

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

Legislative Record

OF THE

Seventy-Seventh Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1915

HOUSE

Thursday, March 4th, 1915.

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Boothby of Augusta.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair wishes to state that our Clerk has been obliged to go home for a short time on account of illness, and during his absence, which we trust will be but a few days, the Assistant Clerk will act as Clerk, and the Chair has requested Mr. Heath, of Augusta, to assist the Assistant Clerk in his work.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, bill, An Act creating the Anson Water District, being a bill was received in the Senate yesterday under a suspension of the rules. (Tabled on motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer.)

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act to create the Hartland Water District, being a bill which was received in the Senate yesterday under a suspension of the rules. (Tabled on motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer.)

Senate Bills on First Reading

Senate 219: Resolve in favor of the town of Lubec.

Senate 218: Resolve in favor of Gorham P. Grant of Winterport, for refund of money paid in lieu of military services in the late War of the Rebellion.

Senate 209: An Act to amend Section Six of Chapter 188 of the Public Laws of 1911, relating to industrial courses in evening schools.

Senate 210: An Act to amend Section three of Chapter 58 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the state certification of teachers in public schools.

Senate 218: An Act to amend Section 110 of Chapter 15 of the Revised

Statutes, relating to the course of study at the State Normal Schools.

Senate 212: An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 29 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to the number of weeks that schools shall be maintained annually.

Senate 213: An Act to amend Section 97 of Chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 45 of the Public Laws of 1905, as amended by Chapter 87 of the Public Laws of 1909, as amended by Chapter 29 of the Public Laws of 1911, as amended by Chapter 162 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the appropriation for the schooling of children in unorganized townships.

Senate 133: Resolve in favor of the Eastern State Normal School at Castine, for construction of a gymnasium building and for repairs and permanent improvements.

Senate 199: An Act to amend Section two of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to fishing through the ice in Martin Pond, sometimes called Long Pond, in The Forks Plantation, in Somerset County.

Senate 200: An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to fishing in certain waters in Township No. 6, Range 22, N. B. K. P., or Forsyth Township, so called, and in Township No. 6, Range 1, N. B. K. P., or Holeb Township, so-called, in the county of Somerset.

Senate 202: An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the protection of fish, game and birds in the southerly point of Swan Island, in the town of Perkins, in the county of Sagadahoc.

Senate 203: An Act to amend Section 48 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to hunting on Kineo Point, in Kineo, in the county of Piscataquis.

Senate 201: Resolve in favor of the Maine State Museum.

Senate 204: Resolve for the purpose of operating the fish hatcheries and feeding stations for fish, and for the protection of fish, game and birds, and for the printing of the report of the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game, with statement of facts.

Senate 206: An Act to incorporate the Trustees of St. Joseph's Academy and College for Women.

Senate 220: An Act to extend and amend the charter of the Fairfield and Skowhegan Railway Company.

Senate 221: An Act to extend the charter of the Farmington & Augusta Railway Co.

Senate 222: An Act to extend the charter of the Quebec Extension Railway Co.

Senate 226: An Act to amend Section 11 of Chapter 123 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the reception of bribes for neglect of duty by sheriffs and other officers.

Senate 227: An Act to amend Section 6 of Chapter 122 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the penalty for manufacturing or having in possession implements and materials for counterfeiting.

Senate 228: An Act to amend Section 16 of Chapter 123 of the Revised Statutes, relating to injuries to fruit gardens.

Senate 224: An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes, relating to proceedings if husband or wife refuses to release interest in real estate.

Senate 225: An Act to amend Chapter 104 of the Public Laws of 1905, relating to insane criminals.

Senate 223: An Act relating to the payment of salaries of judges of probate.

Senate 229: Resolve in favor of the State School for Boys at South Portland, for general maintenance.

Senate 230: Resolve in favor of the State School for Boys at South Portland, for permanent improvements and insurance.

Senate 231: Resolve for the permanent improvement of buildings and for increasing water supply at the Maine

Industrial School for Girls at Hallowell.

Senate 232: Resolve for general maintenance at the Maine Industrial School for Girls at Hallowell.

Senate 207: An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 2 of the Public Laws of 1911, providing for a close time on scallops.

Senate 233: An Act to set off a part of the town of Centerville and annex the same to the town of Northfield.

From the Senate: Majority and minority reports from the committee on State School for Boys and Industrial School for Girls, on Resolve to provide for the construction and equipment of a central school building at the Maine Industrial School for Girls at Hallowell, majority reporting "ought to pass," and minority reporting "ought not to pass."

On motion by Mr. Tuttle of Caribou, both reports were laid upon the table, pending the acceptance of either report, and especially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House the report of the committee on library on bill, An Act in favor of an appropriation for the restoring of the early records in the office of the clerk of courts of the county of York. In the House this bill received its three several readings and was passed to be engrossed March 2, and now comes from the Senate re-committed in that branch to the committee on library.

On motion by Mr. Connellan of Portland, the vote was reconsidered whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, and on further motion by the same gentleman the House voted to concur with the Senate in recommitting the bill to the committee on library.

The following bills, petitions, were presented and, on recommendation of the committee on reference of bills, were referred to the following committees:

Education

By Mr. Plummer of Lisbon: Resolutions of Medomak Valley Grange.

representing 150 members, in favor of distribution of State school funds, according to aggregate attendance; of Evening Star Grange, representing 174 members; of Natural Bridge Grange, representing 103 members; of Dromore Grange, representing 60 members; of Chesterville Grange, representing 128 members; of Granite Grange, representing 122 members; of Seven Tree Grange, representing 180 members; of Nobleboro Grange, representing 146 members; of North Penobscot Pomona Grange, representing 600 members; of Wells Grange, representing 85 members; of Frost Mountain Grange, representing 72 members; of Perry Grange, representing 177 members; of Atkinson Corner Grange, representing 69 members; of Benton Grange, representing 184 members; of South Montville Grange, representing 102 members; of Harvest Home Grange, representing 107 members; of Lebanon Grange, representing 100 members; of Brooklin Grange, representing 69 members; of Westport Grange, representing 46 members; of Turner Grange representing 525 members; of Warren Grange representing 62 members, of Orchard Grange, representing 73 members; of Industry Grange, representing 84 members; of Bauneg Beg Grange, representing 236 members; of Good Will Grange, representing 84 members; of Mousam Lake Grange, representing 50 members and of Quamphegan Grange, representing 123 members, in favor of same.

Placed on File.

By Mr. Russell of Alfred: Resolutions of Industry Grange, representing a membership of 84, favoring equal suffrage for women; off Wells Grange, representing a membership of 85; of Quamphegan Grange, representing a membership of 123; of Mousam Lake Grange, representing a membership of 50; of Union Grange, representing a membership of 160, favoring same.

By Mr. Wise of Guilford: Resolutions of Medomak Valley Grange, representing a membership of 130; of Evening Star Grange, representing a membership of 174; of Brooklin Grange, representing a membership of 69; of South Montville Grange, representing a membership of

102; of Chesterville Grange, representing a membership of 128; of North Penobscot Pomona Grange, representing a membership of 184; of Dromore Grange, representing a membership of 60; of Nobleboro Grange, representing a membership of 146; of Atkinson Corner Grange, representing a membership of 69; of Harvest Home Grange, representing a membership of 107; of Seaside Grange, representing a membership of 98; of Turner Grange, representing a membership of 525; of Warren Grange, representing a membership of 62, and of Perry Grange, representing a membership of 177, favoring same.

Inland Fisheries and Game.

By Mr. Wyman of Kingfield: Petition of A. M. Jones and 12 others, residents of Eustis and vicinity, asking for additional restrictions upon fishing in Stratton brook and its tributaries, in Franklin county.

Judiciary.

By Mr. Watts of South Thomaston: Resolution of Warren Grange, representing a membership of 62, favoring an Act to amend Chapter 129 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to corporations for the operation of telegraphs or telephones; of Good Will Grange, representing a membership of 84; of Dromore Grange, representing a membership of 60; of Industry Grange, representing a membership of 84; of Brooklin Grange, representing a membership of 69; of Westport Grange, representing a membership of 46; of Chesterville Grange, representing a membership of 128; of South Montville Grange, representing a membership of 102; of Harvest Home Grange, representing a membership of 107, and of Granite Grange, representing a membership of 122, favoring same.

By Mr. Hobbs of South Berwick: Resolutions of Quamphegan Grange, representing a membership of 123; of Benton Grange, representing a membership of 184; of Mousam Lake Grange, representing a membership of 50; of Wells Grange, representing a membership of 85; of Perry Grange, representing a membership of 177; of Atkinson Corner Grange, representing a membership of 69, and of Bauneg Beg Grange, representing a membership of 236, favoring same.

