

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

Because I think it ought to be said in fairness to them, as well as to those of us who employ labor, that most of the men who work in the woods are as good a class of men as you will find working at any other trade or profession of the same kind, and most of them I believe try to use their employers well and fairly. I like to think that most of the men who employ these "Lumber Jacks," as we call them, try to use them fairly.

I want to say that personally I believe as the Senator from Penobscot has stated, that the present law works no hardship on any honest man seeking employment in the woods. I also believe as the Senator from Franklin stated, that very few men seeking employment, and perhaps very few of the men who have occasion to employ men in the woods, have any interest in the matter whatever.

For myself, while neither I nor anyone with whom I have been connected in business has had any occasion to use this present law, I am personally interested in the matter and shall ask to be excused from voting upon it.

The question being upon the indefinite postponement of the bill, Mr. Farrington of Kennebec moved that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays. A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays were ordered and the secretary called the roll. Those voting yeas were: Messrs. Blanchard, Denigan, Foss of Androscoggin, Foss of Cumberland, Fulton, Hill, Irving, Kellogg, Pendleton, Staples, Stearns, Theriault, Winslow,—13. Those voting nay were: Messrs. Allan, Boynton, Chandler, Dodge, Edwards, Farrington, Mullen, Noyes, Osborn, Sanborn, Smith,—11. Absentees, Gowell, Hamilton, Leach, Mayo, Moulton,—5. (Mr. Miliken was excused from voting.)

So the motion to indefinitely postpone the bill was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Stearns of Oxford,

Adjourned.

HOUSE.

Tuesday, March 7, 1911.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Quimby of Gardiner.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Senate Bills on First Reading.

Resolve in favor of the county commissioners of Franklin county in favor of repair and permanent improvement of highway in Washington Plantation and Perkins Plantation, in Perkins Plantation, in Franklin county.

Resolve in favor of the county commissioners of Franklin county for the repair and permanent improvement of highway in Letter E Plantation, and Sandy River Plantation in Franklin county.

Resolve in favor of the county commissioners of Franklin county for the repair and permanent improvement of the highway in Jerusalem and Crocker townships in Franklin county.

Majority and minority report on Bill, An Act for the better protection of the herring fishery.

The House accepted the majority report and the bill received its first reading.

On motion of Mr. Hogan of Portland the bill was tabled pending its second reading.

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

Judiciary.

By Mr. Bogue of East Machias—An Act to amend Section 42 of Chapter 66 of the Revised Statutes, relating to affidavit of notice of appointment of executors and administrators; also amending Section 14 of Chapter 89, Revised Statutes.

Also, An Act to amend Section 13 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 66 of the Public Laws of 1907, as amended by Chapter 195 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to fees of witnesses before referees, auditors and commissioners specially appointed to take testimony.

By Mr. Dutton of China—An Act to amend Chapter nine of the Revised Statutes relative to the property of public municipal corporations situated outside their corporate limits. (Tabled for printing pending reference on motion of Mr. Dutton.)

By Mr. Williamson of Augusta—An Act concerning corrupt practices at caucuses, elections and primaries.

By Mr. Davies of Yarmouth—An Act to prohibit foreign corporations engaging in the business of generating electricity by water power within the State of Maine.

Legal Affairs.

By Mr. LeBel of Westbrook—Petition of Pierre Theriault and others of Westbrook to repeal Chapter 151, Private and Special Laws of 1887, and to substitute in its stead an act providing for incorporation of Roman Catholic parishes.

By Mr. Cronin of Lewiston—Petition of H. L. Furbush of Lewiston for amendment of law relating to registration of dentists.

By Mr. Scates of Westbrook—Petition of Ralph M. Whitney of Westbrook, for same.

By Mr. Skehan of Augusta—Petition of Charles Bryant of Augusta, for same.

By Mr. Deering of Portland—Petition of George E. Dow and Charles T. Stevens of Portland, for same.

By Mr. Waldron of Portland—Petition of Arthur B. Leighton of Portland, for same.

Also, Petition of W. E. Hilborn of Portland, for same.

By Mr. Kelleher of Portland—Petition of Frank A. Hayden of Portland, for same.

Also, Petition of Walter S. Coleman of Portland, for same.

By Mr. Murphy of Portland—Petition of Darius S. Roberts of Portland, for same.

Also, Petition of Thomas E. Kirby of Chicopee, Mass., for same.

Also, Petition of S. B. Hilborn of Portland, for same.

By Mr. Jordan of Portland—Petition of C. P. Brown of Portland, for same.

Also, Petition of Fred B. Wheaton of Portland, for same.

Also, Petition of William H. Spear of Portland, for same.

Banks and Banking.

By Mr. Weymouth of Saco—An Act relating to banking institutions and trust companies.

Inland Fisheries and Game.

By Mr. Brown of Bethel—Petition of L. M. Blanchard and 31 others in regard to marking traps and buying furs.

Shore Fisheries.

By Mr. Harmon of Stonington—Remonstrance of N. R. Eaton of Deer Isle and 18 others, against a lobster license law.

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Chase from the committee on the judiciary reported "ought not to pass" on Bill, An Act proposing an amendment of the Constitution providing for the election of the secretary of State, treasurer and attorney general by the qualified electors.

Mr. Goodwin from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to incorporate the Sangerville Water supply Company.

Mr. Trafton from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act relating to the use of seals and relegating an ancient and once useful custom to innocuous desuetude. (Tabled pending acceptance on motion of Mr. Plummer of Lisbon.)

Mr. Lawry from the committee on ways and bridges reported same on Bill, An Act to repeal Chapter 349 of the Private and Special Laws of 1907 relating to closing the Pond road in Readfield to automobiles.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the towns of Enfield and Howland.

Mr. Mace from the committee on claims, on Resolve in favor of the county of Somerset, reported that the same ought not to pass as this Resolve is included in Resolve in favor of Kennebec and Somerset counties which

Mr. Bearce from the Penobscot County Delegation, reported "ought not to pass" on Bill, An Act to abolish the Dexter municipal court.

Mr. Lawry from the committee on ways and bridges, on Bill, An Act to free the Patterson Toll bridge, reported that the same be referred to the next Legislature.

