been in New York or Chicago or up to the North pole where Cook and Peary were, they wouldn't have had any trials at all, nobody would go up there. It is the inaccessibility of this thing which has prevented people from going there. Supposing a workman in a quarry down in Stonington gets injured and is sick a while so that when he gets around he hasn't any money. If he could go to Knox county he might be able to get his witnesses to go down there and try the case out; but he can't get his witnesses to go to Ellsworth and pay the expenses of travel, and what is the result? The result is that the cases are not litigated at all, and he either gets nothing or else settles for a pittance. Supposing some laborer has some honest dispute with his employer there and there is some \$40 or \$50 due him, if he could go over to Knox county and try his case—and it would only cost him \$1.25 to go

over and return, and 75 cents on Saturdays—he could go there; but he knows if he is going up to Ellsworth he has got to pay out so much money that he might as well throw it away in the first place and not go at all. If I was an employer of labor in the town of Stonington and I consulted by own selfish interests I would not vote for this bill. I would vote to have that county seat not Ellsworth, but up to Fort Kent if I could. I would get it as far away as I could from the place where the laborer brings his action against me.

I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, that there is any political significance in this matter. If there is I fail to see it. I believe as a matter of fair justice to these people who are put to all this inconvenience from day to day, women going up to the probate court, as they are obliged to go for their widow's allowance, and men going at all seasons of the year to disclose, I believe it is only fair and just and right that we should follow those precedents that have been set in Hancock county and that we should let them go.

Mr. PATTANGALL of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House, I did not intend to say anything on this matter and I shall speak but a moment. This thought appeals to me. It is not possible here to go over fairly and fully the details connected with this division question. They have been gone over by a committee. Now I suppose that committee heard all the evidence on both sides and I also presume they were intending to do what they thought was right, and if you will notice in your list of committees, on the committee on counties before which this matter came were Senator Sanborn of Piscataquis, Senator Osborn of Somerset and Senator Boynton of Lincoln. Now those three members have some reason for voting against that division. I don't know that that is final or conclusive, but it seems to me that some arguments must have been made that appealed to them for this division. And on the part of the House there were McCurdy of Lubec, Frank O. Gray, Anderson of Limington, Jordan of Portland and McCann of Poland, all voting in the

same way. The only members of the committee to whom the division argument appealed are the gentleman from Stonington and the member of the committee who belongs in Knox county from Thomaston. In other words, every man who went into that committee meeting unprejudiced in the matter decided against the division. Such a committee report as that ought to have some little weight with the House, I should think; and especially in view of the fact that the gentleman from Stonington, who is a man of such excellent qualities that almost anything he wanted would appeal to his fellow members of the committee, being on the committee himself, could not convince a single one of them that he was right except the gentleman who lived in Knox county and who I supposed was a little bit prejudiced that way.

Now one thing more about that division matter. Under our present laws the Legislature cannot divide towns or counties not even if we wanted to. We tried that two years ago. Gentlemen urged upon the Legislature two years ago to divide the town of York, urged it strongly, and after a while the Legislature started in to do it and we voted to do it; but immediately the people of York did just what I have no doubt the people of Hancock will do if we attempt to divide Hancock, they simply filed a petition under the referendum and the whole State had to vote on the question. There is no doubt in my mind that they would file their petition under the referendum and they would stay together two years longer anyway, and they would continue to stay together unless the people of the whole State voted otherwise. Now the people of the whole State could not decide that question fairly because they would not know about it, but they could decide it about as fairly as we can, for we cannot know much about it not in the sort of debate that goes on in the House. I don't know now whether Stonington ought to be left where it is, but I do know this—I know that eight unprejudiced men for whose opinion I have some respect heard the case tried in full and decided that Stonington ought to remain where it is, and I should be bound by their decision unless some pretty strong reason was given against it.

Now there is one point in connection with this matter which weighs in my mind also, and I have not heard it mentioned. We are re-apportioning the legislative and senatorial districts. A change in the population of Hancock county and a change in the population of Knox county would require a different apportionment, I should suppose, if the other conditions remain as they are. That may be taken care of in this bill for all I know but nobody has said anything about it. If it is not and if your division is held up under the referendum I do not see how you can go to work and apportion your legislative and senatorial districts. It seems to me that this is not just the year for distributing those lines upon which our legislative and senatorial apportionment is based.

I realize the inconvenience of the Stonington people in getting to Ellsworth, but you know, gentlemen, if you are going to start county divisions on that line you have got to take up a lot of them. Now in Washington county we have towns up Danforth way where the people cannot go to the shire town without being away from home a couple of days. We try their cases for them sometimes in Calais to convene them, but mostly when they have law suits we refer the law suits in that section to some referee, perhaps a justice of the court, and while I don't know but what it would be more convenient. I presume it would be, for Stonington people to go to Rockland than to Ellsworth, to court, still that of itself I think, would hardly be sufficient as a reason for a division; and I come back to the only proposition I wanted to suggest to the House; and my only excuse for speaking here was because I thought perhaps the House had overlooked it, that this case has been tried and tried fully, and I presume fairly, before a committee of this House, and that every single member of that committee who from his location and connections must have approached the matter in an unprejudiced way voted against division; the only report before the House in favor of division is of two gentlemen who would be in favor of

the revision. I do not believe in dividing towns and counties unless you have to do it. I believe in divorce but only as a last resort, and I don't believe much in divorce unless the wife and husband are both pretty well agreed that they cannot live together any longer. This carrying on a divorce case on the petition of the hired girl don't strike me as a good one. (Laughter) In this case I presume the county of Knox would like to acquire more territory and more population, and if we could only annex it from something beside the State of Maine I would not object; but I don't think it is a good idea for the people from Knox county to come in too strongly on the proposition of dismembering Hancock county. I don't like to see the co-respondent to active in a divorce case. (Applause.)