By Mr. Smith of Hampden: Remon-

strance of Jason Littlefield and 25 other residents of Bangor against the passage of House Bill 144; also remonstrance of W. M. Currier and 22 others of Bangor against same; also remonstrance of Nettie M. Howard and 20 others against same.

Sea and Shore Fisheries.

By Mr. McCurdy of Lubec: Remonstrance of F. W. Thurlow and 20 others against any change in our laws relating to the catching of herring, especially the bill allowing use of seines within 1000 feet of a fish weir; also remonstrance of C. M. Davis and 50 others against same.

Orders

On motion by Mr. Gerrish of Greenville, it was

Ordered, That the committee on inland fisheries and game be granted the use of the Hall of Representatives for a public hearing on Thursday afternoon and evening, March 4.

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Peterson from the committee on agriculture, reported "ought to pass" on Resolve for the completion of the purchase of the farm and erection of buildings thereon of the farm purchased under the provisions of Chapter 190 of the Private and Special Laws of 1913, for the purpose of scientific investigations in agriculture in Aroostook county.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to provide for conducting scientific investigations bearing upon the agriculture of Aroostook county.

Mr. Higgins from the committee on appropriations and financial affairs, reported "ought to pass" on Resolve in favor of the State Board of Charities and Corrections for the years 1915-16 in lieu of the sum provided by Chapter 196 of the Public Laws of 1913.

Mr. Ford from the committee on salaries and fees, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section eight of Chapter 325 of the Private and Special Laws of 1897, fixing the salary of the recorder of the municipal court of Waterville.

Mr. Welch from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Chapter 233 of the Private and Special Laws of 1913, relating to the

salary of the judge of the municipal court in the town of Livermore.

Mr. Mulligan from the committee on sea and shore fisheries, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Sections 21 and 22 of Chapter 123 of the Revised Statutes, relating to obstructing officers in the discharge of their duties.

Mr. Goldthwait from same committee, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section 44 of Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Section one of Chapter 113 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to taking smelts in tide waters.

Mr. Small from same committee, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 90 of the Public Laws of 1911, entitled "An Act relating to the protection of smelts along the coast of Maine from Casco Bay to Penobscot Bay."

Mr. Wheeler from the committee on towns, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 203 of the Public Laws of 1903, relating to the preservation of town records of births, marriages and deaths previous to the year 1892.

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

Mr. Goldthwait from the committee on sea and shore fisheries, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to amend Chapter four of the Private and Special Laws of the year 1913, relating to the taking of smelts in the waters of Egypt Bay, Taunton Bay and River and their tributaries, in the towns of Hancock, Franklin and Sullivan, in the county of Hancock.

Mr. Holt of Goldsboro moved that this report be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Ricker from the committee on education, reported "ought not to pass" on bill, An Act to repeal an Act to grant powers to School District No. 3 in town of Springfield, and all acts amendatory thereto.

Mr. Thibodeau from the committee on library on Order of the Legislature to inquire into the cost of restacking and increasing the capacity of the State Library, reported that legislation thereon is inexpedient at this time.

The reports were accepted.

Mr. Turner from the Committee on State Lands and Forest Preservation, reported "ought not to pass" on Resolve authorizing the Land Agent to sell and convey whatever interest the State has in and to a certain island in the South Bay in Eastern Grand Lake, in Washington County. (Tabled pending the acceptance of the report on motion by Mr. Jordan of Baileyville.)

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves

House 461: Resolve in favor of Alonzo J. Nevers.

House 462: An Act providing for pensions to employees of the city of Bangor.

House 463: Resolve providing a state pension for Eliza E. Philbrook.

House 464: Resolve providing a state pension for Clarence N. Smith.

House 465: Resolve in favor of Lucy A. Owens.

House 466: Resolve in favor of Mary Allen.

House 467: An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Section three of Chapter 116 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to local sealers of weights and measures.

House 468: An Act to consolidate Sections 14 and 38 of Chapter 40 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the penalty for unlawful use of containers marked with registered devices, and to amend Section 39 of said Chapter, relating to search warrants therefor.

House 469: An Act to amend Section six of Chapter 44 of the Revised Statutes, providing a penalty for neglect of duty by local sealers of weights and measures.

Passed to Be Engrossed

Senate 177: An Act to incorporate the Salisbury Cove Water Company.

Senate 183: An Act to incorporate the Maine Fire Insurance Company.

Senate 189: An Act to amend Section 73 of Chapter four of the Revised Statutes, relating to the investment of sinking funds established by any city or town.

Senate 190: An Act to amend Sec-

tion 15 of Chapter 65 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 38 of the Public Laws of 1907, relating to the jurisdiction of probate courts.

Senate 191: An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 145 of the Public Laws of 1911, entitled "An Act to insure publicity with respect to demands upon the State and to facilitate legislative committees in dealing with questions of appropriation."

Senate 192: An Act to amend Paragraph 27 of Section one of Chapter 116 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the compensation of subordinate officers of the Maine State Prison, as amended by Chapter 54 of the Public Laws of 1907 and Chapters 197 and 205 of the Public Laws of 1909.

Senate 176: Resolve in favor of the Maine Industrial School for Girls at Hallowell, to provide for payment of interest on trust funds deposited with the State Treasurer.

Senate 193: Resolve appropriating money for retracing and defining lines around the reserved or school lands lands of plantations and townships.

Finally Passed

Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal School for the purchase of certain land.

Resolve in favor of the Washington State Normal School at Machias for completing and furnishing partially constructed dormitory.

Resolve in favor of the Washington State Normal School at Machias for the removing and remodeling of the O'Brien House.

Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal School for general repairs and permanent improvements.

Resolve providing a state pension for Michael B. Daly.

Resolve in favor of Edgar S. Fossett, secretary of the committee on state prison, for certain committee expenses.

Resolve in favor of the clerk, assistant clerk, messenger, assistant manager, mail carrier, first folder and assistant folder, door keeper and pages of the 76th legislature for attendance at the organization of the 77th legislature.

Resolve in favor of Leonard A.

Pierce, chairman of the House committee on elections, for certain committee expenses.

Resolve in favor of Frank Francis, representative of the Passamaquoddy Tribe of Indians.

Resolve in favor of the Western State Normal School at Gorham, for the purchase and installation of equipment for industrial department.

Resolve memorializing Congress in the interest of universal peace.

Resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing the Machiasport and East Machias bridge. (Tabled pending its final passage and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, on motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton.)

Resolve appropriating money to aid in the repair and maintenance of the Gardiner and Randolph bridge. (Tabled pending its final passage and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, on motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton.)

Resolve appropriating money to aid the town of Forest City in repairing and constructing a bridge. (Tabled pending its final passage and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, on motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton.)

Resolve appropriating money to reimburse Herbert W. Stevens for money expended while chief fire warden in extinguishing a fire.

Resolve appropriating money to aid in building a bridge across Kenduskeag stream in the town of Corinth. (Tabled pending its final passage and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, on motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton.)

Resolve appropriating money in favor of a bridge across Mattagoodus stream, in the plantation of Webster, Penobscot county. (Tabled pending its final passage and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, on motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton.)

Resolve appropriating money in favor of repairing the New Kenduskeag road in the town of Glenburn. (Tabled pending its final passage and specially assigned for consideration on Tues-

day of next week, on motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton.)

Resolved appropriating money in favor of rebuilding a road through Lowell's woods, so-called, in the town of Penobscot. (Tabled pending its final passage and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, on motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton.)

Resolve in favor of the Western State Normal school at Gorham, for the completion of the partially constructed dormitory.

Resolve in favor of the Western State Normal school at Gorham for furnishings for the new dormitory.

Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal School, for construction and equipment of a suitable building for the Household Arts department.

Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal school for completing the furnishings of the new dormitory.

Resolve in favor of the Aroostook Normal school at Presque Isle, for repairs.

Resolve appropriating money for the purchase of traveling libraries suitable for High schools in towns having no public libraries.

Resolve providing for the purchase of 125 copies of the History of Buckfield.

Resolve appropriating money for the purchase of the Maine State Year Book for the years 1915 and 1916.

Resolve appropriating money to maintain the State Forest Nursery and to encourage the reforestation of the waste lands of Maine.

Resolve appropriating money to provide for further public instruction in forestry.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, Resolve in favor of the Penobscot Tribe of Indians for general care, maintenance, relief and education thereof. The pending question is upon the final passage of the resolve. This resolve carries the emergency clause, and under the provisions of the Constitution it requires a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to this House upon its final passage.