Same gentleman from same commit-

tee, on Resolve to appropriate a sum of money to assist in freeing the Patterson Toll bridge, reported that the same be referred to the next Legislature.

The reports were accepted.

Mr. Hersey from the committee on the judiciary reported "ought to pass" on Bill, An Act to amend Chapter 374 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909.

Mr. Trafton from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to authorize the town of York to lease certain lands within said town.

Mr. Bogue from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to amend the charter of the Ossipee Valley Power Company.

Mr. Trafton from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act relating to the jurisdiction of the Bar Harbor municipal court of the town of Eiden.

Mr. Davies from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to change the name of the Baptist Religious Society of North Yarmouth and Freeport to the Baptist Religious Society of Yarmouth.

Mr. Staples from the same committee reported same on Bill, An Act authorizing the construction of a wharf in tide waters in Casco bay in the town of Cumberland.

Mr. Goodwin from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to incorporate the Monson Water Company.

Mr. Bogue from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to further amend Chapter 4 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 78 of the Public Laws of 1905, relating to town and city by-laws and ordinances. Special Laws of 1909, relating to Barrows Falls Light and Power Company.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to extend Chapter 263, Private and Special Laws of 1909.

Mr. Williamson from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Hiram Water, Light and Power Company.

Mr. Chase from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to amend Chapter 359 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903.

Mr. Davies from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to incorporate the Guilford Water District.

Mr. Hersey from same committee, on Bill, An Act to provide for two separate terms of court at Caribou, Aroostook county, reported the same in a new draft, under the title of "An Act to amend Chapter 79 of the Revised States as amended by Chapter 28 and 175 of the Public Laws of 1907, relating to terms of supreme judicial court in Aroostook county," and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Bisbee from the committee on appropriations and financial affairs, on Resolve providing for an epidemic or emergency fund for the year 1911, reported the same in a new draft under the title of "Resolve providing for an epidemic or emergency fund," and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Kelleher from same committee, on Resolve in favor of the Waldo County General hospital, (for maintenance of said institution) reported the same in a new draft under same title, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Stetson from the committee on interior waters, reported "ought to pass" on Bill, An Act to amend the charter of the Spencer Dam Company.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act to amend the charter of the Kibbie Dam Company.

Mr. Lawry from the committee on ways and bridges reported same on Bill, An Act authorizing Kingsbury Plantation to maintain its ways and bridges.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, An Act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Piscataqua river.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the Machiasport and East Machias bridge, with statement of facts.

Same gentleman from same committee, on Resolve in favor of a road in Elliottsville Plantation, reported the same in a new draft under same title, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Harmon from the committee on shore fisheries reported ought to pass on Bill, An Act establishing a close

time on lobsters in the waters of Winter Harbor in the county of Hancock.

Mr. Mace from the committee on claims reported same on Resolve in favor of Holden Brothers.

Mr. Kelley from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Sullivan Newton.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of East Livermore.

Mr. Clearwater from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of St. George.

Mr. Mace from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Waltham.

Mr. McCready from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Mattanawcook Academy.

Mr. Kelley from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of Frank Savage.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Norway.

Mr. Tucker from the committee on School for Feeble-Minded reported same on Resolve naming the principal building at the School for Feeble-Minded.

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

On motion of Mr. Connors of Bangor the rules were suspended and that gentleman introduced a bill, An Act to amend the charter of the Bangor Boom Company. (Referred to the committee on interior waters.)

Mr. WILLIAMSON of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended and that we take up orders of the day out of order.

The motion was agreed to.

Orders of the Day.

Today assigned: Resolution in favor of reciprocity with Canada.

Mr. Hogan of Portland moved that the minority report in favor of the resolution in a new draft be accepted.

Mr. HERSEY of Houlton: Mr. Speaker,

The SPEAKER: The bill is not in the possession of the House. The Clerk informs the Chair that it has not been returned from the printer.

There are two reports, a majority and minority, and the papers are not in the actual physical possession of the House. I will state that to the House and if it is the desire of the House to go on with the discussion until the papers are returned from the printer we will so proceed. House Document No. 369 contains the minority report, ought to pass, and the majority report is ought not to pass.

A division was had and 42 voting in favor of proceeding with discussion and 34 voting against, the motion to proceed with discussion at this time was declared carried.

Mr. HERSEY of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise at this time for the purpose of discussing the tariff, and neither do I wish for one moment to present this matter from any partisan or political standpoint. I think it is the most important question which will be before this Legislature, and I think it should be approached from no partisan standpoint. The manner in which the committee approached it could not have been partisan, Mr. Speaker, for the majority of that committee said that they were opposed to this resolution while the minority presented a report which is a modification of the original resolve which indorses the doctrine of reciprocity with Canada of which I suppose there is no objection in any quarter; but the object of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, if passed by this Legislature, must intend to say to the President of the United States and to the incoming Congress in special session that this Legislature of Maine indorses the resolve or treaty for reciprocity with Canada.

That treaty comes before our Congress under peculiar circumstances. It came a few weeks ago like thunder in a clear sky, it startled the nation, it came from a Republican President, it came without consultation with Congress, it came without consultation with the leaders of his own party or the leaders of any other party, it came without notice, without an examination, it came at a time when it was popular to speak of reciprocity as a great benefit to our nation, and for

the first few days after this announcement the people of this nation thought that the President had taken a position that would bring to the people of this nation more prosperity and had inaugurated something for the benefit of the whole people; but as time went on—and time settles these matters all right—it was found that such a measure did not meet the ideas of Congress, either Democratic or Republican, it did not meet the desires of the people of America, and it certainly did not meet the desires or wishes of that great class, the agriculturalists, the farmers, the tillers of the soil, because they have learned something of what it contains and of its effects upon this country of ours.