Mr. MACE of Great Pond: Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely unnecessary to take up the time of this body, but I wish to say that I represent a class in Hancock county and that I live 35 miles from a railroad and I do not desire to be annexed to any other county, nor do the people in my section of the county. I am deeply interested in this question which has been so ably discussed. Two years ago this matter was decided unanimously by the committee against this scheme of annexation and at the beginning of this session of the Legislature the petition came in from the inhabitants of Isle au Haut and Stonington to be annexed to Knox county. After a fair hearing represented by the genial and able county attorney from Knox county, the committee, I may say unanimously, decided against the proposition of annexation. I say unanimously, because all of the members of that committee who could approach the subject without partisanship decided that there were not sufficient reasons for this proposed scheme of annexation.

We all supposed, gentlemen, from the report of that committee, that the question was settled, but now comes this rosy-hued dream of territorial aggrandizement from the people of Knox county. Under the ad-

vice of the able and adroit county attorney of the county of Knox, the gentleman from Rockland became interested in this scheme to take some part of Hancock county and annex it to his domain, and with all his great logic and all his eloquence and all his skill he has built up a fairly strong case with very little to build on. And the members of the Knox county delegation have interviewed the members from day to day, coaxing them, asking them, to add something to their domain, and even in the third House, gentlemen, has been called in to this matter, and have advanced the idea of territorial acquisition for the benefit of the people of Knox county; they ask you gentlemen, to believe that you are not masters of your own destinies, that you have not sufficient ability to decide on this question without their advice and counsel.

Now, gentlemen and Mr. Speaker, if convenience alone should be taken into consideration we have other cases in the different counties of the State where that would apply. Only one single county can we find that has not a town that would be benefited by being annexed to another county, and that is the county of Knox; they have everything to gain and nothing to lose. In the southwestern part of Oxford county the towns of Porter, Hiram, Denmark, Brownfield and Fryeburg, if convenience alone was to decide where they should go, they should be annexed to the county of Cumberland, because in attending court they have to go to Portland, then by a circuitous route of more than 60 miles they have to go to Paris their shire town, and the same is true, as the gentleman from Waterville said, of the towns of Danforth and Forest City; and even in the case of the gentleman from Augusta's own county, the towns of Clinton and Benton, if convenience alone were taken into consideration, they had better be annexed to Somerset county, because they are nearer to Skowhegan than they are to Augusta. Gentlemen, do you want your county lines meddled with?

The petitioners here have presumed upon the sympathy, upon the ability,

upon the prejudice even, of the gentlemen from Augusta, large of body, strong of brain, with a great sympathetic heart, they have engaged him to aid them in wresting from their sister county some of her territory. Hancock is one of the few counties that has suffered a loss in population. We shall be represented in this honorable body in the next Legislature by fewer representatives. Her people are hardy, honest, intelligent and industrious. They earn their livelihood by honest toil; on the coast they take it from the ocean or in attending to the wants of the tourists who come to our section, and in the interior the people take it from the rocky and unyielding soil and from the forests by which they are surrounded; and these are the people that the gentleman from Rockland says have no business to remonstrate against a division of the county. When this proposed scheme of territorial acquisition for the good county of Knox came up, the people remonstrated unanimously; with only a few days in that sparsely settled county they sent remonstrances here from almost every town in that county, over 4000 names; and the other 30,000 people through their two senators and their seven representatives remonstrated against this proposed division. Gentlemen of this House and Mr. Speaker, those are the people who are anxiously awaiting your decision. Are you going to disappoint those people? Are you going against their unanimous wishes? We have the power, certainly, to divide counties, but do we have the moral right in this case? We have the brute strength surely, but we should legislate so that we may do the greatest good to the greatest number. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that this proposed division will not prevail. (Applause.)

Mr. JORDAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, in signing the majority report I wish to state very briefly the reasons why we reached the conclusion we did. . . e looked at the matter impartially, and if the matter of convenience were alone to be considered it would seem that this proposed division should prevail. But it seems to

be against precedent to divide the county in this matter against the serious opposition of the county. In the matter of petitions, the petitions from Hancock county outside of Stonington and Isle au Haut were practically unanimous against this division. The petitions from Stonington were divided, quite equally divided; I think there were 35 more signers for division than there were opposed to it. It seemed to me that the grievance of the parties who want to be divided was greatly magnified. It was shown before the committee that there was a stage line which was about 36 miles in length running from Stonington to the county seat of Ellsworth. It occurred to me that there are many towns in the State of Maine perhaps which are no worse off than is the town of Stonington in this respect. The matter of records was brought before the committee. It was in view of these considerations that we signed the majority report that the town should not be set off.

Mr. HARMON of Stonington: Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct the gentleman from Portland. Three hundred and fifty-one petitioners of Stonington favor of the annexation and 72 are against it. I think those are the correct figures.

Mr. JORDAN: I may have been in error as to the number.

Mr. HARMON: It is my opinion that the opposition before the committee and

on the floor of this House would have been much milder if it had not been for the fact that if our wishes are granted the lawyers of Hancock county would naturally lose quite a bit of business.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the acceptance of the majority report, reporting "ought not to pass" as to the division of Stonington.

A rising vote was had and the motion was agreed to by a vote of 101 to 18.

The SPEAKER: As to the bill relating to the town of Stonington, the question is on the acceptance of the minority report "ought not to pass." The minority report was accepted.

Today assigned: An Act to provide for the weekly payment of wages.

On motion of Mr. Dunn of Brewer the bill was tabled and assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion of Mr. Scates of Westbrook, Bill, An Act relating to Phillips Village Corporation, was taken from the table.

The bill then received its two readings and was assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion of Mr. Hedman of New Sweden,

Adjourned.