Mr. WASHBURN of Perry: Mr. Speaker, before that vote is taken, I should like to offer a word of explanation as to why the emergency clause has been attached to this measure. This resolve and the one which I presume will follow it, are the regular appropriation bills for the Penobscot and the Passamaquoddy Tribes of Indians, providing for their support and the support of their schools, for their medical attendance, for their fuel, and for many other things which are particularly necessary to them at this season of the year. If the resolves were allowed to take their ordinary course and the appropriations should not become available until July or August the tribes would certainly fall into distress and much sickness and discomfort might result; so that we claim that these resolves are strictly within the law which allows the attachment of the emergency clause to measures which are necessary to the public health and safety. I make this explanation in order to avoid the misunderstanding which occurred two years ago when these resolves at first failed of a final passage; they were afterwards reconsidered and received a unanimous vote in their favor, which I hope will be the case at this time.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the final passage of this resolve. All those in favor of the final passage of the resolve will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have returned the count.

A division being had, 119 voted in favor and none against. So the resolve was finally passed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve making an appropriation for the Passamaquoddy Tribe of Indians for the years 1915 and 1916. This resolve carries the emergency clause, and under the provisions of the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of the members of this House upon its final passage. All those in favor of the final passage of this resolve will rise and stand in their places until counted and the monitors have returned the count.

A division being had, 119 voted in favor and none against.

So the resolve was finally passed.

Orders of the Day

Mr. RICKER of Castine: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House reconsider its vote whereby it voted to indefinitely postpone the report of the committee on sea and shore fisheries, reporting in a new draft and "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend Chapter four of the Private and Special Laws of the year 1913, relating to the taking of smelts in the waters of Egypt Bay, Taunton Bay and River, and their tributaries, in the towns of Hancock, Franklin and Sullivan, in the county of Hancock; and in order to fix the standing of this bill, I am going to ask that all the members of this House vote, no.

The question being on the motion to reconsider.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost.

Mr. GERRISH of Greenville: Mr. Speaker, I move that the vote be reconsidered whereby the House voted on February 26th to accept the report of the committee on inland fisheries and game, reporting "ought not to pass" on bill, An Act relating to fishing in Whetstone Pond, and that the same be recommitted to the committee. I wish to make this explanation in regard to the matter, because it was owing to the fact that when this matter was brought before the committee there was some confusion in regard to this pond and another pond in the same vicinity.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is informed by the clerk that the papers in this matter have been sent to the Senate, and the Chair would rule that action on them would be out of order here at this time.

Mr. CONNELLAN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, in regard to a bill (House Document No. 151) which was yesterday passed to be engrossed, relating to the equalization of salaries of judges of probate, I understand that through an error on the part of some-

body certain proposed amendments which were proposed in the Senate were not accepted by the House. I now move that the House reconsider its action of yesterday in having passed the bill to be engrossed.

The motion was agreed to.

On further motion by Mr. Connellan, the House voted to concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment A.

On further motion by Mr. Connellan, the House voted to concur with the Senate in adoption of Senate Amendment B.

On further motion by Mr. Connellan, the House voted to concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment C.

On further motion by Mr. Connellan, the bill was passed to be engrossed, as amended.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve in favor of aid in rebuilding highway in the town of Concord, being House Document No. 364, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connellan, and specially assigned for consideration today.

Mr. CONNELLAN: Mr. Speaker, I will state that it has been agreed with the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Higgins, that all resolves regarding ways and bridges and all orders to the same effect shall be taken from the table at this time and reassigned for Tuesday of next week; and I make that motion in regard to this resolve, that the same be reassigned for Tuesday of next week.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve in favor of repairing the main highway leading from Franklin to Cherryfield, (House Document, No. 365) tabled by the gentleman from Machiasport, Mr. Welch, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Welch the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve in favor of ap-

propriation for repair of Mopang bridge in Township No. 30, M. D., Washington County (Senate Document, No. 161) tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Pierce the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Senate Document No. 146, bill, An Act to equalize salaries of county commissioners, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Pierce the bill was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Senate Doc. No. 162, Resolve in favor of appropriation to repair the bridges in Township No. 29, M. D., Washington county, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Pierce the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Senate Doc. No. 163, Resolve in favor of appropriation to reimburse the town of Deblois, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Pierce the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, House Doc. No. 321, Resolve in favor of repairing highway in the town of Solon, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connellan, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Connellan, the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, House Doc. No. 320, Resolve in favor of Aroostook river

bridge, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Pierce the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, House Doc. No. 313, Resolve in favor of road around Cook hill, in town of Jackson, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Pierce the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, House Doc. No. 317, Resolve in favor of bridge across Carrabassett river, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Connellan, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Connellan the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House House Doc. No. 309, Resolve in favor of highway in the towns of Greenwood and Woodstock, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Pierce the resolve was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House House Doc. No. 328, Ordered, That no bill or resolve carrying an appropriation of money shall be finally passed prior to the sixteenth day of March next. The pending question is the passage of the order.

On motion by Mr. Colcord of Portland, the order was reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve appropriating money for the reconstruction of Lord bridge in the town of Frankfort, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Plummer the resolve was again tabled and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing highway in the town of Otisfield, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Plummer the resolve was again tabled and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing highway in the town of Otisfield, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Plummer the resolve was again tabled and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve appropriating money to aid in construction of bridge across Sebec River in Milo, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Plummer, the resolve was again tabled and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve appropriating money to aid in reconstruction of bridge in Montville, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, and specially assigned for consideration today.

On motion by Mr. Plummer, the resolve was again tabled and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, House Document 302, bill "An Act to provide for a close time on bull moose". The pending question is the second reading of the bill.

Mr. WASHBURN of Perry: Mr. Speaker: I wish to move the indefinite postponement of that act; and, as I do not expect to get by so easily as did my friend Mr. Holt, I will give the House my reasons for

this motion and for my belief that this legislation is unnecessary, and that it would be unjust to the people of some sections of our State.

The case of the proponents of this measure is based on the supposition that the moose are becoming extinct in our State, and, in opposing it, that is the first contention we must meet. From a somewhat careful study of conditions in Eastern Maine, and particularly in Washington county, I am led to believe that, so far from becoming extinct, the moose are in many sections more abundant than they have ever been before. I have received reports from twenty-six towns in Washington county, and twenty of these report the moose more abundant than they were two years ago. It has been reported to me also that the moose have yarded in some sections of our county this winter in greater numbers than ever before, and I know that they have appeared on our borders and around the shores of our bays during the past summer in places where they never have been seen before—at least within the memory of the present generation. Now it will be argued, I have no doubt, that the moose are confined in their present haunts in Washington county; and until the time of the hearing upon this measure I was inclined to believe that that was true. Since then, in talking with people from other sections of the State, I have come to the conclusion that they too have the moose in considerable numbers. In Aroostook, Hancock, and parts of several other counties, if we are to consider the reports of the railroads regarding the number of moose offered them for transportation, this is especially true. We find that the number of moose offered the Maine Central for transportation was forty-one. Now if it be true that these moose are confined wholly to southeastern Maine, where did the fifty-four moose come from that were hauled out over the Bangor and Aroostook, thirty per cent. more than the entire number handled by the Maine Central system? It will also be called to your attention

that the whole number of moose handled by all the railroads has decreased during the past two years, from 146 in 1912 to 92 in 1913 and 95 in 1914; and this is true, but there are reasons for it. Less men went into our woods to hunt; fewer licenses were sold. The aggregate number of days of guiding done by our guides has decreased by \$009 within the past three years. It will be recalled that the Legislature in 1913 shortened the open season on moose by sixteen days. Would you except as many moose to be killed in thirty days as had formerly been killed in forty-five? An analysis of the figures will show that these two quantities are in exact proportion. We have shortened our open season one-third, and we have reduced our killing one-third. ■

Very few of us have had the opportunity of judging the merits of this question through personal observation, and it is equally difficult for you to get an idea through the few figures that we are able to place before you, and you may ask for some expert testimony. Practically all recent writers upon the subject of big game hunting are agreed that Maine has laws upon this subject which are just and sufficient, but in order to be of any value in this discussion such information must be strictly up to date; and I would like to refer briefly to a work of unquestioned authority, written by William T. Hornaday, who is Director of the New York Zoological Park, for the express purpose of calling attention to the destruction of wild life the world over, and suggesting remedies therefor. The author devotes 400 pages to a scathing criticism and condemnation of the game laws and customs of practically every State and Nation on the face of the earth. What does he say of Maine?