I wish to ask the patience of this House while I bring before you some facts to demonstrate that this treaty ought not to be approved by Congress and ought not to be approved by this Legislature. It is class legislation, un-Democratic, un-Republican and un-American. Between us and Canada there is a border line of 3700 miles, reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. North of that line bordering the United States is a country, a territory as large as the United States, Canada, settled at about the same time that the United States were settled or a little before, and since the time of those settlements Canada has grown to a country of about 7,000,000 people, while the United States have about 91,000,000. The United States has become the greatest nation of the earth during that period. Her great natural resources have developed and become the wonder of the world. On the other hand, across the line in Canada, her forests still stand primeval almost as they were on the morn of creation, the great water powers of the St. John and the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes are undeveloped, her waters through her numerous rivers run unweaved by mill wheels to the sea. She has a soil as rich as ours, and in all her agricultural resources she surpasses us. She has greater water powers and natural resources undeveloped than we have. Her waters are full of fish to supply to the world, no restric-

tions upon labor, and for that reason we find the labor of the world drifting to Canada, cheap pauper labor at her hands to develop her resources, her farms are undeveloped, her agricultural pursuits are of no consequence, of account, she still retains her 7,000,000, small in the markets of the world; and this treaty says that these 7,000,000 people north of us shall have the markets of 91,000,000 people, and in exchange for the agricultural products of the farmers we shall have the great privilege of a market of 7,000,000.

Now Mr. Speaker, this present treaty although it has received merit as something new, as some great thing inaugurated by President Taft as a great blessing to our people, is not new; it is something old, something that this nation once discarded. We had this same treaty in 1854, and we had it for 12 years, commencing in 1854 and ending in 1865, the same treaty that President Taft says we want now, and at the end of that 12 years we sent from the Congress of the United States to England this notice, that it was no longer for the interest of the United States to continue the same course. Previous to that notice from our Congress to Canada in the Canadian Parliament of 1864 the privy council made this report:

"It would be impossible to express in figures with any approach to accuracy the extent to which the facilities of commercial intercourse created by the reciprocity treaty have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this Province; and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities."

England approved of it and England prospered under it and Canada grew rich under it, and we suffered; and so we repudiated it, and Senator Sherman of Ohio, when that matter came before our Congress where they repudiated the treaty and would stand by it no longer, said:

"All the products of Canada come into our markets free of this duty. While this treaty stands it is a dis-

crimination against every farmer and every mechanic and every industrial interest of the Western states. The farmer in Canada may raise his grain and produce and send it to our markets free of duty, and it pays no tax. We cannot reach their railroads; we can not tax their transportation; we can not effect them in the least; and yet every interest of our farmers is taxed. It is manifest, therefore, that while we maintain our present system of internal taxation, the reciprocity treaty is a direct benefit to the Canadian producer, farmer, and mechanic, and it is a discrimination against our own farmers and mechanics. It seems to me, therefore, for this reason alone, if there were no other, that this treaty ought to fall," and it did.

Now then, during the Cleveland administration and while the tariff question was under discussion it was though then that they might revive the old treaty of 1854, and they attempted to do it through Cleveland; and he, great Democrat that he was, repudiated that. In the Canadian Parliament on the 24th day of February, 1903 Sir John Charlton then a member of the Canadian Parliament, said:

"The American policy has been applied not only to us, but to all the world. The object of the United States has been to sell all that it possibly could of the products of its soil and its mills and its workshops and to buy just as little as it could from other countries, and thus have as much of the balance of trade in its own favor as possible. The result has been that the balance of trade in favor of the United States last year amounted to \$600,000,000 as against the whole world, \$71,000,000 as against Canada. That is a good thing for the United States, and it will be her policy so long as the rest of the whole world will permit her to do it; but it is not good for us."

Then he goes on to say further:

"Something must be done to change the trade conditions that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment. Noth-

ing short of this will do, and this condition of free trade of natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than she has already made. We can not afford any more."

We have now through President Taft a revival of the treaty of 1854 and nothing more. In order that you may have no question about it, a few days ago Mr. Fielding, the minister of finance of the Canada government, before the Canadian Parliament said this about the treaty that he wanted his Parliament to adopt:

"It is the reciprocity agreement of 1854 over again with comparatively little change. It promises prosperity to the people of Canada, and this House would make a grave mistake and do a great wrong if it refused to take advantage of it."

Now the President of the United States takes the old treaty of 1854, discarded by the United States, and revives it and puts it before the Senate by a special message, and he says that he wants it to go through without reference to a committee, without discussion, without giving the people of this great nation an opportunity to see what it contains, and without even giving to Congress the privilege of negotiating that treaty, and he says "You must pass it before this Congress adjourns," and when Congress adjourns without passing it he inaugurates by a special message a special session of Congress to crowd this treaty down the throats of the people of this nation. You cannot amend it, you have got to take it as it comes, make all the fight you please it must be taken as a whole or defeated. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is discrimination against the farmers of this country and in favor of Canada and not one whit in favor of the United States.

Now, in order that we may make no mistake about this matter, when England saw that there was free trade by this treaty with her colony, Canada, in agricultural products, she saw that if that thing became effective it meant annexation and she would lose her colonies because there was nothing then between them and everything

would be in common, and the 7,000,000 would take the blessings of the 91,000,000 in the market, and she could not hold her colonies, and so England says to her minister there "What about this?" and Fielding sends a cablegram to England, and what does he say? He says:

"Canada is seeking markets everywhere for her surplus products, subsidizing steamship lines, and sending out commercial agents. Would it not be ridiculous in the pursuit of such a policy to refuse to avail herself of the markets of the great nation lying alongside? The expressed fear that it will seriously affect imports from Great Britain is groundless. The greater part of the agreement deals with natural products Great Britain does not send out. The range of manufactures affected is small and in most cases the reductions are small.

"It appears to be assumed in some quarters that the tariff rates agreed upon discriminate in favor of the United States and against Great Britain. There is no foundation for this. In every case Great Britain will still have the same rate, or a lower one. Canada's right to deal with the British preference as she pleases remains untouched by the agreement. The adoption of the agreement will probably lead to some further revision of the Canadian tariff, in which the Canadian Parliament will be entirely free to fix the British preferential tariff at any rates that should be deemed proper."

Now, what is reciprocity? It is a popular word, but what is it. I will give you a definition of it, the best definition which I could find in the dictionary.

"Reciprocity is an arrangement or agreement between our own Nation and another nation by which we agree to admit, free of duty, certain articles which we need, but which we can not raise or produce here; and in return the other nation admits to its ports, free of duty, certain articles which we produce and which they need, but can not produce in their own land."

Take that definition. Does that define the treaty proposed to be in augu-

rated in this nation? Not at all. It is not reciprocity. There are a lot of us here who are in favor of reciprocity, but this is nothing but a discrimination against the farmers of the United States. Now, in order that you may understand it still further, what does the Canadian press think of this thing? Are they getting a good thing? The Manitoba Free Press in that great agricultural country of Manitoba, the richest land upon the face of the earth what do they say?

"The outstanding feature of the tariff is the complete reciprocity in farm products. This will undoubtedly be popular with the farmers both of the East and of the West. The good times in the eastern Provinces during the life of the Elgin treaty are a matter of tradition, and there is no doubt that the opening of the markets of the great American cities to the products of the Eastern farms will be acceptable and profitable to the Eastern farmer. In the West free wheat and free access to the Chicago market for his cattle will undoubtedly appeal very strongly to the cultivator of the soil."

The Ontario Advertiser has not been altogether satisfied with us in the past, but after characterizing the treaty as "the Canadian farmers' triumph," it authorizes us to congratulate ourselves that all is now forgiven. It says:

"The treaty agreement is a complete reversal of the normal attitude of the United States for nearly half a century. Except during the brief periods of Cleveland's ascendancy, the policy of the country since the Civil War has been one of stiff-necked protectionism, with a particularly forbidding front toward Canada. Probably no persons have been more surprised at the change than the Canadian negotiators. They could scarcely have expected such liberality when they set out for Washington."

But somebody says in giving the market for Canadian farm products in competition to our own will lower the price of food products and thereby help your labor, but that is the greatest blow there could be to labor in this land. In the United States, in the State of Maine, the laborer is

the best paid of any laborer on the face of the earth, and you and I know it. Yes, he is the best paid, and why? Because on this great border between us and Canada stands the immigrant inspection officer as well as the custom house. We keep out the cheap and the pauper labor of the world. Pass that treaty and Canada with her great natural resources and her powers to manufacture cheaply with cheap labor, and how she can compete with the manufacturers of this great nation! To be sure the cost of living is high but wages are correspondingly high. You may lower the cost of living by cheapening the farm products but then you must lower labor at the same time. Let us look at it. There are today 48,322 saw-mills in the United States, employing in round numbers 1,250,000 men who support a population of 5,000,000 people. Where would those people be with the natural resources of Canada and the mills upon her great water powers to compete with? There are \$300,000,000 invested in the pulp and paper mills of the United States, employing 112,000 men. Premier Gouin, in speaking for the Province of Quebec, is quoted in the press as saying:

"The desire of the provincial government is to make Quebec the center of the pulp and paper industry of the world, and there is no reason why this should not be accomplished, for Quebec has the essential pulp wood and water power."

We have heard a great deal of discussion in this Legislature about the protection of the fisheries along the coast of Maine. Fishermen have been looking after their wants, sea and shore fisheries. It is a great enterprise in the State of Maine, a great enterprise along the coast of Maine. The great state of Washington is the first state in the Union in the matter of fisheries. What about those fisheries? Pass that treaty and you won't discuss the fish question in a Maine Legislature; it won't be necessary; there will be no fish question, and there will be no fisheries along the coast of Maine. We cannot compete with the Canadian waters that

are full of fish; the packing houses along the coast of Maine and Massachusetts and Oregon and Washington cannot compete with the packing houses that will be erected where the fish are. Have you any doubt of that? Premier G. H. Murray of Nova Scotia in discussing the provisions of the treaty before the Canadian Parliament on February 24 said:

"I see no reason today why the fishing fleet of Nova Scotia should not increase threefold. I see no reason why we should not become the principal fish food producers of this continent."

"For a quarter of a century the fishing portion—one-third—of our population longed for a free market with the nation to the south," he continued. "Now that great wish seems satisfied, and hope is filling the heart of every man who follows the sea for a livelihood."

What about the farmers? I said it was not a matter of politics. Democrats and Republicans alike ought to be agreed in the State of Maine upon this matter. Even the *Water-ville Sentinel*, on February 27 said:

"The scheme of reciprocity with Canada proposed by President Taft is not a fair proposition, judged either from the viewpoint of a tariff for a protection or from the viewpoint of free trade or from the viewpoint of a tariff for revenue. From the viewpoint of a tariff for protection its aim is to take away from the farmers of this country what little of special privilege is extended to them. From the viewpoint of trade it fails to correct the favoritism granted to other lines of business besides farming. From the standpoint of tariff for revenue it is an absolute failure because it still adheres to the policy of a tariff for the protection of privilege."

The Bangor Commercial of February 14th said:

"The ratification of the proposed reciprocity measure in its present form would be a blow for the future as well as for the present. A blow to the Maine industries depending upon our forest

products would mean a blow to hundreds of thousands of people whose livelihood comes from these industries. We are glad to build for the future but not at the expense of the present, and cannot but object to a measure that, if adopted, will injure Maine's interests until such time as it is abrogated.

"But it is not alone the lumbermen, the paper and pulp manufacturers and the dealers in the manifold forest products who will be dealt a vital blow should the reciprocity agreement be ratified, for every potato farmer, dairy farmer, cattle raiser and hay producer will find his prosperity very seriously menaced.

"This is a question that is of vital importance to every farmer not only in Maine but of all states adjacent to the Canadian boundary for naturally the interests more directly affected are those near the boundary. They naturally can see no justice or equity in giving the manufacturer protection on the articles that they must buy and proclaiming free trade on the products of the farm, of protecting meat and not livestock.

"It has been said that Canada does not raise a vast amount of farm products but this does not mean that she cannot. Open to Canada the markets of the United States on a more than even basis with our farmers, for our neighbors across the border can buy their farms and obtain their labor more cheaply, and the result is not far to seek. Right across the Maine line in Canada are thousands and thousands of acres of fertile lands. Give them a profitable market and their production will be vastly increased at the expense of Maine. Our farmers will suffer in lower prices for their products and depreciation of their farms and the State will suffer in the removal of many of its agriculturalists across the border. And what is true of Maine is equally true of the other states that are adjacent to the Canadian border.

"It is not at all surprising that the sentiment in Canada over the proposed treaty is one of gratification mingled with surprise for Canada is by far the larger beneficiary."