"There are reasons for the belief that Maine is conserving her large game better than any other State or province in North America. One glance over her laws is sufficient to convince anyone that instead of studying the clamor of her shooting

population, Maine has actually been studying the needs of her game, and providing for those needs. If all other states were doing equally well, the task of writing a book of admonition would have been unnecessary. The proof of Maine's alertness is to be found in the number of her extra short seasons on game. For example:

Cow and calf moose are permanently protected.

Only bull moose, with at least 3-inch prongs on its horns, may be killed.

Further on the author says: "There is very little that Maine needs in the line of new legislation, or better protection to her game. I think her laws for the protection of wild life would be sufficiently perfect for all practical purposes. The Pine Tree Statg is to be congratulated upon its wise and efficient handling of the wild-life situation."

There is nothing there, gentlemen, about this ruthless destruction and extermination of the moose; and I submit to you that this work, published in 1913, is the most recent and up to date information upon this subject which I have been able to find in any library to which I have had access. Perhaps I have said enough to convince you that we still have some moose in Maine, and that we have not entirely mismanaged them. Such figures as we have been able to get at indicate that most of the moose killed in our State are killed by our own people for home consumption; but we still have in some sections of the State, and particularly in the northern part of Washington county, many sporting camps, fitted up more or less elaborately, for the accommodation of out of the State hunters. The business of these sporting camp owners will be entirely ruined by the passage of this act. Many of our guides will be thrown out of employment. I have been told personally by some out of the State hunters that they will not come to Maine to hunt deer alone, if the chance of getting a shot at a moose is taken away from them. The inevitable result of the passage of this act will be to drive those sportsmen into Canada. This brings us to the consideration of one important phase of the question, namely: whether this legislation will be

a benefit to the people of Maine, or to the people of New Brunswick. It is acknowledged by all the hunters of big game that the moose question is a question of food; that the herds of moose that came down into southeastern Maine a few years ago came there as the result of the great fires that we had over large tracts of our timberlands. This resulted in a young growth which is the invariable food of the moose. Before the expiration of the time proposed by this act this food may have become exhausted or have grown too large to be attractive to the moose. Their next move will be we know not where. They may go into Aroostook, or Piscataquis, or northern Penobscot; but I contend that they are just as likely to go into Charlotte, or York, or Carleton counties, New Brunswick.

For one, I protest against turning any part of eastern Maine into a great game preserve for the benefit of our Canadian cousins; but if we are to assume for the sake of argument that the next move of the moose will be into central or northern Maine, it is equally unfair to require us to protect and propagate this wild game to be later hunted and killed for the benefit of the people of other sections of the State. I have no doubt it will be argued here that Canadian moose are going to come into Maine instead of our moose going into New Brunswick. To my mind that position is entirely untenable. When they advance that theory what do they ask us to believe? They ask us to believe this: That the moose which are becoming extinct in Maine, according to their contention, under a thirty days' open time, are going to increase and multiply so in New Brunswick, where they have a seventy-five days' open time, that they will have to swarm over into Maine to find food. There are a great many people who believe that the moose is on his way to Canada anyway, close time or no close time, and that it is the railroads, the electricians, and the extension of agricultural operations, as well as the axe and camps of the lumbermen, that are driving them out, and not the sportsmen. One of the first bills reported back to this Legislature from any committee was an act granting a charter to a railroad to be built directly through the heart of this moose country. —a fine thing for Aroostook and Wash-

ington and Hancock counties; but the moose will not thrive on that kind of treatment.

I am aware that it is an unpopular move to oppose the unanimous report of a committee; but I am also aware that at the hearing which was held on this bill the case of the opponents was very feebly presented—not through any fault of the committee, who listened patiently and impartially to every word we had to say, but by reason of the fact that we did not have on our side the eloquent address of the Honorable Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game, a man seasoned by long terms of legislative experience, and who knows well how to appeal to the feelings of any body of men. Nor did we have the testimony of men in the employ of that Commission, who might hesitate to give testimony contrary to the views of their chief. I appeared at that hearing, as I appear here today, on behalf of men who cannot appear themselves; men to whom these legislative halls are as distant and as unapproachable as the Court of St. James would be to you and to me; men who must rely on our fairness and our sense of justice; men who will abide by our decision so long as it lies within the range of reason. It was intimated at that hearing that the Washington county hunters always lie anyhow, and that they will not abide by any game law. I want to protest that that is untrue. Violators there are there, just as there are in many other sections where there is game in appreciable quantities. It is a mighty difficult thing to make the old woodsman believe that he ought not to take a limited amount of wild game for his own use. Perhaps the fairest way to judge him would be to look at the matter through his eyes; place ourselves in his position. Suppose you gentlemen, any of you, lived in one of those back towns or plantations, twenty, thirty or forty miles from the railroad, with no parcels post to your door, no meat-cart, no telephone to the corner grocery! Suppose you knew there were moose in the woods! Suppose they were your woods, the woods you had hunted and roamed in since boyhood! What would you do? Would there be some quarters of fresh beef hidden in your hay-mow some night, or would you say "No, the Maine Fish and

Game Association thinks I ought not to kill a moose?"

The question of the possibility of enforcement ought also to be considered here. When we remember that the cost of our warden service has increased from \$33,000, in 1912 to \$49,000 in 1913, and \$57,000 in 1914, it becomes a serious problem; but the solution of the problem does not lie in the enactment of still more arbitrary and unpopular laws. It will be argued that we ought to be generous down there in Washington County, that we ought to give up this hunting privilege cheerfully and willingly for the benefit of the other sections of the State. I have never yet known the people of any section to give up willingly privileges or advantages whether those privileges and advantages were given them by the hand of Nature or the hand of Man.

This bill, with the exception of the reduction in penalty, which I believe to be a fatal defect, is the same that came into this House two years ago and was voted down by a vote of three to one, and conditions have not changed since then. The only effect of the agitation at that time was to shorten the open season by fifteen days, and that was wise legislation. It was the only legislation needed at that time, and nothing more is needed today. The people of eastern Maine have only had this valuable game with them for a few years. Five, six or seven years ago a moose was a rare sight in Washington County; but we did not come here at that time and ask for a close time on moose in other sections of the State. Now that we have them with us in great and increasing numbers, we believe that it is only fair and just that we should be allowed to hunt them one month in the year. I move the indefinite postponement of the bill, and, Mr. Speaker, we are going to claim the distinction, no matter what the vote of this House may be, of taking one measure from the calendar and disposing of it for better or worse without asking that it be reassigned. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. ST. CLAIR of Calais: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion of the gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn), which he has so ably presented. I have not gone into this question as extensively as the gentleman has, and I am not pre-

pared to make a set speech; but I am prepared to say this: I have no evidence before me that there is any need of a close time on bull moose in Washington County at least. Washington County is one of the best hunting sections in the State of Maine. There are a great many hunters there and there is a good deal of game there. It seems to me that if there had been and desire on the part of the citizen of Eastern Maine for the enactment of this bill, we should have had before us some petitions asking us to favor this resolve. No petitions have come to me, and I think none have come to my Brother Washburn. As I understand it none have come to any member of the Washington County delegation. Therefore you can very readily perceive that in that section of the State where bull moose are hunted, and where they are found, as my brother had said, in increasing numbers, there is no demand for the enactment of this bill. Therefore I most heartily second the motion, and I hope the gentlemen of this House, actuated by common sense, fair play and a desire to do that which is right so far as Eastern Maine is concerned, will vote to sustain the motion of the gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn.)

Mr. WESCOTT of Bluehill: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to state very briefly that I am in hearty accord with the remarks of two gentlemen who have already discussed the bull moose question. I wish to say that down in my section, down in West Hancock County, we do not want any change in the law. We do want the privilege which we now enjoy of going out for a short period each fall and trying our hand at getting a moose, and we do get them down there, too. My people say that no good can come from this proposed close time for a long period; that, although there might be more moose at the end of that period, (unless, as has been suggested, the moose were meanwhile attracted to other regions,) that, as I say, there might be more when the law is raised, yet there would immediately come to our State sportsmen from all over the country; and at the end of a very short time there would not be so many moose as there are now. As I understand it, the idea is to establish a game preserve which will benefit a few. I believe this is against

the laws of the State of Maine, and I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone will prevail. (Applause.)