P. B. Carvell, Liberal member from New Brunswick, said recently:

"It is practically the unanimous wish of the electorate of the Maritime provinces, Conservatives as well as Liberal, that there should be freer access to the American markets for the natural branches products of Canada."

Under the agreement he felt sure there was no possibility that any Canadian interest would suffer. On the contrary, they would all be greatly stimulated. In his own country, he said, hundreds of Canadian farmers had crossed the international boundary line, a stone's throw away not because the land of Maine was more fertile but because the New Brunswick farmer did not have as good a market as the man in Maine."

The Carleton Sentinel, published in New Brunswick, under date of Feb. 3, says this as an editorial:

"We direct our readers to a careful study of the proposed reciprocity agreement concluded between the representatives of Canada and the United States, and made public on Thursday of last week. It will be seen that if this proposal becomes law, practically everything produced by the farmers of New Brunswick will be admitted into the United States markets free from duty.

"One can hardly grasp at the outset what this will mean to the farmers and ordinary producers of the Province.

"As compensation for these wonderful boons, all that we are granting the United States producers is a reduction in duty of from 2½ to 5 per cent. on farm machinery. Thus from a farming standpoint and, in fact, from the standpoint of practically every person in New Brunswick, we win both ways. We will not only obtain a better market for our producers but we will obtain cheaper machinery with which to produce them."

It is true that we have a large number of corporations, a trust you may call it, in the United States manufacturing farming machinery. It will help those few trusts in getting a market for their farm machinery, machinery with which they can do better work.

The Observer, published in New

Brunswick, under date of Feb. 1 says:

"Never since confederation has there been such a golden prospect for Carleton county farmers as is held out by the new tariff agreement announced in Parliament last Thursday. Throughout Canada the message that Hon. Mr. Fielding bore was considered the most important achievement ever made for the Canadian people. For weeks a committee composed of Canadian and American tariff experts have been arranging an agreement of reciprocity, or free trade particularly in farm products, and the concessions gained from the Americans are a surprise to every Canadian, for those who have read the full report will have noticed that our neighbors concede to Canada much more than we have given.

"The new arrangement will not become law until the measure passes both Parliament and Congress. That it will pass the farmers here by a most decisive majority goes without saying, but there is reason to apprehend that the measure may be killed in either the House of Representatives or the United States Senate.

"Over in Arcostook farmers are getting 40 cents a dozen for eggs, 50 cents for cats, 12 cents for pork, \$10 for hay. When this tariff agreement passes Carleton county farmers will be situated on an equal with their Yankee neighbors, and the day the measure becomes law every farm in Carleton county will increase in value 25 to 50 per cent.

"The day the United States House and Senate passes the proposed measure, Carleton county comes in for not only her own but a great slice of her neighbor's market."

Do they know what they are talking about? It is nothing but class legislation while the farmers of this great nation are selected for the sacrifice. And you have accomplished nothing by it. You won't relieve the laborer or the manufacturer or the consumer, but you will injure the producer. Now I say, gentlemen of this House, that the time has been in the past when Democrats and Republicans stood together for Maine and for this great nation of ours. They stood together shoulder

to shoulder when the Union was threatened. They stood together for a United Republic, they marched shoulder to shoulder, they were one, and they saved the Union and they saved the State of Maine. Again they stood together. Democrats and Republicans, some years ago when it was proposed to take our money and depreciate and degrade it and make of a dollar, fifty cents, and they stood together shoulder to shoulder and they saved the money in this country. The time has come now when they must again stand shoulder to shoulder to save the agricultural interests of this nation. Too much talk has been made about the consumer who must depend upon the farmer. The vital source of all our life comes from the farmer. Back to the farm we must go for prosperity. The farmer is the life-blood of the Republic. You must save the farmer if you would have the nation and the people; and I say the time has come when the producer must be given some protection and you must have some regard for him. The great agricultural interests of this nation, the millions of farmers today that protest against this measure must be heard, and they will be heard, they will be heard in this House of Representatives or they will fill the House with those who will hear them. I say that in agricultural Maine we should stand today a unit against this treaty, and say that the majority of this committee, composed of Republicans and Democrats alike, are right when they state that this measure, this resolution, ought not to pass.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, I would have been willing to have this matter go by without this House taking any action whatever. If, however, we must do one thing or another, I think perhaps it might be worthy of consideration to direct their attention to what is best to be done. I am not of those who would agree with the gentleman from Houlton that this reciprocity treaty spells ruination to the farmers of this State. In fact, personally, I may say, so far as I am concerned, I think it would be of advantage to the farmers of this State

and the country and the wage earners of the country to strike off all tariff boundaries, all tariff walls, between this country and Canada or any other country whether that country see fit to do so or not. The gentleman from Houlton said he would not bring it up as a partisan question, and neither do I. There are of course more or less on both sides of both political parties who favor, some a reduction of the tariff, possibly some even free trade. Inasmuch as the tariff question enters into this to so great an extent I would like to call the attention of the House to one or two points.

It strikes me that the tariff is kind of a peculiar proposition anyway. It assumes some things that appear to me to be utterly incongruous, utterly opposed to one another. For instance, at the time of the Rebellion we blockaded the Southern ports for the purpose of preventing trade, and we did it principally for the purpose of preventing imports. Now I assume that the North would have had no objections if every bale of cotton and every bushel of corn had been shipped out of the country. It would have done us no harm if they all had gone out. Then the Southern Confederacy would have had a big balance of trade in their favor, according to the gentleman from Houlton. What we tried to prevent was goods coming in, and that is just what a tariff tries to do, is to prevent goods coming into a country. The tariff does not prevent them going out. In other words, we try to do to ourselves in times of peace what we tried to do to our enemies in times of war. Now that strikes me to be an absurd proposition.