Mr. MORRISON of Eden: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to say anything to oppose this bill; but I want to state a few facts. Before the Bangor & Aroostook Railroad was built I went moose hunting in northern Maine. We had to go around by McAdam Junction, and went up between Munsungun Lakes and what they call the Big Machias, or Machias River and lakes. At that time it was a very rare thing to get a moose, although I will say that I was one of the lucky ones. I want to say right here that the first day of last November I believe that there were more moose in Hancock County than there were in the whole State of Maine at the time to which I have referred. I will also say that down in the little town of Trenton, within one mile of the city limits of Ellsworth, there were seen in one day last fall four bull moose and three cows in one drove. I am going to say that in Washington County and Hancock County there are plenty of moose, and it is an easy matter to get them. I am not going to say anything in opposition to this bull moose law; but I believe that the people should know that there are plenty of moose left in the State of Maine.

Mr. EVANS of North Bridgton: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak intelligently on my own observation; but a gentleman from my town who has been in the woods the last ten years talked with me about a week ago in regard to this measure. He said that last fall he saw more moose than he had in any year for ten years. He said that he did not think they needed protection; and if there was a necessity for a more stringent law, I do not think he would hesitate to say so.

Mr. DRUMMOND of Winslow: Mr. Speaker: We had a hearing on this matter before the Inland Fisheries and Game Committee a week ago yesterday, and there was ample opportunity for them to produce their arguments, the same as to-day, and the opposition came from the northeastern part of the State. I do not blame the people down there for wanting to have a chance to hunt. I would like to go there myself. I have been hunting in the woods since 1901, every fall,

and I never have been able to get a shot at a moose yet. I have seen some signs over on Passadumkeag Stream and around the Moosehead Lake region. I have not been over in Washington county, but I am going there if I can get a decent head without too much trouble. They seem to think that the moose wander over there from Canada. Another question brought up was in regard to feeding. It is the idea of the Inland Fisheries and Game committee that that feed will last as long as anybody in this House of Representatives. As to the heads, I would ask the gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn) if he has seen a decent head brought out from there.

MR. WASHBURN: I would say that I am not a hunter myself, and cannot answer the question.

MR. DRUMMOND: From such information as I am able to get, hardly a decent head has been brought out of the woods for the last two years,—I mean such as would be desirable for a taxidermist to mount. I do not think that Washington county will be so much deprived of their income from hunters as they think. I wish I could express my ideas as well as the gentlemen who have preceded me; but, as I am unable to, I will simply say that I hope this motion will not prevail, but will be indefinitely postponed.

MR. SNOW of Mars Hill: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to this matter, and I only rise to give my opinion as I find it in Central Aroostook. I had understood that the moose were on the decrease in the State of Maine, and until this morning I had no evidence to the contrary. If they are on the increase in the southern or eastern part of the State, it seems to me a different condition than we have in Aroostook. I have inquired of the game wardens and of many men through the central section of Aroostook, and I find them invariably in favor of a close time on moose. I do not know of a single moose being shot this last fall in the section or district from which I come. I have understood from a great many men that they feel that the moose are on the decrease, and they favor a close time on moose.

MR. GERRISH of Greenville: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to bother you with any lengthy talk. Neither have I

compiled any statistics with reference to the number of moose that have been shot. We realize that Washington county covers a very large territory; but we also realize that there is only a certain section of it, as I understand it, that is called moose country. I do not understand that there are any moose shot down around the coast towns. Now when you compare that moose territory in Washington county with the territory of the rest of the State, it seems rather a small territory to govern the whole State in regard to such matters. We do not claim up in our section of the country that there has been such a decrease in the number of moose killed, but we do say that the moose killed have been very small; and as one of the gentlemen has stated here today it would not be any object for a taxidermist to mount the heads taken out. The moose that we find in our section are cows and calves. If we are going to allow the people to kill the bull moose, we might as well take the law off entirely and allow them to kill the cows as well. I ask every member of this House to vote in favor of the passage of this bill; it is only a matter of four years. Our friend from Perry, Mr. Washburn, has said that it will ruin the business of a number of sporting camps in his county. I claim that the sporting camps in Washington county do not constitute the majority of the camps in the State of Maine. We have a great many in Aroostook, Piscataquis, Somerset and Franklin counties. I ask you gentlemen to support this bill. I would like to hear a word from Representative Wyman of Kingfield.

MR. WYMAN of Kingfield: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I wish to discuss the matter before the House at this time.

MR. TUTTLE of Caribou: Mr. Speaker, I am not much of a sport myself so far as hunting is concerned; but I do enjoy fishing, and in the past few years I have been in the woods quite a good deal for that purpose. I will say that so far as northern Aroostook is concerned, I think the moose are more plentiful than they were years ago; in fact I know they are. When I went in the woods of Aroostook thirty-six years ago a moose was hard to find, and it was very seldom that one was seen. Now you can scarce

go into the woods in the summer season without running on more or less moose, and quite frequently a bull moose. Our friend from Greenville (Mr. Gerrish) says that we might as well shoot cow moose if we are going to shoot the bulls, and I think a law permitting this would be more advisable than would be a close time on either cow or bull.

Mr. GALLAGHER of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, the question of a close time on bull moose is not a new one. Four years ago a bill similar to the one before us today was presented, asking a close time for four years. Again two years ago a similar bill was presented asking for a close time for five years. That bill was backed by our present Game Commissioner and a large percentage of the citizens who were not interested in the killing of game, but more particularly in the perpetuation of the species. They did not argue in favor of a close time for selfish motives; but, on the contrary, argued from the standpoint of the greatest good to the greatest number. I would like to quote from the speech at that time of our present Game Commissioner in reference to the preservation of this game, as follows:

"We must preserve to coming generations a portion of the game of the State of Maine; and to preserve to the future sportsmen a little of the rare sport that we of the present generation are permitted to avail ourselves of. Why has it become necessary in these times to draw a smaller line around the liberties of our game committee? I will tell you why. Where 20, 30 or 50 years ago there was one man in the wilderness of this State with a gun, there are ten, or perhaps 25, today. Anybody who has gone through our State knows that. In 1911, 27 states issued almost one and a half million of hunters' licenses, in 21 states not issuing the number of hunters is estimated, and I think truly, at over one million, making a grand total of 2,600,000 men and boys traveling in your woods with guns. Now, gentlemen, can America withstand this drain upon its game resources? How

long can Maine stand the steadily increasing drain upon its game resources? But, you say, how many people are coming to Maine? The records of the Inland Fish and Game department show that the average year to year number of non-resident licenses is about 2500. That is, you license 2500 non-residents to come in here and go into our woods hunting. That, of course, is only a small portion of the number of men that are hunting our game in our big woods; and if this drain continues I am afraid our only alternative is a long closed season, or the handing down to the coming generations of a State entirely denuded of game.

"Now let me go for a moment into the history of the present whereabouts of the moose. Moose are found in such numbers that they are counted in only five states in this Union—in Maine, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho and Minnesota. In only two states in this whole Union can moose be legally hunted at any time, these states being Maine and Minnesota; and Minnesota has set aside almost a million acres as a perpetual game reserve for its moose, where they cannot be legally hunted. Now my friends from down on the border say if you do not allow us to kill the moose that are now present on that border they are going back into New Brunswick. Let me present to you as thinking men the fallacy of any such contention as that. With the State of Maine closed to moose hunting are the moose of Maine going into the hunted territory of New Brunswick where their hunting season begins September 15 and lasts as long as ours does, or are they going to drift to the north and west where, owing to the great fires of 1908 and 1911, thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres are bearing the hard wood sprouts which is the natural game feed today. You say they are leaving the county because there is no feed for them. Great heavens, man, almost the northern part of this State has been burned over twice in the last few years, and we are developing there the greatest

moose pasture in the world, today. Are your moose going back into New Brunswick for the sake of committing deliberate suicide, or are they coming into other parts of the State where they will be protected under the law?"

I do not rise to make any remarks as a hunter. I never have discharged a gun with the idea of killing something, and by shipping the carcass hoped to advertise Maine advantageously. Neither have I ever snapped a camera with the idea of preserving a photograph of some beautiful scene in the Maine woods in which is shown some of our wild animals; but in my opinion a photograph of a live moose in its forest home would be of infinitely more value as an advertisement to attract visitors to our State than a score of carcasses passing through the railroad stations of New England. I believe that the proportion of killers in a community is very small; but unless this small number is restrained the aggregate slaughter by the few will soon deplete our forests of game, and then the killers will look elsewhere for their sport, and the non-killers or camera shooters will not have so much to attract them to our forests, and therefore the selfishness of a few will have lost to Maine two classes of visitors for all time. Gentlemen, I believe we should give the moose a show for four years, and in that time the forests will be replenished, and then with a reasonable open time on both cows and bulls, there will be moose in such numbers that hundreds of killers and thousands of camera shooters will flock to our forests, and Maine will reap a harvest in dollars and cents and in new acquaintances almost beyond your fondest imaginations. Gentlemen, I hope and trust that you will see the wisdom of the proposed act and vote for its passage.