There is another matter about it that seems to be very peculiar, too. If the Southern Confederacy had succeeded, on the doctrine of the advocates of the tariff it would have been necessary for us to have custom houses along Mason and Dixon's line or wherever the boundary should have been made. As it is, it is all right for us to trade back and forth from the North to the South and from the South to the North. I think at the present time there is under dispute the bound-

dary up here between Maine and Canada. Now observe that if that boundary is moved perhaps so that in one position it becomes to the disadvantage of the people, of the farmers, on the western side of that artificial boundary line, if it becomes to their disadvantage to trade with people on the eastern side of that line, on the other hand, if the commission should set that boundary perhaps one mile or less or more farther east, then it becomes all right for those farmers who are on the westerly side of the first proposed line to trade with those who are now inside the new Maine lines. Now that strikes me, as I say, as quite a peculiar condition of affairs. I do not find any warrant for it in nature.

The same thing is illustrated in the case of Texas. When Texas was a part of Mexico she needed protection against the United States. When she freed herself from Mexico and was an independent state she needed protection against the United States and Mexico too. But when she became a part of this Union she no longer needed protection against the United States but she needed protection against Mexico. The Rio Grande, I think is the boundary between the two countries. Sometimes it changes its course. Some years ago, perhaps over night, it changed its course so that some hundreds of thousands of acres which had previous to this change belonged to Mexico were brought into the United States. Now on that island or piece of land were some hundreds or thousands of sheep. Now we have a tariff on wool and I suppose a tariff on mutton. Now observe, that previous to that shifting, those sheep needed protection against American sheep, but after the Rio Grande changed its course they needed protection against Mexican sheep.

Now another thing. We are building a Panama Canal at an expense of some hundreds of millions. I suppose we do it to make trade easier, to make trade not more free, but so it may be less trammelled. The object of a tariff is to make trade more difficult. Now it is absurd for this great government to spend money on the one hand to

make trade easier and on the other hand to spend money by the erection of custom houses and the employment of custom officials to make it more difficult. One or the other of those two propositions is manifestly wrong; there is no escape from it. Now as to the idea that this proposition is going to be of advantage to the people of Canada—and I think the gentleman from Houlton quoted some papers where it is said that it would be a good thing for the farmers there. Now the fact that it appears to be a good thing for the farmers of Canada is no evidence of itself that it will be a bad thing for us people or even for the farmers of this country. I assume that when two people trade on equal terms that each of them considers the trade is of advantage to him. Nobody trades because the other man wants to, he trades because he wants to himself; and if he is left alone the chances are in the long run he will be able to look out for himself just as well as any paternal government can look out for him. So I say the mere fact that a person who has something to sell wants to sell it is not evidence of the fact that it is a disadvantage to the person who wishes to buy. Now they say that the fishing industry of this nation would be killed. And the gentleman quoted some paper where somebody said that the fishing fleet of Nova Scotia would be increased three-fold. They would sell us more fish presumably but they would sell them because we want them, not because they wished to sell them. If we don't want the fish they would not sell them to us, but if they sell us more fish they are manifestly expecting something in return, as is the case with all trade. The gentleman brought up the proposition of there being 7,000,000 people in Canada and 90,000,000 in the United States, as if we were to take all of their products, the 91,000,000 to take all the products of the 7,000,000, and give to the 7,000,000 all of the products of the 91,000,000. That would be a very hard trade; but the 91,000,000 would not be men I think of the average intelligence of this Legislature anyway if they would consent to or would perform

any such proposition as that. Probably the 91,000,000 would buy of the 7,000,000 what the 7,000,000 had that they wished to sell which the 91,000,000 wished to buy, and the 7,000,000 would buy of the 91,000,000 or some part of them such portion as the 91,000,000 wished to sell and the 7,000,000 wished to buy, equally one to the other. There would be no advantage on account of the difference in number. In the case of the gentleman's town of Houlton and Portland or Boston, they have free trade between them. On the same reasoning, it might be a bad thing for Boston or Portland to trade with Houlton because Boston or Portland or New York are so much larger than Houlton. Now instead of extending the tariff wall between this country and Canada, why not put it somewhere between Houlton and Portland or between Houlton and Boston or between the State of Maine and Boston, because Boston is larger than the whole State; so it would be better to put it along the boundary there.

I want to call attention to one thing. I hold in my hand the report of the commission on the high cost of living, I think appointed by the Massachusetts Legislature last year, and they reported on the prices of different things. There was a bi-partisan commission consisting of two gentlemen, one a Democrat and one a Republican, and on page 642 of this report and following there are some prices of whole cattle. The only prices I will compare are those of Boston, Montreal, Bangor and St. John. Here are whole cattle, price per pound in Boston nine to twelve cents. Montreal, nine to nine and one half, Bangor, nine and one half to eleven and one half, in St. John, ten to ten and one half. Now manifestly whether the Aroostook man sold his cattle in St. John or Bangor, or whether the New Brunswick man sold his cattle in St. John or Bangor makes but little difference. Here is whole pork. Boston fourteen, Montreal fourteen and one half. A little better price up there. Bangor thirteen and one half, not quite so good as in Montreal. St. John twelve; a little less. Now here is

whole ham, Boston nineteen, Montreal twenty, Bangor and St. John twenty each. Sliced bacon, twenty-four in Boston and Montreal, twenty-five and twenty-two in Bangor and St. John. There is butter, twenty-eight in Bangor, twenty-seven in St. John. No great difference there. Print butter thirty-three in Bangor, thirty in St. John. Fresh eggs, thirty in Boston, thirty in Montreal, Bangor twenty-two, St. John twenty-three. Potatoes—these prices I assume were for a year or two ago—Bangor fifty cents, St. John forty cents. And various vegetables, beets, sixty-five, fifty in St. John, carrots fifty in Bangor, sixty in St. John. Now these all run substantially the same. I have mentioned only those products which farmers are supposed to sell. The other things of course that they have to buy, if the reciprocity treaty should reduce the price of them, I suppose they would have no objection to it. But as I stated I do not think there is to be the great calamity overcoming and overwhelming the farmers of this State or of this nation from the adoption of the reciprocity treaty or the adoption of this resolution recommending it.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the adoption of the minority report of this committee, ought to pass in new draft. The clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Allen of Columbia Falls, Allen of Jonesboro, Ames, Andrews, Bearce, Bogue, Chase, Clark, Copeland, Couture, Cowan, Davis, Deering of Portland, Descoteaux, Dresser, Dunn, Farnham, Files, Frank, Gamache, Goodwin, Harmon, Hartwell, Hastings, Heffron, Hodgkins, Hogan, Jordan, Kelley, Kelleher, Lawry, LeBel, Libby, Manter, McCurdy, Mower, Murphy, Noyes, Pattangall, Patten, Pelletier, Perkins of Kennebunk, Perkins of Mechanic Falls, Phillips, Plummer, Putnam, Scates, Skehan, Small, Active I. Snow, Alvah Snow, Stetson, Trimble, Tucker, Waldron, Weymouth, Wilkins, Williamson, Woodside—59.