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word to this debate. Of course I come from Aroostook County, and I have made it my business to talk with many on this matter; and I must say that they do not agree with

the gentleman from Caribou (Mr. Tuttle). But that is a matter of difference of opinion. I will say this: The Fish and Game Commissioner, Mr. Austin, is an official of the State of Maine, and it is his duty to look after the interests of the whole State, and in accordance with that he has made it his business, of course, to take up this matter all over this State; and it is only fair to suppose, and I have no doubt of the fact, that his recommendation is made as he believes for the best interests of everybody in the State of Maine that this law should be enacted. I fully agree with the gentleman who has said that it is not fair to say that this bill was not ably presented to the committee. The gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn) was there and presented it as well as he has done this morning. The Fish and Game Committee is made up of men not from one section of the State, but from all over the State. They considered this matter and went all over the evidence much more carefully and thoroughly than it is possible to do in the limited time we have here on the floor of the House. That is the reason the committees are appointed. We are not here legislating for one county or another. We are supposed to be here to legislate for the best interests of the people of this whole State. Now the camp-owners, of course, in some sections would be affected; but the camp-owners' interest should not be allowed to predominate. Neither should the selfish interests of the present generation be allowed to predominate. There is a sentimental side to this matter apart from its commercial side. The buffalo, the one big American animal which they had in the West, is gone, absolutely, with the exception of a few scattered herds in parks where they have to be guarded with great care. The moose is the big animal that we have in Maine—our typical big game. It is not just a question of having a chance to shoot them; but I am sure that every one living in this State, born here or who is living here, has a certain pride in knowing that we have the big and majestic bull moose still abounding in this State. I do not presume to be an expert on this subject at all; but it does seem to me that the gentlemen of this House, unless the evidence against it is absolutely convincing, have no right to overturn the

judgment of the man whom the State appoints to look after this thing over the whole State, and have no right to overturn the unanimous report of the committee appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, charged with the duty of investigating this matter and reporting to us for our information; and I believe that no one county has any right to ask it, whether it is for our benefit in Aroostook or for the benefit of the people in Washington. That is not the question here to be determined. The question is what is for the best interests of the people of the State of Maine; and it seems to me that in the absence of specific evidence to the contrary, the members of this House should assume that the judgment of the committee, made up of men from different sections of the State familiar with this question, chosen because they were best fitted and capable, should prevail, and that this bill, supported by a unanimous report, should not be indefinitely postponed by this House. (Applause.)

Mr. MORRISON of Eden: Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with everything that Mr. Pierce has stated. As I said in the first place, I did not wish to say anything in opposition to this bill. I merely wished to explain that we have moose in the State of Maine, and that we have plenty of them down in Hancock and Washington counties. I heartily agree with everything that Mr. Pierce has said.

Mr. THOMBS of Lincoln: Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House: Were it not for the fact that I come from a section of the State on the western end of what, I think, will be conceded by all persons who are familiar with hunting conditions in Maine to be the last resort of the moose in this State, I would not attempt to give you my views upon this matter. I am not a hunter. I have never shot a moose and very likely I never shall; but I believe from the discussions that developed here two years ago, and from the discussion that we have here at this session, and from my knowledge that I get from hunters and guides resident in the northern portion of Penobscot county, that the statement that I make that

the northern section of Penobscot county, Washington county, and a portion of Hancock county, are the last resort for the noble moose of the State of Maine. They have been driven down into a comparatively large area there of extensive bogs. It is a section of the State not as accessible to the hunter as other sections are. I do not presume to undertake to tell you why they are there; but I think the evidence is conclusive—I believe it so notwithstanding the remarks of the gentlemen here this morning to the contrary—that from Franklin county, from Somerset county, from Piscataquis county, the moose have made a general southeastward movement into the section of the State referred to. I believe that almost every hunter who went out from my town last fall, and from the surrounding towns, brought home his full quota of game, and I have made it in my way to ask these gentlemen whom I believe to be conversant with conditions there what they believe to be right and proper for us to do with this moose question, and they have been honest enough to tell me that while they have been able to get all the game that the law allowed them this year and other years, and probably could for the next few years, they believe that this Legislature should take some steps to preserve the moose for the benefit of the whole State. Let us not take advantage, fellow legislators, of the fact that the few remaining moose in Maine have been driven into this limited locality. If I lived in Washington county, I have no doubt that I should take the position that the gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn) has taken this morning. I do not see how he could satisfy his constituents there, and perhaps claim to have done his duty by that immediate locality, unless he had taken the stand which he has taken; but I believe, gentlemen of the House, that you are going to rise above that narrow view of the matter. I believe you are going to say to the people of the State of Maine that the moose now in this limited sec-

tion belong to the whole State of Maine, and that you are going to adopt some measures here which you believe will protect them for the people of the entire State. It seems to me that this is a vital question. If you do not take some steps here, and the moose become extinct, as the gentleman from Houlton (Mr. Pierce) has said that the buffalo have already done in the West, they are gone beyond recall. If we are going to make an error at all, would it not be better to err on the right side, and put ourselves on record as in favor of repopulating our extensive forest areas with the moose? It is a serious question to my mind. I believe two years ago the Legislature should have taken that step, and I believe and hope, gentlemen, that you this morning will vote to save the remnant of this might herd of animals which once populated our forests, that they may increase and return to their former haunts all over the State of Maine. (Applause)

Mr. WEBB of Cherryfield: Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen: I come from Washington county. Mr. Thombs claims that the moose have been driven from other sections into Washington county. The only fault the people in my section find is that the law is not enforced. We have plenty of law now if it was suitably enforced. All they object to is that moose are killed in the open time.

Mr. WASHBURN of Perry: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this vote be taken by yeas and nays, and I trust the gentlemen of the House, no matter what their opinion on the subject may be, will grant us this privilege in order that we who represent the district where this legislation is so unpopular may have chance to go on record against it.

The notion was agreed to, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, that this bill be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion to indefinitely postpone when their names are called, will say

yes; all those opposed will say no. The clerk will call the roll.

YE—Albert, Allen, Besse, Bradbury, Brawn, Brown of Auburn, Bussey, Clement, Clifford, Currier, Descoteaux, Evans, Fay, Gould, Grant, Greeley, Greenlaw, Hart, Holt of Gouldsboro, Holt of Skowhegan, Jordan, Libby, Lombard, McCorison, McCurdy, McIntire, Mulligan, Nicholas, Perham, Ranney, Roberts, Russell of Lewiston, St. Clair of Calais, St. Clair of Rockland, Small, Tate, Tobey, Tuttle, Varney, Washburn, Waterhouse, Webb, Welch, Wescott—44.

NAY—Ames, Ballard, Beal, Benn, Blake of New Gloucester, Blake of Oakland, Bonney, Bourque, Bragdon, Brann, Brown of New Sharon, Campbell, Carson, Chadbourne, Chaplin, Chamberlin, Cobb, Coffin, Colcord, Connellan, Connors, Corliss, Danforth, Davis, Dilling, Douglass, Drapeau, Drummond, Durgain, Dutton, Edwards, Ellis, Erskine, Ford, Gallagher, Gerrish, Gilmour, Goldthwait, Gooding, Goodwin, Groaton, Greenleaf, Hanson of Saco, Haraden, Harper, Haskell, Higgins, Hill, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Jameson, Lewis, Littlefield, Lord, Mansir, Maxwell, McCarty, McKinley, Meader, Michaud, Mitchell, Morrison, Morse, Mullin, Neilon, Noyes, O'Connell, Peabables, Perkins, Picher, Pierce of Farmington, Pierce of Houlton, Plummer, Polard, Ricker, Russell of Alfred, Ryder, Snow, Tabbutt, Thombs, Towle, Traf-ton, Turner, Ward, Wasgatt, Watts, Wheeler, Wilkins, Wilson, Wise, Woodman, Wyman—92.

ABSENT—Averill, Bernier, Fossett, Hanson of Sanford, Lawrence, Leader, McNally, Millett, Newell, Peterson, Robinson, Sanborn Smith—13.

PAIRED—Daigle yes; Thibodeau no.

The SPEAKER: Forty-four having voted in the affirmative and 92 in the negative, the motion of the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, is lost.

On motion by Mr. Drummond of Winslow, the bill then received its second reading and was assigned for tomorrow morning for its third reading

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House majority and minority reports of the committee on legal affairs on Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Maine providing for the election on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, biennially, of Governors, Senators, Representatives and other officers, now required to be elected on the second Monday of September, biennially, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, pending the acceptance of either report; the majority reporting "ought to pass", and the minority reporting "ought not to pass".

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word in support of the majority report of the committee on this proposed constitutional amendment. The members of this House of course understand that this Legislature has no powers to change the date of election; the only power that the Legislature has in the matter is, if it is possible to secure a two-thirds vote, to submit the question to the voters of this State and let them determine the matter.

When his matter came up in the Senate, it was argued strenuously in support of the minority report, but I did not see any great demand from the people of this State for the submission of this question and the matter had not been agitated to any great extent. It is true that there were no great petitions presented, and no large number of letters written such as come in one matter or another, but it does seem to me, unless the people that you meet are different from those that I meet, that there is among the people of this State a wide-spread idea that once in every four years we have one campaign in September and another campaign in November. Now, if it were possible to separate the national election from the state election, I could see some argument in the proposition that it was better to have our state election at one time and at that time discuss our State issues, and to have our national elections at another time and discuss national issues, but so long as you have to vote for a congressman at the same time you vote for governor and members of the legislature, it is impossible to divorce state and national issues, and of necessity you have to vote in September with relation to national issues.

I am not speaking now upon the question of any advantage to the one side or the other of the political parties in this State as to when you have these elections; I cannot believe that there is any man in the State of Maine competent to determine which side would gain by having the election in September or in November. I do regard it as a fact that two political campaigns inside of two months must

be a matter of considerable expense; it is an expense to hold an election, you are obliged to pay all your officers and attendants, as well as the matter of advertising, and besides that you have the expense to the immediate parties on both sides, the expense in connection with hauling in voters as well as other expenses. Now, that expense it seems to me should be eliminated as far as possible. The expenses in connection with political campaigns should be reduced, because the more we reduce the amount of necessary expenses in connection with campaigns, the more we put political offices within the reach of men of ordinary means; and the less advantage, and the less influence, and the less pull, if you might use that word, that people of wealth have in our political campaigns, the less influence men of means have, the less money you can run a campaign with; and so, as I say, the question of eliminating these expenses once every four years of an extra election would be a matter of considerable advantage to the people of this State.

Now, I do not pretend that these arguments are very conclusive upon the matter, but it is not a matter which we are asked to pass finally, it is a matter which is discussed about, and you know it, and you have heard people speak of what a foolish thing it is that we have campaigns in this State in August and September, and then turn right around again in November and either let the election go by default or else contest it again. But when this matter comes up, gentlemen, it can be settled by the vote of the people of this State, a matter which this Legislature cannot settle, unless you have a reasonable and sensible argument for it, one that has some sense in it, one that appeals to people of judgment and common sense. When the question is plain and easy to understand so that the voters of the State will not be misled, and when nobody has any corrupt motive to have the change made, or to have the present date changed, it seems to me you have an ideal matter to submit to the voters of this State and to let them

determine, and for that reason I am in favor and I hope this House will accept the report of the committee reporting "ought to pass."

MR. HIGGINS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the members of this House, including the gentleman from Houlton (Mr. Pierce), are to be congratulated upon the effort to clear the calendar as much as possible, and I am sure that we all agree and we all hope that at an early date next week we may be able to clear the calendar entirely of all matters which have accumulated and which I think should have been disposed of several days ago.

Now, I do not agree with the gentleman from Houlton in this proposition. I believe, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, that the day has not arrived when we should make a change in our method of voting in September. We all agree that Maine leads; we do not need to follow any of our neighbors. And, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, do you know that in 1820, and even before that, they were voting in November, and when this change was made it was made for a good reason; and by making a change to November do you know that you are going to disfranchise a large number of people in this State? Look at your decrepid, infirm and aged men, who have the red blood of citizenship flowing through their veins. Are we to deprive them of their vote? Look at conditions in the northern part of the State, and in various parts of the State where the conditions of the roads and highways are very bad in November as compared with their condition in September; and then from a political standpoint in behalf of those who are called upon to take the stump in behalf of State and local issues; look at the changed conditions which appear as far as those people are concerned; look at the fishermen on our coast, who go to the woods in November or late in October. Do you propose to disfranchise that large party who want to have an interest in the issues before them during a State campaign? You have not been besieged with petitions for this change; I can safely say that I have not been approached by one single man who favored this change, to the best of my

knowledge and belief. It certainly does not seem as if the people of Maine were very much interested in having a change at this time: the time has not yet arrived. My friend from Houlton (Mr. Pierce) has referred to the matter of expense. The expense is nothing; we have nothing to do with it; you don't find any city or town complaining about the expense in connection with the September election.

Another thing I wish to mention, and that is in regard to the increase in the vote. In the last gubernatorial election there was a total vote of 141,000. Look at the difference between that and your presidential election. I tell you, the people of Maine are interested in state issues and local issues, and the best time in the world to debate those matters and bring them before the people of the state is in the month of September. Now, if this change were to be made and if it was thought advisable to do it, why has not the matter been worked up to a point where we could have more information, where we would have the people of the state requesting the change? I think, gentlemen, they should have something to say upon this matter. And, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I trust the minority report of the committee "ought not to pass" be accepted; and if there is no motion before the House I would move that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

MR. SMITH of Hampden: Mr. Speaker, in all probability a great many of the members of this House have something to say in regard to this matter, and I will be very brief in the remarks I have to make in the view I take of the matter as it appeals to me on the side of economy. Since there has been already put before us a proposition to do away with the direct primary voting because of the expense and because of the fact that it takes people away from their work one day in the year and costs the State something; and that is one of the points that was urged in opposition by those ladies who appeared here as opposed to equal suffrage, that it was taking the women away from their homes for one day when they should be laboring, and they couldn't afford that. And here we have the pri-

mary, and we cannot afford to attend that as we should have done. Now, if we can have some arrangement made whereby we can do our voting on one day in the year, I appeal to you, gentlemen, from the point of economy if it is not business for us as legislators to make it possible for our constituents and for the people of the state of Maine so to do?

Mr. THOMBS of Lincoln: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as a member of the committee on legal affairs, possibly it might be due to the members of this House that I should put before you very briefly some of the views as they impressed us who signed the minority report. This matter was advertised in the usual way, in a state-wide manner. As a member of the committee, I insisted that ample notice be given in order that every one interested in the measure might have an opportunity to appear. I apprehend possibly that at this session there might be a large number of people from all over the state present at the hearing. It was even considered by the committee whether or not other accommodations ought not to be had for a meeting, because I assumed that a man introducing a resolution of that kind into this legislature certainly had some ground for believing that it would receive some support.

On the day of the hearing just one man appeared in favor of the resolve, and that man a member of the legislature, the genial senator from Lincoln County (Senator Boynton), and he presented a very plausible argument and presented the matter as well as any man could to the committee; but I felt as a member of the committee that when he came to us without a petition, and without followers, representing only himself—and he did not claim to represent anybody else, that the committee ought not in justice to the members of this legislature to report the matter differently than is contained in the minority report.

Now, I am willing to place this matter before this House upon the grounds upon which I think the gentleman from Houlton (Mr. Pierce) desired it placed, if I understood him correctly, as he says that at certain times it becomes

the duty of the legislature in matters of this kind to refer them to the people. But along with that let us see, if you please, just what the Constitution says is the duty of the legislature in that respect. I will read from the Constitution, under Article X, relating to this matter: "The legislature, whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to the Constitution," etc. Now, gentlemen, my purpose in reading this is to call your attention to those two words, "when necessary"; and I believe that those two words, "when necessary", mean that when there is a reasonable demand from the voters of this state; and I want to compare here this morning the matter of the equal suffrage movement which is a question similar to the matter under consideration now. Is it not apparent that in the suffrage movement there is a state-wide interest, that there is some demand? And can you not, gentlemen, when you come to vote, or might you not at least say to yourself that there may be some necessity for referring such a resolve? I ask you in all fairness this morning, how you can justify yourself under the oath which you stood up here and subscribed at the opening of this session, to support the Constitution of the State of Maine? Can you say that you have fulfilled your obligations and that you see a necessity for submitting this matter when it has only the official endorsement of one politician?

Mr. ST. CLAIR of Calais: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the framers of the Constitution of the State of Maine in selecting the month of September as the date of our State election were moved by very wise reasons. September is an ideal month in the State of Maine; the roads are good; the weather is pleasant, not too warm and not too cold; is is an ideal time to conduct a political campaign; the people at that time in the year like to come up and like to attend the meetings, and they go to the election, and that is the time of almost our longest days. Now, when you get to November you are within three weeks of the shortest days of the year, and in the State of Maine it is the time of dark days and rainy weather and bad roads. Now, as I say, the framers of our Constitution, I have

no doubt, took that matter into consideration, and I do believe that the people of the State of Maine prefer that the State election be held in the month of September for those good reasons.