NAY—Austin, Benn, Boman, Burkett, Campbell, Colby, Connors, Doyle, Drummond, Dufour, Dutton, Hedman, Hersey, Hodgman, Kennard, Kingsbury, Knight, Lambert, Macomber, Mallet, McAllister, McCann, Mitchell, Morse of Belfast,

Packard, Peters, Pinkham, Pollard, Porter of Mapleton, Porter of Pembroke, Powers, Robinson of Lagrange, Robinson of Peru, Sawyer, Shea, Smith, Snow of Bucksport, Stinson, Strickland, Thompson of Presque Isle, Thompson of Skowhegan, Trask, Turner, Whitney, Wilcox, —45.

ABSENT—Anderson, Averill, Berry, Bisbee, Bowker, Briggs, Brown, Buzzell, Clearwater, Cronin, Cyr, Davies, Deering of Waldoboro, Dow, Emerson, Emery, Fenderson, Greenwood, Gross Johnson, Littlefield of Bluehill, Littlefield of Wells, Mace, Marriner, McBride, McCready, Merrifield, Merrill, Miller of Hartland, Monroe, Morse of waterford, Newcomb, Otis, Percy, Pike, Quimby, Ross, Russell, Sleeper, Soule, Trafton, Trim, Weston, Wheeler, Wilson—45.

So the minority report was accepted.

On motion of Mr. Williamson of Augusta the House took a recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening.

EVENING SESSION.

First Reading of Printed Bills.

Resolve in favor of the town of Danforth.

Resolve in favor of the Maine School for the Deaf.

Resolve in favor of roads in Indian Township.

Resolve in favor of the Central Maine Association for the relief and control of tuberculosis.

Resolve in favor of the Bath City hospital.

Resolve in favor of the York hospital.

Resolve in favor of the Maine Children's Home Society of Augusta.

Resolve in favor of the Children's Heart Work Society of Maine.

Resolve in favor of the Old Town hospital.

Resolve making an appropriation for the purpose of obtaining information in regard to wild lands for the purpose of taxation.

Resolve in favor of repairing the road known as the Lake road, in Township C and C Surplus, in Oxford county, with statement of facts.

Resolve in favor of the Healy Asylum, located at Lewiston.

Resolve, in favor of the Bath Military and Naval Orphan Asylum.

Resolve in favor of the Women's Christian Temperance Union Temporary Home for Children.

Resolve, in aid of Trull Hospital Aid Association.

Resolve, in favor of the Maine Mission for the Deaf.

Resolve in favor of the Good Samaritan Home Association of Bangor.

Resolve providing for carrying on the work of the State Survey Commission.

Resolve authorizing the land agent to sell certain public lots in Cary Plantation in Aroostook county.

Resolve in favor of the Maine Seed Improvement Association.

Resolve in favor of Bangor Children's Home.

Resolve in favor of the Webber Hospital Association of Biddeford.

Resolve in favor of the Bar Harbor and Surgical hospital, located at Bar Harbor, Maine.

Resolve in favor of the Androscoggin Anti-Tuberculosis Association.

Resolve in favor of the town of Norridgewock.

Resolve in favor of the Maine State Sanatorium Association.

Resolve in favor of the Augusta General hospital.

Resolve in favor of Knox County General hospital.

Resolve in favor of the Eastern Maine General hospital.

Resolve in favor of the Children's Protective Society of Portland.

Resolve in favor of the Children's Aid Society of Maine, located at Belfast.

Resolve in favor of the town of Trescott.

Resolve in favor of the Free High school precinct in the town of Dixmont known as North Dixmont Precinct District number one.

Resolve in favor of the counties of Kennebec and Somerset.

Resolve in favor of the town of Albion.

Resolve for the appointment of delegates to the conferences of the International Tax Association.

Resolve providing for an appropriation for the protection of trees and shrubs from the introduction and ravages of dangerous insects and diseases for the year 1912.

Resolve providing for an appropriation for the protection of trees and

shrubs for the introduction and ravages of dangerous insects and diseases

Resolve in favor of John A. McDONALD.

An Act regulating the use of rights and locations in public streets.

An Act to prohibit the removing of waste or packing from the journal box or boxes of locomotives and railroad cars.

An Act in addition to Chapter 93 of the Revised Statutes, relating to liens on lands.

An Act to extend the charter of the Rangeley Lakes and Megantic Railroad Company.

An Act to protect striped or sea bass, in the waters of the Sheepscot river and its tributaries.

An Act to prevent the throwing of refuse or mill waste into the Baskagegan stream.

An Act to amend Section 89 of Chapter 94 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to the compensation of selectmen.

An Act granting certain powers to the Pennamaquam Power Company.

An Act to regulate the investment of deposits in banks and trust companies.

An Act to incorporate the town of Eagle Lake.

An Act for the better protection of the forests from fire.

An Act granting certain powers to the Eastport Water Company.

An Act to grant certain powers to the Hancock County Trustees of Public reservations.

An Act to incorporate the Knox County Central Railroad.

An Act amendatory of and additional to Chapter 48 of the Revised Statutes relating to annual examinations of Savings Banks and Trust Companies and verification of savings deposits. (Re-committed to committee on banks and banking on motion of Mr. Goodwin of Biddeford.)

An Act to authorize the removal of the bodies of deceased persons from the old cemetery in the plantation of Ellottsville.

An Act to amend Chapter 625 of the Private and Special Laws of 1893.

An Act relating to Vassalboro, China & Windsor Light & Power Company.

An Act granting a new charter to the Farmington Village Corporation.

An Act in relation to the Rumford Falls municipal court.

An Act relating to the protection of smelts along the coast of Maine from Casco bay to Penobscot bay.

An Act to amend Chapter 359 of the Special Laws of 1909, relating to maintenance of a dam across Big Machias stream, in the town of Ashland.

An Act to extend the charter of the Scarborough and Cape Elizabeth Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Winter Harbor Light Company.

An Act to incorporate the Dean Hill Cemetery Improvement Association.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 22 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 231 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to sentence for maintaining a nuisance. (Tabled pending second reading on motion of Mr. Murphy of Portland.)

An Act to incorporate the Cherryfield Water Company.

An Act in relation to the Belfast and Liberty Electric Railroad Company. (Tabled pending third reading on motion of Mr. Williamson of Augusta.)

An Act to establish the Lubec, East Machias and Machias Railway Company.

An Act to ratify the change of name of Brunswick Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the David Improvement Company. (Tabled pending first reading on motion of Mr. Kelliher of Portland.)

An Act relating to the solemnization of marriages.

An Act to repeal Chapter 137 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903 relating to the charter of the city of Auburn and the creation of the Board of Public Works.

An Act to amend Sections 11 and 12 of Chapter 222 of the Public Laws of 1909 relating to licensing of dogs.

An Act to incorporate the Franklin Water Company.

An Act in relation to Employment agencies.

An Act to incorporate the Norridge-wock Water Company.

An Act to incorporate the Sanger-ville Village Corporation.

Passed to Be Engrossed.

Senate Bill, No. 129, An Act relating to fishing in Wesserunsett stream.

Senate Bill, No. 130, An Act to regulate the transportation of fish and game.

House Bill, No. 306, An Act relating to duties of State and local assessors.

House Bill, No. 325, An Act to regulate ice fishing Fitts pond.

House Bill, No. 328, An Act relating to payment of damage to growing crops. (Tabled pending third reading on motion of Mr. Pattangall of Waterville.)

House Bill, No. 332, An Act giving additional powers to Rumford Falls Village Corporation.

House Bill, No. 333, An Act to authorize mayor of Portland to appoint commissioners of cemeteries and public grounds.

House Bill, No. 334, An Act to incorporate Maine Title Insurance Company.

House Bill, No. 335, An Act relating to Board of Overseers of Poor of Portland.

House Bill, No. 336, An Act relating to appointment of guardians.

House Bill, No. 346, An Act relating to assessment of taxes in organized plantations.

Senate Bill, No. 131, An Act regulating number pounds salmon, trout, togue and perch in one person's possession.

(The vote was reconsidered where-by this bill received its two readings and the bill was then recommitted to the committee in concurrence.)

Passed to Be Enacted.

An Act to amend Section 6 of Chapter 345 of the Special Laws of 1909, relating to the creation of a board of trustees for the Sullivan-Franklin bridge across the "Narrows" so-called.

An Act to amend Section 12 of Chapter 200 of the Private and Special laws of Maine of the year 1899, entitled "An

Act to incorporate the Kennebec Water District.' '

An Act to incorporate L'Association d'Epargnes de Waterville.

An Act to extend the charter of the Winter Harbor and Eastern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Monmouth Electric Company.

An Act to extend the rights, powers and privileges of the Hancock and Sullivan Bridge Company.

An Act relating to fishing in the tributaries to Jim pond and in Jim brook, in township number one, range five, W. B. K. B., or Jim Pond township, so called, in county of Franklin.

An Act to prohibit throwing of sawdust or other mill waste into the outlet of Worthley pond, in the town of Peru, in the county of Oxford.

An Act to authorize the town of York to construct a way across tidewater of Barrell's Mill pond, so called, in York Harbor.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 38 of the Public Laws of 1905.

An Act to extend the charter of the Parlin Stream Dam and Improvement Company.

An Act to authorize the Bangor Railway and Electric Company to take water from Brewer pond and its tributaries.

An Act to incorporate the Fort Kent and Clairs Toll Bridge Company.

An Act to amend Section 27 of Chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes, relating to public school attendance.

An Act to amend Section 96 of Chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 87 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to agents of schools in unorganized townships.

An Act relating to equity procedure.

An Act relating to holidays.

An Act to provide a charter for the city of Gardiner.

Finally Passed.

Resolve for the introduction of the Hungarian partridge in the State of Maine.

Orders of the Day.

On motion of Mr. Pattangall of Waterville, the rules were suspended and

that gentleman introduced Bill, An Act relating to the packing of sardines, and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was tabled for printing pending its reference to the committee on shore fisheries.

Resolve for the introduction of the Hungarian partridge in the State of Maine.

This resolve came from the Senate re-committed by that branch to the committee on inland fisheries and game.

The question being, shall the House reconsider the vote whereby the resolve was finally passed.

A division was had and the motion was agreed to by a vote of 48 to 28.

The resolve was then re-committed to the committee on inland fisheries and game in concurrence.

On motion of Mr. Tucker of Wisnasset, Resolve in favor of the town of Roque Bluffs, was taken from the table, and on further motion by Mr. Tucker the resolve was recommitted to the committee.

On motion by Mr. Tucker the report of the committee on School for Feeble Minded, on bill in relation to the School for the Feeble Minded, was taken from the table.

On motion by Mr. Tucker the report of the committee was accepted, and on further motion by the same gentleman the rules were suspended, the resolve received its two readings and was passed to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Hersey of Houlton, Bill, An Act to amend and unify the laws regulating the sale of agricultural seeds and commercial feeding stuffs, was taken from the table and on further motion by the same gentleman it was recommitted to the committee on agriculture.

On motion of Mr. Goodwin of Biddeford, Bill, An Act providing for a thorough audit of liabilities as well as assets of savings banks, was taken from the table, and on further motion by Mr. Goodwin it was recommitted to the committee on banks and banking.

On motion of Mr. Dunn of Brewer the vote was reconsidered whereby the House accepted the report "ought not to pass" on bill relating to ice fishing in Brewer pond, and on further motion by Mr. Dunn the bill was recommitted to the committee on inland fisheries and game.

On motion of Mr. Austin of Phillips the rules were suspended and he intro-

duced a petition praying for change in the open season for fishing on Swift river and its tributaries, and on further motion by the same gentleman it was referred to the committee on inland fisheries and game.

On motion of Mr. Bowker of Phippsburg,

Adjourned.