It has been said here that it is unnecessary to have two campaigns. We all know that the Presidential campaign in this State is almost invariably a very tame affair. It has been regarded that the State election decides the political questions of the State for that year, and it is taken for granted that as Maine went in September so it will go in November. I have been a voter for considerably over 40 years, and I don't remember but one time when the position of the State of Maine in September was reversed in November. We put in our time and our strength and our interest into the September election, an ideal time to hold an election, a time when all these issues can be discussed and discussed fairly and openly, and a time when the people of the State can easily attend. All those of you who like myself have gone before the people of the State of Maine in the September elections know that we discuss all of the issues, we discuss the State issues, the municipal issues, the county issues, and we discuss national issues too; so that the people of the State of Maine are well educated in the September campaign for the coming November campaign. They have also the additional advantage of the time from September to November to think the matter over for themselves. I hope there will be no attempt by this Legislature to change the date of holding the State election, and that we shall adhere to the good old custom of holding our election in that beautiful month of September when it is a pleasure to conduct a political campaign and a pleasure to attend rallies.

Mr. HILL of Corinth: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee on legal affairs I signed the majority report and one of the reasons why I am in favor of this change is because it would eliminate the flood of speakers that we have from all over the United States coming here and distributing our September elections; we lose sight of our September election by being flooded with oratory from all over the United States, speakers who come here to take up our time in con-

nection with our elections. One of the great reasons why I signed that majority report was that in September, if it was carried over to November, we will then all attend to our duties as we should and not be embarrassed with a flood of oratory, and I hope this change will be made on account of economy and also on account of our State fairs.

Mr. DUTTON of Bingham. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of the state of Maine would far better prefer to hold their state elections in September at a time when climatic conditions are agreeable. There is something that you have not taken into consideration in the discussion of this question, and that is that the people in the larger communities of this question, and that is that the people in the larger communities with their duties and their work may be allowed to leave their places of employment, while the people in the rural communities when they leave their employment and their ordinary vocations must go further away from home to attend to their duties in connection with elections. In the thickly settled communities it is an easy matter for them to get out and attend a state election, while in the rural communities it is necessary that they must travel a distance of from ten to forty and even fifty miles to attend the polls. I have just this one request to make in behalf of the people of Somerset County: that is, you cannot give us any roads or bridges to pass over to get to the polls, but that you will allow us to yet hold our state election at a time when we can go to the polls without the use of snowshoes or a flying machine. (Applause.)

Mr. SNOW of Mars Hill: Mr. Speaker, I have been much interested in the remarks made by the different gentlemen on the floor of the House. It seems to me that from the time of our primary election until the second Monday of November we should have time enough to make all the campaign speeches necessary in the state of Maine. I do not see why we should want to get two months more of that kind of thing. We have all the time necessary, and if we had to go on the way we went last fall with two months more of campaign speeches or speech-making in the state of Maine, half of the people would not know any more how to vote intelligently than they

did, and the other half would be nearly insane.

The Democratic party last year gave to us all the good things in that party from Woodrow Wilson back to the days of Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson: the Progressive gave to us all the good sayings of Theodore Roosevelt and Mr. Johnson from California and others in the state of Maine who spoke upon questions at issue. Aye, it is possible too, that the Republican party may have added something to the general discussion. Now as to the cost of running a campaign. It will cost every party in the state of Maine from \$5,000 to \$10,000 more to keep that thing up from September to November; the expense will be upon the parties rather than upon anybody else, because if the Democratic party lays down and makes no campaign for a month after the primary elections, it is possible that the Republican party might take advantage of it and do a little secret work. The same thing is true if the Republican party puts their campaign off; the Democrats in all likelihood would take advantage of that; so from the time of the primary election up to the time of the state election every party is interested and at work more or less.

Now, there is another thing that has been injected into our campaigns in the last few years, and it is something which is likely to be kept up, every party adopts the same plank; with the advent of the automobile our men can get from one town to another easily and have hearings or speeches in different towns and they will cover four or five towns in a day, making speeches. Now, if you put that off until October or in November, you cannot hold those outdoor meetings, the weather will be too cold, too frosty, too much wind, and a man can't stand out in the open and we all like to go once in a while and hear a good Democratic speech out in the open, but if you have it too late we can not go and attend such outdoor meetings. We are not constituted in Aroostook County to stand everything; we like to have you come when the Republicans have an open-air meeting in the square, whether you are a Democrat or a Progressive, we like to have you come and listen to what we call the truth. I have not heard of

any great number of people in Maine calling for this change; no petitions have been presented; there is no state-wide movement for this change, and I believe that the proper and the right time for the state of Maine to have its election is in September.

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

The motion was agreed, to and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Higgins, that the minority report, reporting "ought not to pass" be accepted. All those in favor of accepting this report, when their names are called, will answer yes; all those opposed will answer no. The clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Albert, Allen, Ames, Beal, Benn, Besse, Blake of Oakland, Bradbury, Bragdon, Brann, Bussey, Carson, Chaplin, Chamberlin, Clement, Cobb, Coffin, Danforth, Dilling, Drummond, Durgain, Dutton, Ellis, Evans, Fay, Ford, Gould, Grant, Greater, Greenlaw, Hanson of Saco, Harper, Hart, Higgins, Jordan, Lawrence, Littlefield, Lombard, Mansir, McKinley, Meader, Mitchell, Morrison, Morse, Nicholas, O'Connell, Ranney, Ricker, Russell of Alfred, Ryder, St. Clair of Calais, St. Clair of Rockland, Sanborn, Snow, Thombs, Tobey, Towle, Tuttle, Varney, Washburn, Waterhouse, Wescott, Wise.—63.

NAY—Ballard, Blake of New Gloucester, Bonney, Bourque, Brawn, Brown of Auburn, Brown of New Sharon, Campbell, Chadbourne, Clifford, Colcord, Connellan, Connors, Corliss, Currier, Davis, Descoteaux, Douglass, Drapeau, Edwards., Fossett, Gallagher, Gerrish, Gilmore, Goldthwait, Gooding, Goodwin, Greeley, Greenleaf, Haskell, Hill, Hobbs, Hodgkins, Holt of Skowhegan, Jameson, Lewis, Libby, Lord, Maxwell, McCarty, McCorrison, McCurdy, McIntire, Michaud, Millett, Mulligan, Mullin, Nelson, Newell, Noyes, Peabbles, Perham, Perkins, Picher, Pierce of Farmington, Pierce of Houlton, Plummer, Pollard, Roberts, Russell of Lewiston, Small, Smith, Tabbutt, Tate, Trafton, Turner, Ward, Waggatt, Watts, Webb, Welch, Wheeler, Wilkins, Wilson, Woodman, Wyman.—76.

ABSENT—Averill, Bernier, Erskine, Hanson of Sanford, Haraden, Holt of Gouldsboro, Leader, McNally, Peterson, Robinson.—10.

PAIRED—Daigle, no; Thibodeau, yes.

The SPEAKER. Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative and 76 in the negative, the motion of the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Higgins, is lost and

the House refuses to accept the minority report.

Mr. Pierce of Houlton moved that the House non-concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the majority report.

Mr. HIGGINS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, owing to the lateness of the hour we make no objection at this time, but we will endeavor to have something to say upon the matter at the time of its passage to be enacted.

The question being on the motion to non-concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the majority report,

The motion was agreed to.

The majority report having been accepted by the House, the bill was thereupon tabled for printing under the joint rules.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Reports A and B from the committee on legal affairs on bill, An Act to repeal Chapter 221 of the Public Laws of 1913, entitled "An Act to provide for nomination of candidates of political parties by primary election," and amendments thereto, being Senate Doc. No. 34, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce. The pending question is the acceptance of either report.

On motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton, the reports were again laid upon the table and specially assigned for consideration tomorrow..

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays be-

fore the House Resolve authorizing the Land Agent to sell certain lands in Plantation No. 33, being House Doc. No. 220, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, and specially assigned for consideration today. The pending question is the second reading of the resolve.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, at the request of the committee on state lands and forest preservation, I move that this matter be again laid upon the table and be assigned for special consideration on Wednesday of next week.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. Thombs of Lincoln, House Doc. No. 385, bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Lincoln Light and Power Company, was taken from the table.

The pending question being the third reading.

On further motion by Mr. Thombs, the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Campbell of Island Falls, House Doc. No. 318, Resolve in favor of aid in building a bridge in the town of Crystal, was taken from the table, and on further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was again tabled and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

On motion by Mr. Holt of Skowhegan,

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at nine o'clock.